

P@X online bulletin

HUMAN-CENTRED APPROACHES AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

INDEX:

Editorial
José Manuel Pureza 1

P@X Theory
Human security and post-intervention: the
case of Lybia
David Chandler 2-4

David Chandler and the thinking on the
Human Subject
Sarah da Mota 5-7

Book Review
Security beyond the State: Private
Security in International Politics
Otávio de Melo Neto 8-9

P@x Observatory 10-12

P@x Studies
Politics of intervention: a critical
perspective on Portugal and Germany in
Afghanistan *André Barrinha, Maria Raquel
Freire, Paula Duarte Lopes e Pascoal
Pereira* 13-14

The human being and security: some
personal considerations
Giovanni Ercolani 15-17

PS Attic 18-21

P@X
Coordination Peace Studies Research
Line/CES:
José Manuel Pureza

Thematic issue organised by
PhD Program on International Politics and
Conflict Resolution 2010-2014

Coordination of P@X bulletin:
Rita Santos and Sofia Santos

Edition and revision
Rita Santos and Sofia Santos

Humanities, Migration and Peace Studies Group
(NHUMEP)
Centro de Estudos Sociais
Colégio S. Jerónimo, Apartado 3087
3001-401 Coimbra
Portugal
Tel: + 351 239 855593
Fax: + 351 239 855589
[http://www.ces.uc.pt/nucleos/nhumep/pages/
pt/apresentacao.php](http://www.ces.uc.pt/nucleos/nhumep/pages/pt/apresentacao.php)
paxinfo@ces.uc.pt

Editorial

This issue of P@x addresses the meaning and scope of human-centred discourses – as opposed to the traditional state-centric speeches – in the field of international security. The ontological shift registered in the dominant discourse of International Relations – and international security in particular – from the 1990s, with the overcoming of an absolute state-centrism and the increasing introduction of references to individuals as the answer to the question "whose security?" has been the object of various readings.

The first is an apologetic reading, according to which the concept of human security condenses the potentially oppressive shield break of the uniqueness of States as international security benchmarks. This emergency break operated by the concept of human security would be, therefore, an emancipating cut.

However, as recalled on Sarah da Mota's article, this apologetic reading is an expression of the triumphalism of the liberal thought. Human security and the responsibility to protect are the new names of a continuum line in a long historical process in which the abstract humanism has been used to support the expansion's policy of the Western's *modus vivendi* where individualism, the disregard of non-Westerners and the one-sidedness of the concept of morality are the most important features. In this sense, the "human turn" may be seen as a global scale disciplinary biopower tool, and its

achievements – such as human security – aiming to contain the peripheries' turbulence. Ultimately, for this reading the human security is the core of an ideology to justify a global interventionism dedicated to the standardisation of lifestyles and to the governance of *borderlands*.

The political developments of human security-related practices, which led to the concept of responsibility to protect, seems to give reason to this critical reading. The responsibility to protect is a semantic alternative to humanitarian intervention which, nevertheless, keeps its normalising and disciplinary logic based on a Western's array that makes no more than trying to replicate it globally giving it as the template.

David Chandler, one of the authors of the discussion on this benchmark change and its effective range, brings us elements of great importance to a rigorous understanding of what is at stake today. Taking the recent NATO intervention in Libya as example, Chandler stresses the need to introduce the conceptual heterogeneity within the field of humanitarian interventionism. What is new in the Libyan case in respect of precedents of humanitarian intervention is the discourse of the primacy of the power and capabilities of the internal actors over foreign intervention. The view which prevailed during the 1990s and early years of this century – in which the direct assumption of

responsibility for containment by external stakeholders was central – seems to have given place to a new discourse, with a much more limited level of expectations and where the identity of the subjects of change overlaps the horizons (and results) of that very change. The term "post-interventionism", used by David Chandler, perhaps forcibly, translates this apparent new primacy of the procedural over the substantive.

The implications of the new contours of human security for peace studies are irrefutable. The challenge is to assess the dynamics of peace and structural and cultural violence that they shed. And this is a research program which the P@x will not flee from.

José Manuel Pureza/NHUMEP

*** Translated by Tiago Fazenda, PhD Candidate in International Politics and Conflict Resolution, CES, University of Coimbra.

P@X Theory

HUMAN SECURITY AND POST-INTERVENTION: THE CASE OF LYBIA

In the 1990s, the key debates concerning international security were constituted in terms of whether policy should be human-centred or state-centred. Today, we can perhaps go beyond this binary to understand that within human-centred framings of intervention there are vital conceptual distinctions. Human-centred approaches of humanitarian intervention and human rights were posited upon liberal internationalist understandings of the 'domestication' of the international sphere, under global governance, ethics and law: the assertion of global sovereign rights of intervention and the limitation of state sovereignty. Human security always sat uneasily with this global liberal interventionist framing and can better be grasped as discursively constructing a 'post-interventionist' order. The post-interventionist world order no longer juxtaposes external intervention to sovereignty as if this was a zero-sum game, or articulates intervention in the liberal language of a clash of rights or as a problem which needs a legal solution.

In this paradigm, the external management of, or intervention in, the affairs of others is understood as a process of empowerment, of prevention, and of capacity – and capability-building. This broader, and more agent-based, framework of 'empowerment' can today be perhaps understood to reflected disillusionment with the 1990's promise of Western solutions and as reflecting a set of much lower expectations. The agent-centred approach of human security is based upon the rejection of direct attempts to address problems through the provision of external social, economic and military resources, of the sort associated with post-hoc or responsive protection.

This shift was aptly demonstrated by the bombing of Libya, and overthrow of Colonel Gaddafi's regime, in 2011; heralded by many international relations commentators as marking a return to the 1990's era of humanitarian intervention. However, the dropping of bombs over Libya clearly lacked the ethical, political and legal framework of meaning of the 1990s. The



"Free Libya", NATO, October 2011

Libya campaign did not present the 'humanitarian' bombing as an undermining or rolling back of state sovereignty. There was no claim of external sovereign rights or that the international interveners assumed sovereign responsibility to protect the Libyan people. The no-fly zone - and its extended enforcement - was posed as facilitating the agency of the Libyan people, enabling and facilitating them in the process of securing themselves.

Post-interventionist or preventive approaches can still deploy military means, as the bombing of Libya demonstrated, however the conceptual framework is distinct, and this distinctness is vital to understanding the paradigmatic shift at work here. The form or the appearance is the same – humanitarian bombs and regime change – but the conceptual content is different.¹ Libya illustrates how the post-interventionist discourse operates in a different and distinct register, dissolving the clarity of liberal security frameworks in the language of capacity-building and good governance. Post-intervention cannot be grasped in the legal and political terms of the 1990s where intervention was conceived of in terms of a clash of legal and political rights and clashing sovereign claims of securing agency. It was precisely this paradigmatic shift that enabled Libya to be hailed as the success which other humanitarian interventions failed to achieve.

This, it is essential to note, is regardless of the final outcome. Without Western responsibility for the outcome of the intervention in Libya and without any

P@X Theory

transformative promise, Western powers were strengthened morally and politically through their actions, whereas in Bosnia, Kosovo, Afghanistan and Iraq, they were humbled and often humiliated.

Libya was an intervention freed from liberal internationalist baggage, where the West could gain vicarious credit and distance itself from any consequences. Even Bosnia's former colonial governor, Lord Ashdown, argued that we should learn our lessons and not be tempted to impose our version of liberal peace (Ashdown, 2011). As British MP Rory Stewart astutely noted, if Libya was a success, it was because 'it was hardly an intervention at all' (Stewart, 2011).



People celebrate, August 2011, Alexandre Meneghini/AP

The framework of human security is presented as a radical democratization of security, where the subjects of human security are the most vulnerable and the mechanisms are those which enhance their own capacities for security. This framework is that of intervention to protect through empowerment rather than through external sovereign intervention. The discourse of human security inverts a traditional liberal understanding of sovereign securing power. The emphasis is no longer upon the intervening external sovereign or international actor as a securing agent; the empowering discourse of human security insists that the emphasis must be upon a 'bottom up' understanding of security. Securing agency is 'de-liberalized' in this discourse.

This is a far cry from the social contract framing of liberal modernity with the collective constitution of securing agency at the level of the state.¹ Human security as a discourse of post-intervention works in reverse. Rather than securing power being transferred to the sovereign, this securing power is decentralized or dispersed back into society.

Human security framings seek to place the agency of the non-Western subject at the centre of security practices. The crisis of liberal interventionism, clear in the undermining of the authority and standing of the UN at the end of the 1990s and fears over the future of international law, seems to have resolved through the reinsertion of Western policy concerns within the human security paradigm of empowerment and post-intervention. Once this paradigm is clearly conceptually drawn out, it may be possible to understand human security frameworks not as marginal and definitely not as distinct from, or as alternatives to, the coercive use of military force but, in fact, as dominating the international agenda and rescuing the credibility of military campaigns through evading and ameliorating the problems of legal accountability, moral legitimacy and political responsibility.

David Chandler

D.Chandler@wmin.ac.uk

Professor of International Relations, University of Westminster, UK. He is the editor of the Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding. More information on his work can be found at: www.davidchandler.org.

P@x Theory

Notes:

[1] As Foucault states, this is not a matter of areas or spheres of intervention being altered – the 1990s debates over sovereignty and intervention have been resolved to this extent – but of how to intervene: ‘the problem is not whether there are things that you cannot touch and others that you are entitled to touch. The problem is how you touch them. The problem is the way of doing things, the problem, if you like, of governmental style (2008: 133).

[2] See, for example, Foucault’s discussion of the liberal problematic of intervention, or ‘liberal economy of power’ (2008: 65).

References:

Ashdown, Paddy (2011), “Ray-Bans and pick-ups: this is the future; Iraq-style intervention is over. The messy Libyan version will be our model from now on”, *The Times*, 26 August.

Foucault, Michel (2008), *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France 1978- 1979*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Stewart, Rory (2011), “What can Afghanistan and Bosnia teach us about Libya?”, *Guardian*, 8 October.

*** Translated by Amanda Daltro Sanches e Pedro dos Reis Nunes, PhD candidates in International Politics and Conflict Resolution, at the Centre for Social Studies, University of Coimbra

P@x Theory

DAVID CHANDLER AND THE THINKING ON THE HUMAN SUBJECT

At a time when prevailing socioeconomic patterns seem to be running out of options, and the conduction of democracy is stumbling over an ambiguous path, to approach the matter of the Human is essential. It is to go at the centre of all the more urgent problems. It is to focus on the more natural element of the international system. In the field of Security Studies, the “subject” of security is one of the most pressing questions, perhaps the most debated: who or what is to be secured? Attributing the “human” quality to the subject of security represents a complete surpassing of the national security-centred thinking. In this context, recalling some of the topics approached by an author to whom the centrality of the Human has been an ontological and philosophical concern for some years is thus a topical task. It allows deepening the understanding of the issue and is the reason why we chose to evoke here the main reflections of David Chandler, in his approach of the “human subject”, on the last September 23rd at Coimbra.

Throughout his work, David Chandler has sought to understand how human choices have resulted in considerable failure, namely in the liberal context. Chandler does not hesitate in being critical about the dominating models as well as conceptual and normative trends which rapidly grew popular in the security and military fields. This is the case with the outbreak of morality in foreign policy, which then gave rise to the “Responsibility to Protect” as a principle. That critical approach is the mark which is transversal in the author’s main work. Chandler has been highlighting the perversities resulting of the “Responsibility to Protect”, criticizing the humanitarian model effective since the 1990’s (Chandler, 2002; 2004), and also disapproves a concept of Human Security which has been lacking objectivity and propitiating the expansion of biopower (Chandler, 2008a; 2008b). Another reproach of the author concerns the way Liberalism’s assumptions have been imposed

on the international stage, which results in a non-liberal action aiming at the keeping of the status quo and imposition of a Western *modus vivendi* (Chandler, 2003; 2010).

Chandler mistrusts the international regimes which privilege individual rights, for he sees in them the mark of political processes throughout which the notion of the Human



David Chandler, <http://www.davidchandler.org/>

has been manipulated and oriented towards ideas of individualism, liberal Occidentalism, dependence of non-western subjects, unilateralism in the concept of morality. The author outlines the forced and artificial aspect in introducing moral values in the system of collective security, phenomenon in which language is instrumentalised. From this deconstruction of the Human, Chandler transmitted in Coimbra the idea that the world is absorbed by the centrality of the Human. Chandler evidenced how the Human currently represents a problem, caged in a – liberal – project of limitations and practical and discursive restrictions, confined in a conception of a world where the environment itself is forgotten in an uncertain nebula. In Chandler’s understanding, genuine humanization only may occur when the Human is liberated from these very constraints.

Another important point of Chandler’s intervention in Coimbra thus focused the ambiguous relationship between environment, the Human, the representation of problems, and the choices delineated to solve these problems. In fact, says Chandler,

P@x Theory

the environment judges the Human, telling him he has been acting wrong. What the author might be meaning by this is that the environment in which the Human has to live and survive manifests in adverse ways for himself (through wars, for instance), showing him how bad he has been managing this environment. This leads Chandler to the following interrogations: do we actually choose conflict, the lack of democracy, environmental problems? How might we transform them? In a global era, there will be no difference between the human subject and the world. Today's problems cannot only be solved by science and technology, and we won't be able to solve them as long as we consider these problems as external to us, refers Chander (2011). We interpret from this that it is vital to internalize and appropriate the problems of the world, insert the Human in them. We are responsible for the world as it is; since we are responsible for the world we live in, the state the world is in only serves to demonstrate that we have not been able to make choices, simply because "we are not good at it" (Chandler, 2011).

Summing up, we may observe two main assumptions in respect of the contemporary approach of the Human. The first is conceptual, remitting to the idea of the mainstreaming of the Human through notions such as Human Security or human development, both popularized as object of humanitarian action and international security policies. The question of the linguistic and discursive construction is omnipresent and subjacent to that acceptance, allowing the operationalization and practical application of these concepts to be abused and associated with manoeuvres of destruction and violence (Bellamy, 2004; Durodié, 2010; Watson, 2011). Emerging of this process surges the idea of a forced and artificial morality, a trend that some authors attribute to the work of Liberalism (Tahmasebi, 2010; Weber, 2010; Wieland, 2005).

The second assumption is philosophical, remitting to certain contradictions. As a matter of fact, what Liberalism advocates is not

actually the *Human*, but the *individual*, placing him on a level apart from earthly reality as it only considers his political values and not the finiteness of his human life (Levinas, 1990: 69). Therefore there is a conceptual gap in Liberalism when interpreting the political facts without taking into account the morality, or the normative and ethical effects of the policies adopted in individuals' lives. So a conceptual tension might have been generated, in which the reference to the Human automated an understanding oriented to one human being in particular, the individual, as opposed to the State, subjective and collective entity.

It appears from the reading of Chandler that the problem resides in a centrality that is misguided by a liberal project which has turned the Human into a meaningless and incorporeal entity, only valued by its subjective characteristics, and not by its physical finiteness. With the topic of the "human subject" Chandler does not bring any fundamentally new concern – be it in his work, be it in the critical literature scope. Nonetheless, considering the Human is to consider humanity in its more universal ontology, such as we think David Chandler did in Coimbra. Appealing to humanity is to invoke the ethical and moral value of the individual, the conscience of himself in the wholeness, ensuring a common goodness – Humanism – instead of a private good, fostered by Liberalism. Through these structuring elements of the value of human choices, as well as the value of the Human itself, Chandler testified the need of refocusing our thinking in what is the most essential – the human subject.

Sarah da Mota

sarah.damota@gmail.com

PhD Candidate in International Politics and Conflict Resolution at the Centre for Social Studies, University of Coimbra.

P@x Theory

References:

Bellamy, Alex (2004), "Ethics and intervention: the 'humanitarian exception' and the problem of abuse in the case of Iraq", *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 41, n°2, 131-147.

Chandler, David (2002), *From Kosovo to Kabul (and beyond): Human Rights and International Intervention*. London: Plutopress.

Chandler, David (2003) "Review essay – Expanding the research agenda of Human rights: a reply to Bellamy", *The International Journal of Human Rights*, Vol. 7, n°1, Spring, 128-140.

Chandler, David (2004), "The Responsibility to Protect? Imposing the 'liberal peace'", *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 11, n°1, Spring, 59-81.

Chandler, David (2008a), "Human Security: the dog that didn't bark", *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 39, n°4, 427-438.

Chandler, David (2008b), "Human Security II: waiting for the tail to wag the dog – a rejoinder to Ambrosetti, Owen and Wibben", *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 39, n°4, 463-469.

Chandler, David (2010), "The uncritical critique of 'liberal peace'", *Review of International Studies*, British International Studies Association, 1-19.

Chandler, David (2011), "Rethinking the Human Subject", Aula aberta, Faculdade de Economia, Universidade de Coimbra, 23 de Setembro 2011.

Durodié, Bill (2010), "Human Security – a retrospective", *Global Change, Peace & Security*, Vol. 22, n°3, October, 385-390.

Levinas, Emmanuel (1990), "Reflections on the Philosophy of Hitlerism", *Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 17, 63-71.

Tahmasebi, Victoria (2010), "Does Levinas justify or transcend liberalism? Levinas on human liberation" *Philosophy Social Criticism*, Vol. 36, n°5, 523-544.

Watson, Scott (2011), "The 'human' as referent object? Humanitarianism as securitization", *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 42, n°1, 3-20.

Weber, Cynthia (2010), "After Liberalism" *Millennium – Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 38, n°3, 553-560.

Wieland, Carsten (2005), "The bankruptcy of Humanism? Primordialism dominates the agenda of international politics", *Internationale Politik und Gesellschaft*, N° 4, 142-158.

Book Review

Abrahamsen, Rita; Williams, Michael C. (2011), *Security beyond the State: Private Security in International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

The new global structure of governance in the post-Cold War period discloses a new definition of the role of the state, not only internally but also externally. There are new actors, a rethinking of global priorities and a new set of concepts, including that of security, which has gained a great deal of attention.

'Security Beyond the State: Private Security in International Politics', by Rita Abrahamsen and Michael C. Williams (Cambridge University Press, 2011), presents a study on the return of 'mercenarism' in this new global era. The consequences felt in the military sector and the fact that, in more than 110 countries, private security companies are now part of the everyday life of the citizens, urges for an important discussion on the meaning and on the impact of these.

It becomes clear that private security companies have experienced a considerable commercial growth in the past decades and that, by 2015, they will reach the value of 230 billion dollars, following an annual increase of 8 per cent. The consequences of these data will surpass the field of security and include discussions on issues of responsibility, equality and violence.

One of the main features of the analysis done by the authors is that, through historical and speech analysis, it tries to deconstruct the role played by the private and public sphere in the security concept. The authors go through the webberian idea of the monopoly on force and through the confirmation of the symbolic and material power of the state to point out that the state is not loosing strength but it is only being reconfigured. In this way, the relationship between public, private and security, built up by neoliberal politics, has triggered the changes that directly influenced the process of security privatisation. Therefore, to better understand this process, one should focus on how security is managed in liberal democracies.

One of the main concerns regarding the academic analysis done on private security companies is, according to the authors, the danger of generalisation, that can produce a 'mercenary misconception'. This misconception would influence the academic research into treating the matter as illegal or immoral, instead of analysing its influence on the socioeconomic relations that can in a way build a transnational context for security governance. To the public-private axis, the authors gather that of local-global and its connection to security that has been influencing and legitimising power for centuries.

The authors' main argument is that the privatisation of security is not the same as commercialisation of the military sector, since the process of globalisation creates the 'global security assemblages', transnational structures of networking that allow the interaction between actors in search for a governance on security through the establishment of normative structures. The growth and globalization of the private security companies market will eventually create transnational security agents that cannot overlook problems regarding criminality and the punishment of its own actions. In this sense, it becomes crucial an analysis on these agents through the lens of concepts such as justice and criminality.

Another important issue is the increase of employment opportunities in the field of international private security in the past 50 years. Sometimes, a state employs more private security employees than public police force or armed forces put together. An example of this is the Bulgarian state which employs 130.000 people through private security companies but it only employs 28.000 police officers. Throughout the analysis, it becomes clear that these numbers relate to the high military unemployment after the end of the Cold War and to some institutional factors that facilitated the process, such as the normalisation of the activity in countries like Russia.

The analysis of the book is mainly focused on Africa due to the popularisation of the usage of these companies that were and are still present in the construction process of a great part of those African states and so, consequently, ended up creating those transnational entities that challenge the classical idea on the relationship between the public and private sphere. In order to better understand this relationship and to further analyse the influence of these transnational security companies, the authors did interviews with police officers, representatives of those companies on the field, governments,

customers in general and owners, in this way studying the relationship between these companies and the agents of state security and between these companies and the local population.

Therefore, it is also noticeable the idea that opposite to the deterritorialisation of the global elite there is the centralisation of the commercialisation of the private security companies. Following that logic, we can divide the book in two parts: the first one analyses in a more theoretical way how the private security companies have been observed in historical terms (chapter 1), taking into consideration the neoliberal factors, the joining of new actors in the governance of security, the transnationalisation of the private security companies depending on market growth, and the implications of the axis public-private in the constitution of the state authority (chapter 2); building also a re-reading of globalisation and of the constitution of the 'global security assemblages', within a discussion about power, authority and territory (chapter 3).

The second part of the book focuses more on specific matters through the analysis of the influence of private security companies on the protection of public companies, more specifically, oil extraction companies in Angola and diamond extraction in Sierra Leone (chapter 4), as well as the role of this kind of security performing in urban contexts, focusing this analysis on the African cities of Cape Town and Nairobi (chapter 5). The authors conclude the book by analysing the consequences of globalisation of private security in the construction of the 'global security assemblages' (chapter 6).

'Security Beyond the State: Private Security in International Politics' presents in an interesting and innovative way a new perspective on the emergent global structure of the governance of security, emphasising factors normally overlooked, such as the construction of the public and the private in the inducement of the securitising principles. Furthermore, it suggests that globalisation is not a threat to the integrity of the state, but a natural path that must be understood as having a reconstructing role, searching new forms of governance and normalisation in the new dynamic that must be understood through a focus on criminology and justice. The fact that it treats the threat to sovereignty as an idea that can be transformed makes the understanding of the 'global security assemblages' easier.

However, to exemplify the practicability of the 'assemblages', the authors refer to African countries (Nigeria, Sierra Leone, South Africa and Kenya) that possess in their foundations structural problems regarding the triangle power-authority-territory and are also states in which the international private companies are part of the initial institutional structure context. To analyse the applicability of the concept in structures that do not possess the same interaction between the public and the private, the local and the global, it is perhaps not as simple as proposed by this analysis.

The authors should also pay more attention to the disequilibrium caused in the moment of reconfiguration of the power structures and they also don't make clear just how much these 'new' transnational actors influence the global agendas. Nevertheless, the book helps us to acquire a critical understanding of the new scenario of the global governance on security, allowing the reader to enlarge its academic research possibilities in the study of the global companies of private security, a more dynamic reading possibility, but state-centred nonetheless.

Otávio de Melo Neto

otaviocorreia@gmail.com

PhD candidate in International Politics and Conflict Resolution, at the Centre for Social Studies, University of Coimbra.

***Translated by Laura Bastos, PhD candidate in International Politics and Conflict Resolution, at the Centre for Social Studies, University of Coimbra.

P@x Observatory

Resources on Human Security

Buzan, Barry (2004), "What is 'Human Security'? A Reductionist, Idealistic Notion that Adds Little Analytical Value", *Security Dialogue*, 35(3), 369-370.

Chandler, David; Hynek, Nik (2010), *Critical Perspectives on Human Security: Rethinking Emancipation and Power in International Relations*. London: Routledge.

Edwards, Alice; Ferstman, Carla (eds.) (2010), *Human Security and Non-Citizens: Law, Policy and International Affairs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kaldor, Mary (2007a), *Human Security: Reflections on Globalisation and Intervention*. Cambridge: Polity.

Kaldor, Mary (2011), "Human Security in Complex Operations", *Prism*, 2 (2), 3-14.

Martin, Mary; Owen, Taylor (2011), *The Routledge Handbook of Human Security*. London: Routledge.

UNDP (1994), *The Human Development Report: New dimensions of human security*. New York: The United Nations.

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

Waddel, Nicholas; Duffield, Mark (2006), "Securing Humans in a Dangerous World", *International politics*, 42, 1-23.

PEACE BUILDERS

The Human Security Gateway

<http://www.humansecuritygateway.com/>

The Human Security Gateway is an online database regrouping resources on human security, such as reports, academic papers and fact sheets. The Gateway is designed to make human security-related research more accessible to the policy and research communities, the media, educators and the interested public. It focuses attention on threats stemming from violence to individuals and to societies at risk. The Human Security Gateway is an initiative of the Human Security Report Project, an independent research centre affiliated with Simon Fraser University in Vancouver, Canada.

The United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security

<http://ochaonline.un.org/Home/tabid/2097/Default.aspx>

The United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security was launched in 1999 by the Government of Japan and the United Nations Secretariat. Its primary concern was to promote human security and protect and strengthen endangered peoples and communities. The United Nations Trust Fund finances activities carried out by UN organisations and/or designated non-UN organisations. Those are mainly development-related activities implemented in developing countries or conflicting areas. So far a number of projects have been executed over 70 different countries.

The African Human Security Initiative (AHSI)

<http://www.africanreview.org/>

The AHSI is a network of 7 African Non-Governmental African Organisations to embark upon a process of benchmarking the performance of key African governments in respect of human security issues. The AHSI is developing its research in 8 countries (Algeria, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa and Uganda) based on 7 key-commitments. The activities under this project are mainly related to: human rights, democracy and good governance, civil society, weaponry, peacekeeping and conflict resolution, and fight against corruption, terrorism and organised crime.

Observatório de Segurança Humana

<http://www.segurancahumana.eu>

The observatory works to establish a locus for research and experience exchange in the area of global security and especially human security. The project focuses on knowledge production of social practice responsible for human security and insecurity and advocating for an increasingly inclusive political agenda in these matters. The Observatory's mission is to promote, within the academic community, relevant research directed to these issues and the creation of a network of researchers. With this purpose in mind, it sets out to affirm itself as an instance of debate, information exchange and production of contents in the matters of human security.

International Relations and Security Network

<http://www.isn.ethz.ch>

The International Relations and Security Network is an open access information services for International relations and security professionals. In cooperation with several universities, research centres and international organisations, its mission is to facilitate security-related dialogue and cooperation within a network of organisations, professionals and experts, and to provide open-source international relations and security-related tools and materials. The International Relations Security Network is a project of the Centre for Security Studies, at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology. Among others, it offers access to a digital library and free access to an e-learning platform.

International Crisis Group

<http://www.crisisgroup.org>

The International Crisis Group is a well-known non-governmental organisation committed to preventing and resolving conflicts. Its reports are useful to researchers and politicians on the definition of security strategies. The International Crisis Group resources are source of analysis and advice to intergovernmental bodies like the European Union, World Bank and United Nations. Crisis Group's reports, and the advocacy associated with them, have had a very significant direct impact on conflict prevention – through the ringing early warning alarm bells published on a monthly base – and resolution in regions across the world – as it provides a source of information unobtainable elsewhere on developments regarding conflict and offers new strategic thinking on several issues.

POLITICS OF INTERVENTION: A CRITICAL PERSPECTIVE ON PORTUGAL AND GERMANY IN AFGHANISTAN

P@X Studies

CES has, since 2011, been engaged in a joint project with the University of Marburg (Germany) on *Policies of Intervention – A Comparison of German and Portuguese Foreign Policy Engagements in South / Central Asia*. This two-year project, sponsored by the Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT) in Portugal and the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) in Germany investigates the policies and practices of intervention of Portugal and Germany in Afghanistan, while keeping in mind (i) the tensions in each country between security objectives and development agendas, (ii) the relationship of these to the European Union (EU)/North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) policies and practices, and (iii) the extent to which these tensions are exacerbated by hegemonic United States of America narratives and policies towards the region. In addition, it intends to highlight the need for the discussion on Afghanistan to move simply from implementation issues on the ground, and take into account the complex process of policy *formulation* in national contexts, under conditions of relative policy-dependence and policy-linkages.

In practice, the project has involved the consolidation of contacts between the Portuguese and German research teams as well as the development of further contacts with experts, academics and politicians working on the topic in both countries. Several interviews have already been conducted – close to 50 – involving high-level policy makers from both executive and legislative branches, high-ranked military officers with experience in Afghanistan, opinion-makers, academics, and analysts from foreign policy think tanks in both countries. These interviews were semi-structured, and focused on the foreign policy formulation and decision-making process regarding the international intervention in Afghanistan.

Apart from the interviews, it was also possible to gather and discuss a significant amount of information at the closed workshop organised at CES-Lisbon on September 13, 2011. This

This restricted meeting – that was then followed by a public session on Portugal and Germany's intervention in Afghanistan – was fundamental for the evolution of the project as both German and Portuguese participants (including current and/or former military and political decision makers) could freely share their first-hand experience and perspectives, under Chatham House Rules. The discussion included topics such as the importance of the intervention in Afghanistan for the reshaping of the concept of international interventions; a widespread critique on the absence of a comprehensive approach in its conception; a listing of approaches, strategies, objectives and implications of the decision to intervene; the debates in Germany and Portugal on the responsibility and legitimacy of their participation in the intervention; and an analysis of the objectives and interests of both regional actors (Iran, Pakistan, China) and international organisations (such as the EU and the United Nations).

The identification of similarities and differences between German and Portuguese decisions and approaches is currently being worked by the team to result in a co-authored paper. Additionally, the Portuguese team is preparing a paper on Portuguese motivations, drivers, decision-making dynamics, and issues associated with rendering the mandates operational, assessing the commitment and potential contribution of Portugal, as well as how this is defined and affected by our integration into international structures, in particular the Atlantic Alliance, but also the EU.

During the recent visit of the Portuguese team to Marburg (February 2012) it was possible to discuss and share these ideas with a German audience, in a workshop on “Western Intervention Policies towards Afghanistan and Pakistan – Strategies, Challenges and Perspectives”. One of the main ideas discussed – which left the German public quite interested – was the little interest the deployment of Portuguese Armed Forces has had in the domestic public space, when compared to the huge impact German's participation has been having in the country's public opinion debate.

Related to this is the limited role the Portuguese parliament has played in the definition and overview of the decisions related to the country's participation in International Security Assistance Force (ISAF), also quite distinct from the relevant role played by the German parliament. Finally, whereas in the Portuguese case, there has been a great concern with contributing to the overall war and reconstruction efforts of the mission, following what could be understood as an 'holistic' approach, German's participation has been more concerned with the *raison d'être* of its presence in the country, promoting a more autonomous development agenda, in a logic that could be defined as more 'atomistic'.

However, even though these three issues clearly set apart the Portuguese case from that of Germany, there is a great amount of common features uniting both countries intervention in Afghanistan: from the initial logic of support to the United States' retaliation in the aftermath of 9/11 to the general discourse of supporting the war effort in the name of international security, both Portugal and German's participation in Afghanistan are commonly informed by an understanding of their role in that country as primarily connected to their overall commitment to the security of the Euro-Atlantic space, i.e., to their commitment to a particular international order.

André Barrinha, Maria Raquel Freire*, Paula Duarte Lopes* and Pascoal Pereira***

abarrinha@fe.uc.pt

rfreire@fe.uc.pt

pdl@fe.uc.pt

pascoalpereira@ces.uc.pt

* International Relations professors at the School of Economics of the University of Coimbra and researchers at the Centre for Social Studies.

** PhD Candidate in International Politics and Conflict Resolution at the Centre for Social Studies, University of Coimbra.

P@X Studies

THE HUMAN BEING AND SECURITY: SOME PERSONAL CONSIDERATIONS

Let us concentrate on a particular important period as the Cold War, with the event of implosion of the Soviet Union, and its two main actors: NATO and USSR. If one of the actors vanished, the other one has survived and with it its paradigm.

When the Berlin Wall fell down and no Soviet tanks were there ready to invade Europe, I can say that the NATO defense paradigm, upon which all our knowledge of the enemy-Soviet Union was constructed and hegemonically spread, really represented a structured protocol-paradigm-grid of analysis and interpretation.

How did the NATO paradigm explain the Soviet Union implosion? Interestingly, in 2005 Edward A. Kolodziej in his "Security and International Relations" gave an answer: no International Relations theory was able to explain the facts that brought a "contra-revolution" and the implosion of the Soviet Union.

Not only IR theories were too much static in adapting themselves to time and the new environment, as the NATO paradigm was completely fossilized on a defense concept, which monopolized the interpretation of the security concept by imposing a simple equation: security = military problem-solution. I can assume that the purpose of the NATO paradigm was not only to address defense issues but it was (as it still is) an auto-referential narrative-paradigm with the aim to reinforce its structure.

If I remember well, the former USSR was not attacked by any state nor did it directly attack any NATO members (Art. 5 of NATO agreement was never evoked). But before I have used the word "contra-revolution" - why? Not all contra-revolutions must have a stereotyped image of guns and blood. It was a contra-revolution in the sense that from the "revolution generation" (1917) to the "implosion generation" (1989), in these seventy-two years, almost three generations lost faith in what they were doing. This happened not only as a consequence of the totalitarian soviet-communist regime they were something different, at what was going on outside the Soviet territory.

If any revolution carries with it a dream, the soviet people started dreaming a different non-official dream, then: a contra-revolution in dream-shift.

Apparently, in all the military interventions in which NATO countries have participated after the USSR implosion, the NATO Cold War protocol-paradigm has remained unchanged. Of course you can answer me that NATO produced two Strategic Concepts (1999 and 2010) to adjust itself to the new world realities, in order to protect NATO countries interests. But what about the protocol-certification for the "societal" aspect in the "multiple stress zone" where NATO forces could operate in a near future? We should read the more recent "Active Engagement, Modern Defence", which constitutes the "NATO's New Strategic Concept", through Foucauldian lens and I am sure you will be surprised to see in front of you a "military text" which can be read as a medical text. An "Active Engagement" which, whilst paying so much attention to the health of NATO territories and populations (NATO's system), has a complete disinterest for the "bodies" which belong to the "non-NATO areas" where potential crisis can affect NATO countries interests. A very "NATO-ethno auto-referential centric" approach, to my advice.

Therefore, if NATO's new strategic concept-narrative constructs a new paradigm-lens through which we can see insecurity and a consequent remedy for our security-health (We-NATO System), this protocol does not provide any clue for how to approach, how to develop a paradigm in order to understand what is going on in the non-NATO societies-mode of life (the ones that apparently can be a source of instability for the NATO countries, then un-healthy).

How will NATO forces operate in complex-emergencies without understanding not only the actors-agencies involved in this conflicts/new wars, but the very dynamism of the confrontation-armed conflict inside a

P@X Studies

precise symbolic-cultural system? “Ignoring the process by which people have arrived (and perhaps continue to arrive) at that extreme position or situation” (Keen, 2009:174).

In the past years we have already become familiar to armed conflict concepts such as “New & Old Wars” (Kaldor, 2006), “War amongst people” (Smith, 2005), “Large group identity-conflict” (Volkan, 2004), and “Hybrid Wars” (McCuen, 2008), which started to call the attention towards the “human factor” in conflict dynamics. Is the NATO new paradigm, using a “critical security studies” narrative, to cover a “strategic” hermeneutical reality in order to return to the equation: “security = military problem-solution”?

This is not only a problem of the military environment; it is a protocol of knowledge which should be valid for the academic environment too. How many regional “experts” are writing papers, articles, books around without any knowledge of the local, the societal, the cultural-social environment they pretend to write about, reproducing the same superficial Cold War period paradigms that were not able to explain anything at all?

If all IR paradigms pretend to be a scientific description of what is happening inside a human laboratory, I can say that they completely underestimate the importance of the “human factor”. It should not be so difficult to identify at least the simpler dimensions of a human being. Just open any western-culture newspaper, and on the horoscope page, under every horoscope sign, you will read all of these: love, work, money, health and family. Are these dimensions valid only for the We-NATO people?

In conclusion, we, student-analysts of Security, have to approach our topic of investigation with an open mind, with the intention to produce something that will help the human being, then not only the We-NATO, to emancipate. We must be able to come to work with a “liquid” paradigm which constantly challenges the typical questions:

- What is being secured?
- Against what is it being secured? Who are the enemies?
- Who provides security?
- What methods can be undertaken to provide it?

And it is exactly in this “liquid” paradigm, where the “human factor” found its principal position, that we can re-focus our lens and look at the events under a “cosmopolitan look”, which combines the local and the international, as both of them are influential and tied to each other.

Then, it is our personal decision, as free human beings: “we can decide to study (security) in ways that replicate a world politics that does not work for countless millions of our fellow human beings; or we can decide to study in ways that seek to help to lift the strains of life-determining insecurity from the bodies and minds of people in real villages and cities, regions and states” (Booth, 2005:276).

Giovanni Ercolani

drercolani@yahoo.co.uk

Thesis Advisor for the “Peace Operations Training Institute-POTI” (USA) and Independent Scholar on Political Anthropology and Security Studies.

P@X Studies

References:

Booth, Ken (2005), *Critical Security Studies and the World Politics*. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Kaldor, Mary (2010), *New & Old Wars – Organized Violence in a Global Era*. Cambridge: Polity.

Keeb, David (2009), *Complex Emergencies*. Cambridge: Polity.

McCuen, John J (2008), "Hybrid Wars", *Military Review*. Available at: <http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/milreview/mccuen08marapr.pdf>

NATO's New Strategic Concept, Available at: http://www.nato.int/strategic-concept/pdf/Strat_Concept_web_en.pdf

Smith, Rupert (2005), *The Utility of Force – The Art of War in the Modern World*. London: Penguin Books.

Volkan, Vamik (2004), *Blind Trust: Large Groups and Their Leaders in Times of Crisis and Terror*. Virginia: Pitchstone Publishing.

P@X Studies

Peace Studies' Attic

PublicationsPS

Afonso, Carla; Cardoso, Katia; Santos, Rita; Roque, Sílvia; Moura, Tatiana (2012), *Youth and Urban Violence in San Salvador, Rio de Janeiro and Praia: Public policies, community-based responses and recommendations*. Brussels: IfP-EW. Available on: <http://www.ifp-ew.eu/publications/index.php>

Cardoso, Katia (2012), "De volta à pátria? Os deportados Cabo-verdianos dos Estados Unidos da América". In Iolanda Évora e Sónia Frias (org.), in progress - Seminário sobre Ciências Sociais e Desenvolvimento em África. Lisboa: CEsa, 63-77. Available on: <http://pascal.iseq.utl.pt/~cesa/index.php/pt/menupublicacoes/e-book/195>

Cravo, Teresa (2011), "Consolidating Partnerships: History and Geopolitics in Portugal's Twenty-first Century Foreign Policy". In Sebastián Royo (ed.), *Portugal in the 21st Century: Politics, Society and Economics*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, a division of Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, 2011, pp.215-244.

Freire, Maria Raquel; Kanet, Roger E. (ed.) (2012), *Russia and Its Near Neighbours: Identity, Interests and Foreign Policy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Kanet, Roger E.; **Freire, Maria Raquel** (ed.) (2012), *Russia and European Security*. Dordrecht: Republic of Letters Publishing.

Pureza, José Manuel (2012), "Humanitarismo, segurança humana e benignidade da dominação". In Observare - Observatório de Relações Exteriores (ed.), *Actas do I Congresso Internacional do Observare*. Lisboa: UAL.

Pureza, José Manuel (2012), "Europa: imaginação e punição", *Le Monde Diplomatique - edição portuguesa*, 8-9.

Roque, Sílvia (2011), *Um retrato da violência contra mulheres na Guiné-Bissau*. Bissau: Governo da República da Guiné-Bissau/Nações Unidas. Available on: www.ces.uc.pt/myces/UserFiles/livros/907_VAW_study_completed_FINAL.pdf

JANUARY

Daniela Nascimento was **Visiting Scholar at the Escola de Cultura de Paz**, Autonomous University of Barcelona (Funded by the Ibero-American Scholarship for Young Teachers and Researchers, Santander Totta/ Coimbra University) during January and February 2012.

Teresa Cravo was **guest researcher at the Monash University**, School of Economy and Management, Melbourne, January 2012.

José Manuel Pureza commented the conference **“Political and Religious Challenges Facing European Muslims”**, by Tariq Ramadan, Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, Lisbon, 5 January 2012.

José Manuel Pureza presented the communication **“Vida e obra de Johan Galtung”**, Il Ciclo Vidas e Vozes – Debates Contemporâneos, Centro de Estudos Sociais, Coimbra, 21 January 2012.

Maria Raquel Freire presented the communication **“Rússia, Ucrânia e a Segurança Europeia”**, National Defence Course 2011/2012, National Defence Institute (IDN), Porto, 23 January 2012.

André Barrinha presented the communication **“Turquia”**, Seminar **“Portugal e o Médio Oriente”** organised by the National Defence Institute (IDN) and the Portuguese Institute for International Relations (IPRI), Lisbon, 26 January 2012.

FEBRUARY

Teresa Cravo defended her PhD dissertation **“What’s in a Label? The Aid Community’s Representations of Success and Failure in Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau”**, Department of Politics and International Studies, Cambridge University, Cambridge, February 2012.

Maria Raquel Freire, Paula Duarte Lopes presented the communication **“Portuguese participation in military operations: the case of Afghanistan”**, Workshop **“Western Intervention Policies Towards Afghanistan and Pakistan – Strategies, Challenges and Perspectives”**, Marburg University, Marburg, 3 February 2012.

Teresa Cunha presented the communication **“Economias de abundância: um pesadelo para a crise”**, Masters course in **“Right to food and rural development”**, ESAC, Coimbra, 11 February 2012.

Teresa Cunha presented the communication **“As memórias e as guerras em Timor-Leste: esquecimentos, brutalidades, aprendizagem e poder das mulheres”**, Seminar **“Timor-Leste: colonialismo, descolonização e lusotopia”**, Espaço por Timor, Lisbon, 25 February 2012.

André Barrinha presented the communication **“Realismo e Estudos de Segurança”**, Portugal Security Studies Network, Autonomous University of Lisbon, Lisbon, 29 February 2012.

MARCH

André Barrinha presented the communication **“Realismo e intervenções militares”**, VI APCP Colloquium, ISCSP, Lisbon, 1-3 March 2012.

Licínia Simão presented the communication "**A União Europeia e a resolução de conflitos: que mudanças depois do Tratado de Lisboa?**", VI APCP Colloquium, ISCSP, Lisbon, 1-3 March 2012.

Maria Raquel Freire, António Leitão, Paula Duarte Lopes presented the communication "**Construção da Paz em Timor-Leste: uma análise das dinâmicas de política externa portuguesa**", VI APCP Colloquium, ISCSP, Lisbon, 1-3 March 2012.

Maria Raquel Freire presented the communication "**A nova Rússia: evolução da política externa num contexto internacional em mudança**", Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas da Universidade Nova de Lisboa (FCSH-UNL), 1 March 2012.

Daniela Nascimento presented the communication "**As redes sociais como novos espaços de mobilização, contestação e poder?**" (with Ramon Blanco), VI APCP Colloquium, ISCSP, Lisbon, 2 March 2012.

Sofia José Santos presented the communication "**Do Family Guy ao Twitter: media, violências e interculturalidade**", at Escola Secundária Emídio Navarro, Viseu, "CES goes to school", 8 March, 2012.

Katia Cardoso presented the session "**Quando o sonho americano é interrompido. O impacto da deportação na vida dos imigrantes**", "CES goes to school", Agrupamento de Escolas de Soure, 15 March 2012.

Sofia José Santos was in fieldwork in London, under the scope of the Project "**Women, Peace and Security: the implementation of the UNSCR 1325 in Portugal**", from the 15 to the 18 March, 2012.