

Disciplinary Linkages: Development on Paper to Development in the Field

Neil Silcock

Nottingham Trent University - UK
neil.silcock@ntu.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

In this paper I shall highlight the need for a multidiscipline approach in aiding development and safeguarding the security of the peoples of the world. The evolution of collective security to recognise the role development must play in the maintenance of international peace and security has expanded the need for other fields to play its part in ensuring that effective actions follow strong rhetoric. International Organisations' reports and declarations are just one aspect in promoting development there needs to be action taken on the ground by experts in various fields, and Non Governmental Organisations play an important role in this.

KEYWORDS

Collective security, United Nations, development.

INTRODUCTION

The central theme of my thesis explores the evolution of collective security and its future in the Twenty-First Century. One way this evolution has been assured is through institutions like the United Nations expanding the definition of collective security using the norm creation of reports and recommendations presented to the international community such as the Responsibility to Protect, the High Level Panel Report: A More Secure World and the United Nations Millennium Declaration and its Millennium Development Goals. It is with these incremental changes that allow international organisations to forge debate and hopefully change the discourse surrounding relevant issue areas.

For my conference paper I intend to explore the broadening of the notion of collective security particularly through the High level Panel Report, and its need to develop a more inter-disciplinary approach in safeguarding the security of the

'peoples of the world'. The High Level Panel Report shifted the expectations of collective security to include a human element. Human security and development became explicit in this report, and it is owing to this broadening that a more multi-disciplinary approach is needed to lift development from the pages of a report to the areas where it is needed. In order to do this I shall highlight the role that the built environment has in relation to critical security issues in the field, linking the disciplines of International Relations and the Built Environment sectors.

I shall firstly outline the evolution of collective security to include a development perspective, which stemmed from the Millennium Summit and then briefly explain what the High Level Panel Report is and what it means for collective security, before going on to highlight the interdisciplinary aspect of development on the ground and the linkages between the

rhetoric of an International Governmental Organisation and the actions of a Non Governmental Organisation.

As we approached the Twenty-First Century, there existed in the international community a sense of optimism over the future of international peace and security, and this optimism, according to some needed to be harnessed and built upon in order to safeguard the security of our world, no matter where you inhabited it. The original sentiment behind the Millennium Summit of September 2000 was to reaffirm commitments in the Charter, and look forward to working together to achieve protection and prosperity for all. Collective security seemed to have become a realistically achievable aim prior to the summit and one that may have been able to attract an international consensus.

It was in this air of optimism that the Millennium Summit was created with goals of peace, protection and development with the intent on gaining a consensus of the international community on the United Nations and its goals, and therefore collective security.

Once the General Assembly reaffirmed its commitment to the Organisation and the Charter, the Millennium Declaration offered shared values of its members, essential to international relations listed as; Freedom, Equality, Solidarity, Tolerance, Respect for Nature, and a Shared Responsibility. It is on these values that the declaration made clear its intentions to strive for these principles by detailing actions to be undertaken in the subsequent years. These actions were itemised in to groups, namely; Peace, Security, Disarmament; Development and Poverty Eradication; Protecting Our Common Environment; Human Rights, Democracy and Good Governance; Protecting the Vulnerable; Meeting the Special Needs of Africa; and the Strengthening of the United Nations.

As one of my case studies in my project will highlight by looking at the war of 1999 in Kosovo, there existed a desire to add the notion of humanitarian intervention

into the armoury of international collective response discourse, and a debate surrounding NATO's legitimacy in using airstrikes in Kosovo to defeat the Serbian leader Slobodan Milosevic brought about the Responsibility to Protect. This report looked at the responsibility of a sovereign state to protect its peoples and the responsibility of the international community to intervene should a state renege on said responsibility. The issue over Kosovo was not settled as the debate over legality versus legitimacy in this case is ongoing, and sovereignty versus intervention more generally, however, a shift in attitudes towards the humanitarian aspect of intervention was clearly observed.

The Responsibility to Protect is guided by three principles; firstly to change the language from humanitarian intervention to the responsibility to protect, taking away a certain stigma attached to that phrase; secondly to pin responsibility on the state, and if should fail will trigger an international commitment to intervene; and finally to ensure that intervention is undertaken properly. Hence, the three concepts of, the responsibility to prevent; the responsibility to react; and the responsibility to rebuild.

However, there was a point of departure from optimism to scepticism after the attacks of September 11th 2001 that coincided with the release of the Responsibility to Protect, which was not forgotten about as it reiterated in subsequent United Nations documents and reports but was obviously pushed aside during the immediate after effects of the terrorist attacks in the United States. Rather than the end of 2001 ushering in the international consensus that was hoped for during the Millennium Summit, there was a scramble to strengthen state borders, and the debate over development sidelined for a 'hard security' discourse headed by the United States. The ensuing days, weeks and months saw an almost unilateral approach to security by the United States as a Bush Doctrine of pre-emptive strikes to safeguard national security was rolled out by the Bush Administration. This discourse dominated the agenda for the next few years to the

detriment of a development agenda until a speech from Kofi Annan readdressed the issue when he charged a panel to assess Threats, Challenges and Change, and to promote the critical changes needed to reaffirm collective security promised by the Millennium Declaration.

This declaration signalled a change in how collective security was viewed by the international community. The Twentieth Century's understanding of international peace and security was dominated by how an international organisation deals with interstate conflict which is explicitly reflected in the United Nations Charter but in the final decade of the century primarily moved toward how to deal with intrastate conflict. This shift although not without its problems as my thesis will testify when looking at the Balkans, was not as seismic as the change in the international climate and its response to a different kind of threat posed by terrorist attacks by an enemy with no fixed borders and who occupy a space outside international organisations. It is with these new threats in mind that the High Level Panel went about broadening the discourse of collective security.

The High Level Panel was instructed by the then Security General Kofi Annan primarily as a response to the invasion of Iraq in 2003, and the split in the Security Council that this invasion caused, to ensure that member states of the United Nations can utilise the Charter of the United Nations more effectively. Officially the Panel was set up to "assess current threats to international peace and security; to evaluate how existing policies and institutions have done in addressing those threats; and to make recommendations for strengthening the United Nations so that it can provide collective security for all in the Twenty-First Century" (HLPR 2004, p1).

The three basic pillars on which a new consensus on effective approaches to tackle threats to security are that today's threats know no national boundaries; that no state can make itself invulnerable to today's threats alone; and not every state will always be able or willing to meet its responsibility. These pillars mirror the

ideas of a stateless enemy, the need for multilateralism in gaining a collective response to a threat, and a states' responsibility to protect its citizens.

The report's definition of a threat is "any event or process that leads to large-scale death or lessening of life chances and undermining States as the basic unit of the international system is a threat to international security" (HLPR 2004, p12). With this definition in mind the panel established six clusters of threats that are relevant to the Twenty-First Century, economic and social threats including poverty, infectious diseases and environmental degradation; inter-state conflict; internal conflict including civil war, genocides or other large-scale atrocities; nuclear, radiological, chemical and biological weapons; terrorism; and transnational organised crime.

By establishing threats in this manner, we are able to see that traditional threats that occupied the minds of the founders of the United Nations, are not the only threats dealt with by member states. In fact these clusters are very much linked to one another as genocide, ethnic cleansing, terrorism, human rights violations, poverty, and disease all play their part in internal conflicts and civil wars, but also, "cultural exceptionalism, religious fundamentalism, economic inequalities, and environmental degradation have the capacity to generate both interstate and intrastate conflicts" (Chibundu in Danchin, p121).

These so called 'softer' security issues therefore can very easily become a 'hard' security dilemma for the international community. By highlighting these threats and giving them equal status, the High Level Panel tries to adopt a preventative stance as well as striving for a collective reactionary automatism as intended by the Charter. Development therefore becomes not only a tool to ensure the upholding of the Millennium Declaration but also a preventive measure in the fight against international threats, trying to deal with the problem at its source. By highlighting developmental issues earlier and monitoring the seriousness more efficiently, whilst not allowing relapses

after conflicts, threats can be limited, and dealt with prior to escalating into the aforementioned intrastate violence of civil wars and possibly interstate conflict.

The World Summit Outcome of 2005 served as a follow-up to the Millennium Summit to highlight successes but more importantly underline the shortcomings of the international community to act decisively in adhering to the Millennium Declaration, which in some quarters may have been superseded in importance to other international factors. The comprehensive review by world leaders underlined the need for the international community to strengthen development cooperation and financial resources by facilitating approval by the multilateral financial institutions of development programmes to ensure that the agreed Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) would be met by 2015. Again, the Outcome document was split into sections highlighting the priorities of the Millennium Declaration, five years after its inception. The recognised issue areas are Development; Terrorism; Peacebuilding, peacekeeping and peacemaking; Responsibility to Protect; Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law; Management Reform; Environment; International Health; Humanitarian Assistance; and Updating the United Nations Charter. These areas not only mirror and support the High Level Panel's Report on Threats, Challenges and Change, but the reaffirmation of these issues keeps the discourse of the broadening of collective security alive.

This discourse has continued into the Millennium Development Goals Outcome Report of 2010, although a decade had passed, the Millennium Declaration is once again reaffirmed. The Outcome of this summit was entitled, Keeping the Promise: united to achieve the Millennium Development Goals, calling for increased efforts at all levels, and includes an action agenda for their achievement, also looking at mainstreaming the goals into national and international policy; the interconnectedness of all MDGs; the need for improved accountability and delivery on commitments; and the importance of women in achieving the MDGs.

The rise of development in the discourse of the international community since the turn of the millennium has raised the profile and the need to act seriously and effectively to not just meet targets set by international organisations, but to realise the development on the ground. It is not just governments, and International Governmental Organisations that need to respond to these threats posed by conflict, natural disasters, environmental degradation, disease and poverty, the actuality of building infrastructure that will aid reconstruction or indeed begin construction needs a more measured approach from different disciplines.

Article 25 is a UK registered charity that takes its name from the 25th Article of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights that references the built environment. The charity builds bigger, better, safer and more sustainably in developing countries after disaster. This is practical development in action.

The Non Governmental Organisation (NGO) is made up of architects, engineers, project managers and built environment experts who build schools, clinics and homes in order to rebuild lives by giving people "buildings which are a lasting tool for combating poverty and reaching the Millennium Development Goals" (www.article-25.org).

Perhaps the most useful part of the Article 25 process is not necessarily the impact structurally on a post disaster/conflict built environment but its expertise, "the expertise to maximise the value of charitable funds for organisations who need best value and best information when deploying every penny of funding" (www.article-25.org). In an age of humanitarian aid agencies chasing limited funds and perhaps compromising over issue areas in their strive for money means that often, "the interests and priorities of aid organisations are often at odds with the interests and priorities of those suffering from disasters" (Keen 2008, p127). Optimising funds therefore, ensuring efficiency along with sustainability is imperative. Article 25 are

able to do this by providing a cheaper solution maximising utilities, using local resources and manpower, adding a less than unimportant side-effect of community building, Article 25 makes sure "every built project is also a development opportunity...(sharing) skills, train local workers and emphasise community participation as our priority". (www.article-25.org).

The importance of measured design and proper planning can be seen in the temporary shelters in post natural disaster hit Haiti where a swift but ill thought out response can be seen to makes things worse, "too often short term shelters become long ones and people are held in a limbo where they remain unable to fully recover and rebuild livelihoods" (www.article-25.org).

An example of the work that is typical of the charity can be seen when Article 25 was approached to build a school for approximately 300 children of differing age groups with a budget of £80,000 for a small concrete structure. However, the street child rescue NGO that approached the charity looked after 1300 children. With the expertise in design and build, and the leverage to increase budgets by three or four times, the project undertook a transformation, the school was bigger and better and more importantly could cater for all the children the NGO was responsible for, all for within the budget stipulated. This type of work is carried out across the globe not just in the education sector but also hospitals and residential areas.

A broadening consensus needs a broadening approach if development is to be successful and threats are to be met. By setting goals and issuing targets the international community makes sure that

issue areas stay within the public domain and international consciousness, and by highlighting shortcomings or development delivery deficiencies by national governments can use a name and shame tactic, which incidentally is much used in the Human Rights sector, to speed up the delivery of financial obligations, and ensure rhetoric is matched by action. The job of realising the aims of development on the ground does need to be undertaken by experts, who not only understand their discipline but also the need to adhere to cheap, sustainable, and locally inclusive methods, a task probably not suited to world leaders and their round table diplomacy. One without the other will not work in ensuring we achieve the Millennium Development Goals, but an interdisciplinary approach brings the goals closer to us.

REFERENCES

DANCHIN, P. & FISCHER, H. 2010. *United Nations Reform and the New Collective Security*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ICISS, 2001. *The Responsibility to Protect*. Canada: The International Development Research Centre.

KEEN, D. 2008. *Complex Emergencies*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL'S HIGH-LEVEL PANEL ON THREATS, CHALLENGES AND CHANGE. 2004. *A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility*. New York: United Nations Foundation.

UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY. 2000. *United Nations Millennium Declaration*. New York: United Nations.

www.article-25.org