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58.1 Introduction

‘No development without security’ is proving more and more to be a development-policy paradigm, one that calls for new approaches in the field of development policy. The discernible distance between development and military actors and their tasks of the past, has in recent years rapidly diminished. This applies to Germany, but also to most other bilateral donors and multilateral institutions, including the United Nations (Tschirgi 2004, 2006; Griffin 2003). Thus far, however, too little reflection and discussion has been devoted to its consequences.

The relationship between development and security is not a fundamentally new conceptual issue (see chapter by Uvin above). This applies also to the practical interfaces between various outward-oriented policies – above all development, foreign, and security policies. In the past, an aspect which has at least implicitly played an essential role has been the stable and peaceful environment that has to exist if development is to be possible. Earlier debates saw this relationship primarily as abstract interdependence.1 The current debates since the early 2000’s have focused more directly on convergence in conceptual and practical policy terms.

The present debate extends beyond practical relevance due to important changes in the concept of security. The state-centred security concept has given way to an entirely new concept. Security has fundamentally evolved in the international debate from a concept which focused on the stability of the state to a protective approach related to the individual (Duffield 2006; Thakur 2006). Basic changes have been brought about by the debates in the United Nations (ICISS 2001; UN High Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change 2004; UN Secretary-General 2005). Although policy conclusions have not always been drawn, there is evidence of attempts in this direction. A clear example is the transformation of the former Organization of African Unity (OAU) into the African Union (AU) that has explicitly abandoned the principle of non-interference (Klingebiel 2006). The United Nations’ decision in December 2005 to establish a Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), which will above all seek improved coordination among the various actors and integrated strategies in post-conflict situations, may also serve as a guide for the future (see the chapter by von Einsiedel/Nitzschke/Chhabra in this volume).

The present text looks at development – security interfaces from the angle of a wider concept of security that includes the definition and goal of human security.2 To distinguish the overall goal of human security (a concept that is used in a number of different policy fields including development policy) from ‘applied security’ manifested in traditional military and security institutions, the terms ‘security policy’ and ‘military (actors)’ are used. ‘Development’ in the present text equally refers to the respective policy field and its actors.3 When talking about ‘security’ at the development-security interface, the physical integ-
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1 The practical aspects of the civil-military relationship in the area of humanitarian aid have long been under discussion. This is true of the military side in two respects: it sometimes takes on logistical tasks (transport of aid supplies), and it is involved in the security situation in areas receiving aid. Both tasks have led to a long debate on the relationship between humanitarian aid and military actors.

2 Human Security means “the security of people against personal threats to safety and life” (Thakur 2006: 2), building on different types of freedom: “freedom from want, freedom from fear and freedom to take action on one’s own behalf” (CHS 2003: 1); at: <http://www.humansecurity-chs.org/finalreport/Outlines/outline.pdf>.
rity of the individual and freedom from direct violence in crisis situations is at the heart of the debate.

Afghanistan, the Balkans, Liberia, and - for some donors - Iraq are topical examples for the growing closeness between development and security policy. The World Bank analysis *Breaking the Conflict Trap* (Collier/Elliott/Hegre/Hoeffler/Reynal-Quero/Sambanis 2003) documents the close mutual relationship between development policy and military engagement. The report assumes that development policy is in a position to provide help in lessening risks in post-conflict situations that could be sufficient to permit reductions in military presence.

The boundaries defining development-military cooperation are not always clearly drawn among the group of bilateral development actors. Traditionally, for members of the OECD Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC 2001) one of their top ‘no-go areas’ in terms of assistance was direct support for operational capacities of military actors. Furthermore, areas that are not officially classified as eligible for ODA (Official Development Assistance) are often exempted. The lack of clarity whether activities related to security-sector reform are eligible for ODA support highlights the reluctance by some development actors to fully embrace the new development-military ‘closeness’.

There are several reasons why the changing relationship between development policy and the military has entered the focus of public attention.

First, a significant number of so-called ‘protracted crises’ are characterized de facto by trusteeship rule - and therefore involve functions that extend beyond purely military tasks (e.g. Kosovo, Afghanistan, Iraq). These situations are often marked by efforts to stabilize fragile security, to restore effective statehood, and to embark on a course of economic and social reconstruction (Ferdowski/Matthies 2003; Debiel 2002a). Nation-building tasks, already a major element of peace missions, are taking on a growing role in this context.4

Second, development policy is increasingly interested in gaining more constructive influence in post-conflict situations, and in some cases even expects contributions from the field of security policy and advocates or calls for military intervention to end violent conflicts. In April 2004, the German Minister for Economic Cooperation and Development called for peacekeeping troops to be sent to Darfur/Sudan; and, in a 2003 appeal, international non-governmental organizations active in Afghanistan called for an expansion of the ISAF (International Security Assistance Force) mandate there.6

Third, other policy fields, above all foreign and security policies, are coming more and more to expect, and call for, an active involvement of development policy in post-conflict situations. Experiences made with past military missions are cited as reasons: As the European Security Strategy (ESS), prepared by the High Representative of the EU Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and approved by the European Council in December 2003, puts it, “In almost every major intervention, military efficiency has been followed by civilian chaos.”7

Finally, the growing number of overseas missions directly involving the German Bundeswehr8 have
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4 King’s College 2003: 14: “Peace operations in their growing complexity have increasingly included state-building functions.”
7 Council of the European Union 2003: 12. Also for the operations of other countries like the US, a serious lack of civilian capacity in peace and stability operations is identified and proposals are made to strengthen civilian functions; see e.g. United States Institute of Peace 2004.
8 Currently some 6,700 Bundeswehr soldiers are directly involved in missions abroad, including ISAF (International Security Assistance Force), KFOR (Kosovo Force), EUFOR (European Union Force) in Bosnia and Herzegovina and EUFOR RD CONGO (European Union Force République démocratique du Congo) (at: <http://www.bundeswehr.de>), 10 July 2006. The costs for these missions have increased more than tenfold between 1995 and 2003 (Klingebiel/Roehder 2004: 3).