OUTSIDE ACTORS

MILITARY
Topics Last Week

- Steve on OCHA, UN, NGOs, and Coordination
- Weiss
  - First attempt
  - Illustration of principles
  - State of the art: lot of work to be done
  - Great rejoinders, especially David Rieff (did you read his critique of When Victims Become Killers?)
TOPICS

- Chris Kirkey’s class on Friday; office hours for literature!
- Career Panel, tomorrow at six.
- Military
  - Review of earlier discussion of military intervention
  - Tasks
  - Implementation
  - Alternatives
  - Afghanistan
  - Conclusions
- Guest Speaker: Tanya Domi and Augusto Moedu
Remember the 4 themes?

- WHEN AND HOW TO INTERVENE? (SOVEREIGNTY IN INTRA-STATE CONFLICTS)
- CONTINUUM DEBATE: LINKING RELIEF, REHABILITATION AND DEVELOPMENT
- DECLINING RESOURCES, DISPARITIES IN ALLOCATION
- MANAGEMENT
  - INTER-ORGANIZATIONAL
  - INTRA-ORGANIZATIONAL
Military

- Remember the Breakdown of Distinctions: we discussed the overlap/interdependence among Security, Relief, Rehabilitation, and Development. In addition, we discussed the Continuum Debate.
- Remember discussion on 3 types of intervention
- Now Tanya
TYPES OF INTERVENTIONS

Military
- Security Council decision
- Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO)
- all other organizations
- ++ Legal (Moral)

Civilian
- (UN mainly)
- Secretary General initiative
- Department of Political Affairs (DPA)
- all other organizations
- ++ Moral (Legal)

Civilian
- (NGO mainly)
- no central decision (state sovereignty)
- all organizations (but not SC or SG)
- ++ Moral (- Legal)
MILITARY INTERVENTION

- Double nature of the military: due to its power and technology, it is
  - a decisive threat to life & order, and
  - the instrument to protect both

- When to use force?
  - Non-intervention is the norm to contain powerful states and protect sovereignty
MILITARY INTERVENTION

- One big exception (allow use of force):
  - Genocide (but no force used to stop Rwandan genocide)
  - Human Rights abuses?
  - Cross-border impact of war, refugees => destabilization

- Hehir (chapter 2) wants to broaden the possibilities for intervention in case of human rights abuse in failed states
MILITARY INTERVENTION

- If one uses force, distinguish:
  - jus ad bellum (defining the conditions under which force can be used)
  - jus in bello (defining how force is to be legitimately employed)

  The latter will get more attention today

- Normally, the Security Council decides, one big exception: NATO action in Serbia/Kosovo: current status of Afghanistan (IHL class)
MILITARY INTERVENTION

Different types of military intervention:

- peacekeeping
  - 1st generation: separating warring groups
  - 2nd generation: peace-building with an essential security component (incl. facilitation and protection of humanitarian assistance)

- peace-building (nation building, LRD)

- peace-making (conflict resolution; more diplomats)

- peace enforcement: actual use of force to end conflict and/or to protect minorities, such as the Kurds and the no-fly zone, (it can include the facilitation and protection of humanitarian relief).
MILITARY INTERVENTION

- Differentiate actual use of force from facilitating peace accords & protecting hum. relief!
- In all but peace-enforcement consent of the parties is crucial
- Peace enforcement has been the least successful in practice, e.g., Somalia. It can also compromise impartiality/neutrality of humanitarian organizations: distance
- threat of force (deterrence) does not function as in inter-state conflict. It is more limited, because factions are already fighting. After Somalia and Rwanda, most thugs don’t have a high opinion of peacekeeping forces.
TASKS (facilitation & protection)

- The release and transfer of prisoners (military can take care of security and logistics)
- Logistics (as with natural disasters, e.g., food transport, infrastructure (tents, bridges, simple buildings, heavy equipment))
- Search for missing persons
- Mine awareness / Demining
- Civilian-Military Cooperation (CIMIC), e.g., information exchange, security meetings
TASKS (facilitation & protection)

- NGOs & military can train each other on operations, on rebuilding, on international humanitarian law, etc.

- Security/Protection is a hot issue. Generally, NGOs like to remain independent (see Tauxe on ICRC & Sahnoun)
Implementation: Diversity in Mandates of the Military

- Under which Security Council resolution? What are the exact contents (tasks, enforcement, duration)?

- Which countries contribute? What can they contribute (equipment, quality of manpower, etc.)

- Who leads the force?
  - quality of the commander of the forces;
  - quality of the Special Representative of the Secretary General & UN HQs’ support;
  - Do donor countries support the SRSG and commander?

(Do we need African operations led by Africans?)
Protection (security of the NGOs) by the military in Somalia actually led to more violence. This highlights some possible military shortcomings:

- mission creep (from security role to political, enforcing role);
- Generally, weapons reinforce language of war;
- Military are not a democratic institution. This leads to cultural differences:
  - not participatory
  - role of hierarchy/centralization (vs. decentralization & field initiative in most NGOs)
  - different meaning of protection (security vs. int. refugee law)
Linking the military and humanitarian aid in Afghanistan?

Two main forms of criticism:

Harm of Blurring Humanitarian and Military Activities: Army as rescuer & aggressor

- If truth is the first casualty of war, HA is a close second. H. Aid now used politically for US PR (in the US, Islamic world & Afghanistan) in order to minimize criticism and gain support: Is this truly H aid? No it is to win the war (there is a big need, but I prefer the necessary distance & political neutrality).

- In the l.t. may hamper rebuilding, in the sense of LRD with security and nation building. Afghans are good at resenting outside interference! Nation building will be hard. Humanitarian actors may become sidelined while the need is high.

- Final judgment depends on the course of war: was this a humanitarian intermezzo? Long war: silly PR intervention. Short war: they started immediately with aid
Air Drops are generally bad instrument for dropping aid.

- High flying to avoid anti-aircraft gunfire:
  - Food scattered over wide areas. Has improved over the yrs.
  - Culturally inadequate food packets (pork, veggy, & peanut butter) Has improved over the yrs.
  - No coordination with people (NGOs) on the ground:
    - Dangerous: no collection area: Kurds killed by pellets, into mine fields
    - Who gets the food? Taliban (that’s neutral!), stronger people (w. transport and arms). Therefore it is not based on distribution to the neediest.

- Other problems:
  - Medicine cannot be done through the air: you need PHC struct. (TB, ebola like illness)
  - Can HA reinforce ethnic strife: hamper rebuilding. Let the Afghans play a big role.
  - Endangers lives of aid workers.

- Now needed: Open borders (militarily inconceivable)& big effort
  - Ground access to lower prices, convoys & donkeys etc. Taliban does not allow that, border countries don’t want people coming in.
  - Yet, refugees need to get out and be protected (also food & medicine).
Alternatives

- Prevention
- Humanitarian action alone (the other two types). Sometimes this has been more effective, sometimes this was an excuse for international political inaction. Central question: are the root causes tackled?
- Development cooperation (same question)
- Sanctions (blunt instrument) & Conditionality
- Denunciations
- Denial of diplomatic privileges
- Let them fight it out
  - the end of the war
  - hurting stalemate/ripeness of conflict
  - can imply genocide?
Conclusions

- Comparing the three types of intervention, there are more civilian missions and NGO activities than military interventions.
- Peace enforcement only in rare cases & it can compromise humanitarian actors.
- Military/UN/NGO relationship is here to stay, but it is often an uneasy relationship: need some distance.
- Different perception of mandates; how do Military perceive their mandate and how do NGOs perceive their mandate? In principle, the mandates can be complementary & none of the authors in Moore wants to completely abolish the use of force.
Conclusions

- Define what you mean by use of force (enforcement or facilitation and protection)
- Check alternatives, but these also have their problems. Central question is and remains are the root causes being tackled!
Conclusions

- More intra-state conflicts have led to a broader interpretation of security: aids, underdevelopment, civil wars (terrorism), etc. are now increasingly seen as international security threats.

- However, the preference is to delineate the respective roles and tasks of humanitarian and military actors better (whereas in the areas of relief, rehabilitation, and development the tendency is towards more complete forms of reintegration).
TOPICS

- Military
  - Review of earlier discussion of military intervention
  - Tasks
  - Other roles of the military
  - Interaction with NGOs
  - Conclusions
- Afghanistan