Part I

Post-Conflict Security Arrangements - the Role of the International Community

Chapter 1

The International Community and State Reconstruction in War-Torn Societies

Robin Luckham[1]

There is some hubris in the idea that the international community (and in particular the major donors and international bodies) can assist the reconstruction of entire states and national societies after war and state collapse. Yet in recent years this is precisely what it has been attempting in country after country, including Bosnia, Kosovo, Sierra Leone, Afghanistan, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Liberia and (even more problematically) in Iraq.[2]

War and political violence in the developing world have been endemic since World War II. There has been a gradual long-term increase in the number of conflicts in progress at any one time, but largely because more conflicts have been started than have ended. Many of the most virulent conflicts - notably those in Afghanistan, Angola, Burma, Colombia, the DRC, Indonesia, Kashmir, Rwanda, Sri Lanka, and Sudan - have roots that extend back two to five decades. An immediate upsurge in conflicts after the end of the Cold War was followed by a decline starting in the mid-1990s (Fearon and Laitin 2003), reflecting the success of conflict resolution efforts, for instance in Central America.

---

[1] Senior Research Associate, Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, UK.

[2] Sometimes reconstruction has occurred under a UN umbrella, as with the UN Transitional Authority in Cambodia and subsequent UN post-conflict administrations in other countries. Sometimes the lead roles have been assumed by major alliance systems and regional organisations, like NATO, the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe, and the European Union in the Balkans. Sometimes, as in Iraq, it has been 'coalitions of the willing', in particular the United States and other Western powers. Regional organisations like the Economic Community of West African States or Southern African Development Community in Southern and Central Africa have stepped in to support peacekeeping operations, peace negotiations, and sometimes national reconstruction, as in the DRC.

Even so, the tendency for conflicts to become self-perpetuating or to reignite over the long term underscores the priority of peace-building and reconstruction.

Even if the number of wars has not dramatically increased, their nature and impact has. 'New', 'post-modern' or 'network' wars have challenged political authority, governance, and the entire social fabric of conflict-torn states more directly than did earlier wars (Kaldor 1999; Kaldor and Luckham 2001; Duffield 2001). These wars have also been extremely destructive in terms of civilian casualties, the displacement of populations, the destruction of livelihoods, physical and social capital, and their negative impact on development (Nafziger and Auvinen 2002; Luckham, et al. 2001; Stewart in this volume).

All this is enough reason for the official development community to be seriously concerned. But it does not explain why that community, and notably bilateral donor agencies and international financial institutions, have shed previous inhibitions about interceding in conflicts and security issues. During the Cold War these issues were seen as too 'political' and risky for them to handle. World Bank reports eschewed any analysis of authoritarian rule or of conflict until the early 1990s, when the introduction of the concept of 'good governance' permitted the Bank and other development assistance agencies to address such issues through a seemingly neutral and technocratic discourse. The Bank's post-conflict unit, like the UK Department for International Development (DFID)'s Conflict and Humanitarian Affairs Department and similar units in other donor agencies, was established during the 1990s.

A gradual but decisive shift took place toward more interventionist theories and practices of development assistance: from simply funding development policies and programmes; to influencing aid recipient countries' policy frameworks under stabilisation and structural adjustment programmes; to directly transforming political and administrative institutions under the rubric of good governance, so as to ensure a supportive institutional framework for market-based development. From this it has been a fairly short and logical step to the idea that the development community could and should concern itself

with reconstructing governance in war-torn states and societies after conflict.[3]

The political stabilisation of the developing world is prioritised because of the fears of Western governments, international firms, and multilateral agencies that political turmoil and violent conflict threaten global security and the expansion of global markets. Humanitarian principles have been twisted to legitimise interventions that serve great power politics and corporate interests, as in Iraq. These interventions in turn generate what Chalmers Johnson (2000) terms 'blowback': anti-Western protests, including the emergence of armed networks such as Al-Qaeda, able to strike at targets in the West itself. The current preoccupations with the 'war on terror' and with weapons of mass destruction are the most obvious markers of such concerns.

The dramatic and horrifying events of 9/11 brought these issues to the centre of the international stage. Yet as Halliday (2002) and others have argued, the train of events following 9/11 simply accelerated changes already underway in the security policies and development agendas of the United States and other Western countries. Section 1 of this paper examines these policies and agendas, and their effects on the scale and nature of the major powers' interventions in the developing world. Section 2 analyses some common causes of conflict and state failure, emphasizing that the particularity of causes, and legacies, means that there can be no 'one-size fits all' approach to peace-building and reconstruction. Section 3 looks at how dialogue with a wider range of stakeholders can be fostered, so as to ensure that the reconstruction of states and societies is inclusive and legitimate. Section 4 concludes by identifying some generic policy dilemmas of post-conflict reconstruction.[4]

---

[3]   Duffield (2001) argues powerfully that the 'securitisation of development' and the rise of a 'new humanitarianism' - the belief that the traumas and suffering associated with conflict are a global responsibility - constitute a new form of global hegemony and interventionism. Duffield argues that these trends have led increasingly to the uncritical imposition of Western liberal values, political institutions, and capitalist markets on a subordinated but diverse and multi-cultural developing world.

[4]   Useful discussions of state collapse and the role of the international community in putting states together again are Doornbos (2002), Ottaway (2002) and, with specific reference to

What Motivates International Intervention?

International involvement in the reconstruction of war-torn states is Janus-faced.[5] It reflects not only a drive to achieve new forms of hegemony but also normative conceptions of an interdependent liberal global order and of the role of the United Nations in preventing violent conflict and peace-building (Annan 2002).

These conceptions can be traced back to many earlier initiatives, notably the Brandt Commission Report on international development, *North-South: a Programme for Survival,* and the Palme Commission Report on *Common Security: a Programme for Disarmament*, both published in the early 1980s, and indeed to the UN Charter itself. They have gradually introduced many valuable new elements into the theory and practice of international relations and of global development: greater recognition of the importance of international humanitarian law; the withdrawal of legitimacy from military and authoritarian regimes; support for democratisation; greater emphasis on human rights; the idea that state security should be based on human security; and greater international involvement in conflict resolution, peace-building, and post-conflict reconstruction.

A major misperception about this liberal and democratic world view - which critics like Duffield (2001) may have encouraged - is that it has simply been foisted on the world as part of the apparatus of international hegemony. To be sure, the democratic and developmental principles behind international humanitarianism have all too often been hijacked by Western leaders to lend respectability to their interventions. Yet they are nevertheless important and deserving of support in their own right. Moreover, they enjoy wider legitimacy in the international system and in developing countries themselves, where they have been taken forward through regional initiatives.

Afghanistan, Cramer and Goodhand (2002). All are published in an excellent issue of *Development and Change* on state collapse.

[5] This argument is more fully spelt out in Luckham (2003).

The Brandt/Palme vision of global interdependence was the product of an alliance between European social democrats and Third World statespersons, and for a long time it was ignored or opposed by the major world powers. The notion of 'human security' was the product of a powerful critique of traditional state-centred thinking about security, and it became a central feature of the UNDP's Human Development Reports in the early 1990s. Demands for democracy originally arose from struggles against military and authoritarian rule in the developing world, and were only later taken up by aid donors, many of which indeed had earlier lent support to dictatorships. Campaigns for human rights and international humanitarian law drew strength from campaigns against rights violations in countries like Pinochet's Chile, apartheid South Africa, Nigeria, or Chile, as well as from international advocacy groups such as Amnesty International. Many of the most respected UN peacekeeping forces have been recruited from developing countries, including Ghana and Fiji. Even recent additions to the donor peace-building armoury, such as security sector reform, have emerged from the theory and practice of democratic transition in countries like South Africa, which have had much to teach the West itself about democratic civil-military relations. In Africa, initiatives for the promotion of humanitarian values include the African Charter of Human Rights and the African Union's Peace and Security Council, together with the conflict-prevention and peacekeeping mechanisms of the African Union, the Economic Commission for West Africa, Southern African Development Community, and other regional and sub-regional bodies.

A less remarked on feature of the new interventionism is a certain 'developmentalisation' of security.[6] National security planners, defence ministries, military staffs, staff colleges, and defence academies have begun to involve themselves in development issues, the theory and practice of peacekeeping, humanitarian law, human rights, human security, peace-building, and post-conflict reconstruction. To a large extent this is because they are having to undertake a much wider range

---

[6] Recent events in Iraq, including the torture and humiliation of prisoners, might seem to suggest the contrary, and that crude *realpolitik* after all prevails in Western security establishments. Pentagon and White House policies have encouraged flagrant disregard for human rights and international human law, including the Geneva Convention.

of roles, including 'out of area operations', counter-terrorism, peace support operations, and security sector reform.

One of the most controversial aspects of international intervention has been the erosion of national sovereignty. Processes of globalisation already severely restrict the capacity of national governments to manage their economies and to deliver security unaided. The erosion of sovereignty opens the gates for interventions driven by the geopolitical interests of major powers, as well as by humanitarian concern for people who suffer state repression or conflict.

The view that the international community has the right, indeed the responsibility, to intervene to prevent gross human rights abuses or end conflicts raises the hackles of many governments in the South (though not necessarily of their citizens). But the force of such objections is diminished when sovereignty has already been dissipated by a government's failure to fulfil its core responsibilities, including provision of basic physical security and protection of citizens' rights. As the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty insists, states that fail to deliver security to their citizens and massively violate their rights are not exercising their sovereign responsibility to protect (ICISS 2001). Hence state sovereignty needs to be supplemented by a more robust and genuinely equitable multilateralism, based on common norms and principles accepted by all the major international actors.

What has diminished the legitimacy of US and British intervention in Iraq, and made it so deeply offensive to most in the Middle East, has been the arrogant assumption that there is one law for the major powers and another for the developing world. A superpower that refused to sign up to or be bound by international agreements on global questions such as the International Criminal Court, or biological and chemical weapons, was already less likely to have its bona fides accepted when it intervened to restore democracy and prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq - even before its own aggressive peace-enforcement and disregard for human rights destroyed its remaining shreds of authority. There is now a real danger that the legitimacy of the United

Nations and of the entire peace-building agenda may be fatally compromised if it is seen as subservient to America's hegemonic agenda in the Middle East.

Yet the cooptation of the United Nations' and other international agencies' humanitarian, peace-building, human rights, and democratisation agendas is not a good enough reason to reject the agendas themselves. Whatever one's reservations about the hubris and blundering in Iraq, the paradoxes of donor-driven democratisation in Bosnia, or the biases and fragility of peace-building in Afghanistan, international intervention in violent conflicts is here to stay, simply because the problems it was designed to address are still with us. Fractured states, war-torn societies, the spread of insecurity within states and across boundaries, and the terrible problems they give rise to, are realities the international community simply cannot ignore.

Nor is it realistic to ignore the interests of the major international players, including the United States, the European Union, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, or of regional powers including China, India, South Africa, or Nigeria. A recent empirical study of peace processes that have established a relatively durable end to violent conflict concludes that the active military engagement of major global or regional powers, or of the major alliance systems, as in Bosnia, Cambodia, Sierra Leone, or East Timor, has been an important ingredient in their success (Downs and Stedman 2002).

If humanitarian interventions are to be legitimate, and sustainable over the long term, they must be disentangled from the self-serving and sometimes grubby interests and policy agendas of the governments and agencies that undertake them. Even United Nations agencies and international humanitarian nongovernmental organisations are not exempt from the charge that their policies and programmes may be self-serving, or reinforce the very humanitarian disasters they are supposed to alleviate.[7]

---

[7] On the failures of the international interventions in Somalia see Sahnoun (1994) and Clarke and Herbst (1997), and on those in Rwanda see Adelman and Suhrke (1996), Woodward (1997), Kuperman (2001), and Jones (2001).

One cannot of course ignore national interests in a world of nation states, any more than one can ignore the bureaucratic agendas of international organisations or the fund-raising priorities of international NGOs. But it is crucial to acknowledge the biases and the play of interests they introduce. Even if such biases cannot be wholly eliminated, they can at least be opened up to debate, challenge, and, hopefully, reform.

Evaluating the Humanitarian Agenda

In sum, one should interrogate the global humanitarian agenda at five levels:

First, as just suggested, there is a need for critical yet realistic discussion of the gaps between the manifest goals of military and other interventions (what they are supposed to achieve, such as resolving conflict or building democracy) and the latent or hidden agendas of those undertaking them, and of how policymakers can ensure those agendas do not get out of hand, as in Iraq.

Second, all forms of intervention need continual interrogation of their underlying moral and political premises. Given the accusations that they serve to advance a hegemonic vision, these premises cannot be taken for granted.[8]

Third, the principles of multilateralism require constant restatement and reassertion, as in *The Responsibility to Protect* (ICISS 2001). The issues are global in the first place. At least in principle, multilateral interventions are less likely than unilateral ones to serve special interests. And they are more likely to be regarded as legitimate, except where multilateralism is regarded as a mere flag of convenience for unilateral action, as seemingly in Iraq. In some situations, unilateral interventions may be legitimate, *faute de mieux*, like the UK's involvement in peace-building in Sierra Leone, but even in such cases

---

[8]   They are beyond the scope of this paper, but I would cite for instance the ongoing debates concerning the validity of universal human rights; Amartya Sen's rethinking of the links between development and freedom and of the concept of human security (Sen 1999); and Biku Parekh's cogent critique (1994, 1997) of the cultural particularity of liberal democracy as well as of humanitarian military intervention.

they must enjoy the proper consent of national stakeholders and be defensible on the basis of general principles.

Fourth, better understanding is required of the historical trajectories of conflicts, the factors that drive them, how they might reignite, and how this could be prevented. Not all conflicts are the same, as I argue below.

Fifth, rather than being imposed from outside, peace agreements, reconstruction plans, or constitutions need to emerge from continuous dialogue with and engagement of a broad range of national stakeholders: not just with the warring parties (though they must buy into the peace), but civilians too; not simply with political and economic elites, but with a wide range of civil society and grassroots groups. Such dialogue might seem an obvious requirement of peace-building, but peace-makers forge ahead surprisingly often without giving it a second thought.

Conflicts, State Failure, and Their Legacies

Most recent conflicts in the developing and post-communist worlds can be viewed as state- and nation-building in reverse (Kaldor and Luckham 2001, Luckham 2003), as well as development in reverse (Collier et al. 2003). They have unravelled political authority, interrupted normal governance, fractured national societies, and often problematised the state itself. 'After conflict' would then seem to imply a teleology of state- and nation-building: a sequence from pre-conflict to conflict to post-conflict; from relief and humanitarian aid during conflict to reconstruction and development aid after it; from collapsed or failed to functioning states; from ethnic violence to national reconciliation; from the rule of the gun to the settlement of conflicts through democratic processes.

Real life is far more complicated, however. First, most conflicts do not simply end. The political, social, and economic factors sustaining them often remain, and even the violence may continue in other forms, notably criminal. Many conflicts that were once considered 'resolved' have reignited again and again, as in Colombia, Sudan, or Liberia. Breakdowns in governance may antedate conflict, as in the DRC, or be

caused by it and continue after it has 'ended', leaving societies suspended in a state of semi-anarchy and insecurity, as in Somalia.

Second, the major premise of state reconstruction is that states have in some sense failed or collapsed.[9] But in violent conflicts the roles of states vary immensely. In some, the problem may not be collapsed states, but regimes that have been exceptionally repressive or authoritarian - like the present government in Sudan, which has not only waged war directly against dissidents in the South but has also sponsored raiding and violence by armed militias in Darfur and in the South. In other cases, even democratically elected governments have aggravated conflicts by pursuing policies that result in the political, social, or economic exclusion of minorities or socially disadvantaged groups, such as Tamils in Sri Lanka or the urban and rural poor in Colombia. Some conflicts have spread not because of the failings of individual states alone but through an accumulation and interaction of violent conflicts across an entire region, such as the Great Lakes in Central Africa, or the Caucasus, subsuming states within wider regional or indeed global conflict complexes.

Third, violent conflict and state collapse leave baleful legacies that make peace difficult to build and states hard to reconstruct (Cliffe and Luckham 2000: 302-4; Luckham 2003: 21-5). These legacies include governance voids, or the disappearance of normal public administration in all or part of the national territory; the rule of 'un-law', including the breakdown of police and judicial systems, widespread human rights violations, and impunity for the perpetrators; the breakdown or absence of democratic accountability mechanisms; extreme political and social polarisation; 'societies of fear' (Koonings and Kruijt 1999), which normalise violence and human rights abuses; systematic redistribution of power, wealth, and status in favour of those who control the gun or can profit from war economies; and the disempowerment of minorities, women, refugees, and a wide range of other groups.

---

[9]   An indication of the conceptual and policy confusion surrounding this topic is the proliferation of terms: 'collapsed states', 'failed states', 'problem states', LICUS (lower-income countries under stress - the World Bank's clumsy euphemism), 'fractured states', and so forth. The terms matter less than the fact that one is talking about a highly complex and historically variable reality, not adequately captured by any single term.

Despite these legacies, the starting point for reconstruction cannot and should not be a simple return to pre-war normality and the reconstitution of the state in its previous form. Not only were the latter's failings among the reasons for conflict, but war and its legacies create new political realities, which must be recognised and adjusted for in peace-building.

Fourth, reconstruction is more likely to be sustainable if it factors in the multiple layers of political authority above and below the state, and is not excessively preoccupied with rebuilding the state and central governance alone. When states start to fall apart during conflicts, other layers of political authority - both above the state at the regional and international levels, and below it in political and civil society - tend to emerge into the open. Even in the most severe and anarchic instances of state collapse, as in Somalia, the Congo, or Afghanistan, there is seldom a total governance void. Other bodies including mosques, churches, community-based organisations and NGOs, and remnants of local bureaucracy cut off from the centre may assume services previously delivered by the state. Security functions may be carried out by a variety of non-state actors, although this adds to the risks of human rights abuses, extortion, and violence. Markets may even thrive in war economies and create their own modes of economic regulation; in Somalia, according to Mubarak (1997), the dismantling of the Barre regime's corrupt and intrusive state management of the economy opened spaces for entrepreneurs in the midst of apparent anarchy.

Understanding the Legacies of Conflict

Any strategy for post-conflict peace-building and reconstruction should address a complex array of legacies from past and present conflicts. The distinctions made in table 0.1 are a first step in understanding these legacies, insofar as they help identify generic problems stemming from the different ways the state has been called into question. The table shows different ways the state can be called into question, cross-tabulated against the three forms of conflict most often stressed in recent causal analyses of conflicts: struggles over resources; contested social

identities, especially ethnic and religious identities; and major social inequalities.

Table 0.1: States called into question by violent conflicts

How the state is called into question

Struggles over:	'Collapsed'	Authoritarian	Non-inclusive	Subsumed within wider conflicts
Resources	Sierra Leone	Angola	Colombia Indonesia	Iraq Democratic Republic of Congo
Identity	Somalia Bosnia	Sudan	Sri Lanka Kashmir	Afghanistan
Inequality	Liberia	El Salvador	Guatemala Philippines	Nicaragua

These contrasting situations are discussed below, but first several caveats are in order. The causes shown in table 0.1 are by no means the only 'causes' of violent conflict, and they often conflate the factors originating conflict with those sustaining it[10], as well as conflating cause with effect.[11] Nor are they necessarily mutually exclusive: Frances Stewart, for example, uses the term 'horizontal inequality' to describe how social inequalities tend to crystallise around and reinforce regional, ethnic, or religious differences.

Further, in reality none of the states chosen as illustrations can be assigned to any single analytical category. For instance, although the DRC and Sierra Leone are shown in different cells, both faced state

---

[10] See Cliffe and Luckham (2000), in which we distinguish between factors 'producing' and 'reproducing' conflicts. There is some evidence that resources - and more generally 'greed', or the expectation of economic gain - are a better predictor of the continuation of conflicts than of their origins.

[11] The political mobilisation and polarisation of ethnic and religious differences, in particular, can be either a cause or a consequence of conflict, or both at the same time.

collapse after the state had been undermined by protracted periods of authoritarian neo-patrimonial governance. And both have become enmeshed in wider regional conflict complexes involving multiple interventions by their neighbours. In Angola, Indonesia, and Sudan, conflicts over resources have sharpened and been intensified by identity conflicts. In all three countries, protracted authoritarian governance has excluded particular regions or ethnic groups from power and the benefits of development.[12] In El Salvador, Guatemala, and Colombia, conflicts arose from deep social exclusion, but they were complicated in Colombia's case by the emergence of a shadow economy around the drug trade and extortion from the oil companies.

Thus in each instance the conflicts are best understood not as the product of individual causes, or even as the outcome of particular patterns of governance and non-governance, but rather in terms of the varying historical trajectories that create and sustain political violence. Angola provides an especially salient example: a conflict now widely characterised as a 'resource war' began in the 1960s as a liberation struggle against the inequities of colonial rule; evolved into a contest for power between different elites rooted in the country's ideological, regional, and ethnic divisions; was sustained in the Cold War context by the interventions of the USSR, Cuba, the US, and apartheid South Africa; and finally turned into an increasingly cynical and brutal struggle to control the country's mineral wealth. The point is that the conflict itself was radically transformed over many years; and in turn itself redefined the entire political economy of the state (Hodges 2001).

State Collapse

The first of the cases shown in table 0.1 is state failure or collapse proper, where state administration has effectively ceased, most often during violent conflict but sometimes before conflict has broken out or after overt hostilities have ended. State collapse is the most extreme manifestation of wider global trends that have problematised many states

---

[12] Indonesia and potentially Angola are now engaged in democratic transition.

and undermined their capacity to manage national economies, to orchestrate development, to deliver services, and to provide security.[13]

State collapse has almost always involved the loss of the state's monopoly of legitimate violence, which is usually regarded as the key component of Weberian statehood. Somalia is the most obvious case, and indeed it is the only country to have lacked a recognised and minimally functioning state for a long period, now more than a decade. The state has fallen apart for shorter periods in Afghanistan, Bosnia, Congo (DRC), Haiti, Liberia, and Sierra Leone. As these cases suggest, state collapse is also perfectly possible where there is a juridical but non-functioning state, as well as where there is no internationally recognised political authority, as was the case in Somalia.

State collapse can precede as well as follow conflict. For many years before it actually 'collapsed', Mobutu's kleptocratic regime in Zaire, now DRC, enjoyed almost no effective authority in much the country; basic services, including sometimes security, were provided, if at all, by churches, NGOs, and other bodies; and there was in effect no national economy, but rather a number of regional economies, each more integrated with those of neighbouring states than with the remainder of the country (Lemarchand 2001). A similar situation has prevailed under the presidencies of the two Kabilas, even following the peace agreement and establishment of a government of national unity (except that the anarchy and violence have in the meantime become more entrenched and destructive, and have enmeshed the DRC's African neighbours).

Where the existing state was part of the problem, it might seem that its temporary disappearance could potentially clear the ground for reconstituting the state on a more inclusive and legitimate basis. In practice it is usually hard to re-establish a functioning state at all, let alone undertake comprehensive state reform. However, Somaliland provides an encouraging example of how a legitimate and reconstructed

---

[13] Whether economic interdependence undermines the state or strengthens it is endlessly debated in the literature on globalisation. This questioning also sheds light on how, in the modern world, there exist multiple layers of political authority, both above the state at the regional and international levels, and below it in political and civil society.

public authority can emerge from protracted political violence. A new political order emerged from lengthy negotiations among warring clans, which were facilitated by intermediaries that had no significant international involvement, except that of the diaspora community (Farah and Lewis 1997; Ahmed and Green 1999; Hularas 2002). Somaliland's lack of international recognition and support has emerged as one of the main obstacles to its long-term reconstruction. The main lesson, if any, for countries like Afghanistan, Liberia, or Sierra Leone, where the international community has taken the lead in reconstructing the state, is the need to recognise and support domestically driven democratic processes. Indeed Liberia's contrasting re-descent into despotism and war after 1997 under former warlord President Charles Taylor well illustrates the dangers of international complacency about externally brokered peace negotiations, constitution-making, and elections.

Authoritarian States Opposed by Predatory Groups

Authoritarian states, contested by armed adversaries seeking to control the state and appropriate its financial and other benefits, have tended to generate somewhat different problems of post-conflict reconstruction from those deriving from state collapse. Authoritarian state elites have often shared responsibility for continued human rights violations with the rebels opposing them, as in Sudan or Angola. And they have tended to resist external pressures to negotiate peace or to concede reforms, except when brought to the negotiating table by some combination of severe economic crisis, costly military stalemate, or defeat. Nor have the predatory groups opposing them necessarily been any more likely to negotiate, when they have profited from the 'attack trade' and war economies.

A ruling elite is better able to resist external and domestic pressures for change if it controls substantial mineral resources or other independent sources of state revenue, such as oil in Angola and Burma and timber (and oil) in Cambodia. Therefore the key issue is accountable governance - especially regarding the control of natural resource

revenues - more than state reconstruction per se, although the latter too may be essential after protracted conflict.

Moreover, the end of the fighting does not necessarily create circumstances that empower the political and social forces that could insist on government accountability. In Cambodia, for example, Hun Sen's Cambodian People's Party manoeuvred to recapture the state and subvert democratic governance, following interim UN administration under UN Transitional Authority in Cambodia and a period of coalition government. In Angola, after the conclusion of peace with a demoralised and militarily weakened UNITA (Uniao Nacional para a Independencia Total de Angola), the MPLA (Movimento Popular de Libertacao de Mocambique) nomenclatura has remained in control of the country's oil revenues and the levers of state power, and has continued to resist international and domestic pressures for more accountability.

Mozambique provides a rather more encouraging example, of an internationally brokered peace that laid the basis for reconstituting a battered (but not collapsed) state, democratisation, and economic reconstruction. The key factors in this success were a peace settlement, which was not imposed but negotiated via international intermediaries and the UN; the fact that the incentives to continue fighting were less than in resource-rich countries such as Angola or the DRC; the FRELIMO government's genuine commitment to the reform process (despite losing its revolutionary zeal, it never became as autocratic or as corrupt as the MPLA regime in Angola); the way the armed opposition, RENAMO, despite its involvement in atrocities, acquired a real stake in the democratic process by becoming a political party; and the fact that economic reconstruction, though not without problems, laid the basis for economic growth and, to an extent, poverty alleviation.

Authoritarian States Challenged by Popular Revolts

Authoritarian or non-democratic regimes may be called into question because of their non-inclusive policies, through struggles to address major societal injustices or political, economic, or social exclusion. The

paradigmatic armed struggles of the colonial and Cold War eras were waged by nationalist or radical groups with a transformational political agenda. Though analyses of the 'new wars' highlight the predatory nature of rebellions against the state, by no means have all of these wars fitted such a stereotype. For example, the rebellion that brought the National Resistance Movement to power in Uganda in 1986, the campaigns ending the *derg's* military despotism in Ethiopia and Eritrea, and the struggle against the apartheid state in South Africa and Namibia and that against Indonesian hegemony in East Timor, were all waged by armed groups with popular support and relatively well defined political agendas. Even where groups with well defined political goals, like the Sudan People's Liberation Army (SPLA) in the Sudan, have been diverted in more predatory directions during protracted armed conflict itself, elements of that agenda may survive and influence their approach to peace-building and reconstruction.

It is notable that a number of these armed struggles were concluded by military victory and the victors' assumption of power. Even where peace was negotiated after a military stalemate, as in South Africa, Namibia, and East Timor, it in practice amounted to a political victory for the liberation forces. Generally speaking, this political victory has endowed the victors with much greater popular legitimacy than most other post-conflict regimes. It has also committed them, at least in principle, to fundamental reforms aimed at addressing the social injustices that motivated their struggles. What has changed, however, since the end of the Cold War is that the socialist programmes of earlier liberation movements have been displaced by democracy and market-oriented economic reform programmes, reflecting a new realism both about the constraints on development in a globalised world and about the price to be paid for international donor support.

On the one hand the relative clarity of the winning groups about their development goals has clearly facilitated state and national reconstruction. It is striking that many of the apparent post-conflict 'success stories' have been managed by former revolutionaries. On the other hand their change in course away from socialisation in favour of market-oriented development has tended to generate distinctive policy

dilemmas. Most post-conflict programmes have featured the competing priorities of economic liberalisation and of social equity and poverty reduction, but the tension between these priorities has been especially acute where social equity was the principal demand of those taking up arms against the state. Another area of policy conflict has been the tension between the centralising, command-oriented tendencies of many liberation movements and the requirements of democratic politics, surfacing (in different ways) in countries like Eritrea, Ethiopia, Namibia, Rwanda, or Zimbabwe.

Wars of National Identity

Fourth are states whose national composition or territorial form has been challenged through wars of national identity, as in Bosnia, Kosovo, Sri Lanka, Rwanda, or Southern Sudan (where the SPLA has shifted back and forth between demands for partition and for power-sharing and regional autonomy within an undivided state). Such national struggles have often opposed social injustices as well, hence tending to share some of the same characteristics as other transformational struggles. But one should not forget that identity conflicts have often also been exacerbated by national majorities (or those speaking for them) reasserting their exclusive claims over the identity of the state - as have the Sinhalas in Sri Lanka, the previous Amhara elite in Ethiopia, Serbs in ex-Yugoslavia, or, in a particularly extreme manner, the Rwandan Hutus during the 1994 genocide.

The central issues tend therefore to concern the future identity of the state more than just its reconstruction. Issues include whether and how to accommodate the demands of separatist groups, like Sri Lanka's Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE); and how to make existing state institutions more inclusive through power-sharing, constitutional reforms, or more equitable distribution of the benefits of development. Even if the state is ultimately partitioned, the same issues tend to recur, sometimes in an aggravated form, since partition tends to create new national majorities, like the Croatians or Kosovans in ex-Yugoslavia, or potentially Sri Lankan Tamils in Northern and Eastern Sri Lanka, many

of whom have no more commitment to inclusive politics than their former oppressors.

Conflicts at the Margins of the State

Conflicts waged at national peripheries may paralyse state administration in significant parts of the country. Examples include the festering conflicts in Kashmir and Punjab in India, in Northern Ireland, in Northern Uganda, in the Casamance region of Senegal, or the armed rebellions in Aceh and West Irian in Indonesia. These conflicts have often differed only in degree from the other struggles over the national identity of the state, just discussed above. But they do not usually challenge the existence of the state itself. Nor have they necessarily been the product of a non-democratic state. Indeed in all the examples just cited, the conflicts originated or were perpetuated because of the failure of elected governments to respond adequately to minority demands.

At the same time, national governments have tended to be better able to define these conflicts as purely 'domestic' insurgencies, thus deflecting international pressures to negotiate and postponing political and other reforms that might satisfy minority demands. This has meant there is a significant risk of complacency, with conflicts left to fester and eventually escalate, as did the LTTE insurgency in Sri Lanka in the 1970s and 1980s, or the rebellions in Northern Uganda from the mid-1980s until the present. Added to this has been the tendency of such disputes to be aggravated, as in Kashmir or Northern Uganda, by neighbouring governments' support for the rebels. Insofar as states have attempted to resolve the conflicts, the emphasis has been less on state reconstruction than on some combination of military counterinsurgency and political reform, to draw the sting from the rebellions by promising more inclusive forms of politics.

Regionalised Conflict

Some states have their authority undermined by the growth of regionalised conflict complexes. The DRC is an obvious example, whose conflicts have interlocked ever more tightly with those of its neighbours in the Great Lakes and Southern Africa. Other cases include the interlinked conflicts of the Mano River Union countries in West Africa (Liberia, Sierra Leone, Guinea, and, linked to them, Cote d'Ivoire); the conflicts engulfing ex-Yugoslavia and the Balkans (Woodward 2003); the complex links between the war in Afghanistan and the insecurities of its neighbours; and the links among the now-resolved conflicts in Central America, aggravated also by US interventions in the region. Not all countries caught up in such conflict complexes themselves have had collapsing states, or even conflicts, within their own boundaries. For example, among the DRC's neighbours, Angola, Burundi, Rwanda, and Uganda themselves have experienced recent civil wars, while Namibia, Zambia, and Zimbabwe have not.

In such cases, post-conflict reconstruction often has to be approached as a regional, not a purely national, endeavour. Where conflicts have become embedded in wider regional conflict formations - not to speak of global power politics - efforts to rebuild states and reform their governance can easily become hostage to conflicts ongoing in other states; to meddling by neighbouring governments and external powers; and to flows across national boundaries of weapons, conflict-goods, and military entrepreneurs. Thus regional approaches to peace-building, such as the Lusaka process in the DRC, the Stability Initiative in the Balkans, and the successful Contadora and Esquipela peace processes in Central America, have been indispensable prerequisites for state reconstruction.

Collapse Caused by External Intervention

Some states are undermined or collapse through external intervention, military invasion, or regime change. Examples include Afghanistan, Iraq, or previously (in certain respects) Cambodia or Nicaragua.

Afghanistan has had a long history of military interventions by global as well as regional powers, starting from the original Russian invasion, if not earlier, and continuing during and after the US-led military removal of the Taliban government, with many years of state disintegration and renewal[14] in between. In Iraq the US-led coalition not merely removed Saddam Hussein's regime, but was also responsible for destroying a powerful if flawed state, notably when it dismantled the entire military, security, and Ba'ath political party apparatuses. The protracted crisis that ensued has been one of insecurity and even more of illegitimacy - initially of the Coalition Provisional Authority and, since June 2004, of the interim Iraqi government.

The fundamental priority in both Iraq and Afghanistan is not simply to reconstruct the state and its monopoly of legitimate violence. Even more it is to establish a legitimate public authority, sufficiently independent of the occupiers to enjoy public respect, and sufficiently inclusive to draw wide support from the diverse ethnic and religious communities of each country. The international community and in particular the US-led coalition is regarded more as part of the problem than of the solution. Hence the need is to find an appropriate exit strategy that does not aggravate the prevailing insecurity and creates a more legitimate multilateral framework for international assistance for reconstruction and state reform. Making the UN responsible for reconstruction is by no means a panacea, and could backfire if it is under-resourced or is seen as a proxy for continued domination by the United States and its Western partners. Democratisation and state reform too are necessary, but only likely to succeed if they are home-grown and based upon some recognition of the powerful political and social forces, including radical Islam, that have emerged from the wreckage of the state.

Implications for International Intervention

No doubt one could come up with more categories. But the basic point is that the ways in which states are challenged by conflict have important

---

[14] Whatever one thinks of the Taliban, at least it re-established some semblance of state authority, albeit at great cost in terms of human life and forgone development.

implications for peace-building and state reconstruction and for the role of international actors. Broadly speaking, there is more scope for international intervention where structures of public authority have been swept away entirely, or when protracted stalemate between the warring parties has become so costly for both that it forces them to call in the international community. States that have remained relatively intact have been generally more wary of international involvement, often seeing it as a threat to their sovereignty - above all if they are major regional powers in their own right. Examples include India in Kashmir, China in Tibet, Israel in Palestine, or Indonesia in Aceh. In the case of collapsed states, it makes a lot of difference whether the state fell apart from within or was brought down by external intervention. The latter almost inevitably makes foreign powers and even international agencies de facto parties in the conflict, making it much harder for them to act as legitimate honest brokers with a credible claim to be able to resolve it.

State Building, Nation Building, Democracy, and Development

External support has been directed not only towards the reconstruction of the state but also increasingly towards its reform. The problem remains that reform tends to be conceived in terms dictated by the major donors and international agencies, prioritising the usual formula of liberal democracy, good governance, and economic liberalisation. Whilst elements of this formula are desirable in themselves, the entire package, and the manner it is promoted or imposed from the outside, tends to inhibit the fundamental rethinking that post-conflict states require about the nature and purposes of political authority.

Such rethinking should engage with four parallel but linked endeavours:

- *Rethinking and reconstituting the state itself*, to assure as far as possible legitimate public authority, a functioning state apparatus, and effective and accountable security and law and order institutions. Rebuilding administrative capacity, as well as the state's monopoly of military, security, and policing functions, is clearly vital. But re-establishing the *legitimacy* of state institutions is

equally crucial, where their authority has been undermined by despotic rule, state violence, and the violation of human rights.

- *Inclusive nation building,* so as to reconstitute national citizenship on a more inclusive basis, whilst also recognising and respecting religious, ethnic, gender, and other societal differences. How to do this, and whether to place the emphasis on universal rights or on power-sharing and the institutionalisation of cultural differences, is best left to national dialogue and debate.
- *Democratisation at all levels of public authority,* not merely in the formalistic sense of creating replicas of western liberal democratic institutions, but in the broader sense of the popular accountability of government and greater citizen voice at all levels of political authority. Such democratisation requires not only democratic institutions but also democratic politics (Luckham, Goetz, and Kaldor 2003).
- *Building a developmental state* with the capacity to ensure that external assistance matches national priorities, to build alternatives to the previous war economies, to deliver basic services to citizens, and in the longer run to facilitate sustainable growth and development. Whether this is best done by expanding free markets and limiting the role of the state should be treated as an empirical issue, to be decided on the basis of national circumstances, rather than as an overriding priority.

There has been a natural tendency to prioritise the first and to a certain extent the fourth of these endeavours: rebuilding the state, restoring its capacity to carry out public administration, and enabling it to deliver security and basic services and to manage development and a market economy. All these goals are of course crucial. But focussing on state and economic reconstruction by themselves is not enough, especially where existing states and ruling elites may have been part of the problem in the first place, or where they have been challenged in multi-ethnic societies by groups with their own different conceptions of the legitimacy of the state and the goals of politics. As argued above, multiple levels of political authority coexist with the state and may indeed eclipse it, especially during conflicts. It is important to recognise

these, build on them, and ensure they support state authority, not subvert it.

Nation building was one of the central concepts of decolonisation. It is even more relevant in the early 21st century, when conflicts have sharpened ethnic and other polarisation and undermined the fragile sense of citizenship in the 'imagined communities' we call nation states. The international community has tended to focus on power-sharing arrangements and the design of constitutional frameworks to give all major groups a stake in the political process and the economy, and to minimise the exclusion and marginalisation that lead groups to take up arms against the state (Harriss and Riley 1998; Ghai 1998; Luckham, Goetz, and Kaldor 2003). Constitution making is a hazardous endeavour. It is likely to run into opposition, as in Iraq, if it is too visibly orchestrated by the international community or occupying powers; if it is insufficiently inclusive; and if it does not address the political realities on the ground. Building confidence among divided communities and rebuilding the social capital of trust between religious persuasions, ethnic communities, or clans can be delicately encouraged from above, but in the final analysis is best left to be nurtured as much possible as from below.

Democratisation has been given a bad name by the democracy-promotion efforts of the Western powers and international agencies. Moreover, democracy is not the infallible solution to conflict that it is often supposed to be. In principle it poses an alternative to violence, by encouraging the resolution of disputes through the political process. But in practice democratic institutions have often failed to resolve conflicts and in some cases have even aggravated them (Stewart and O'Sullivan 1999; Luckham, Goetz, and Kaldor 2003).

Legitimacy is key to building peace, to reconstituting public authority, and to resolving disputes through the political process. Hence democracy and elections are necessarily built into virtually every peace agreement and post-conflict reconstruction programme. But it cannot be taken for granted that democracy will be sustainable, that it will support rather than get in the way of reconstruction, or that it will foster conflict resolution. Hence careful attention must be paid to:

- *Questions of process and sequence:* the timing and management of elections relative to the other elements of peace-building, including the restoration of security; the sequencing of constitution making and its inclusiveness; and ensuring that the democratisation process is locally driven and locally owned, rather than externally imposed (Bastian and Luckham 2003).
- *Making both the democratisation process and democratic institutions as inclusive as possible* for all groups in society and at all levels of political authority. Most post-conflict programmes at least pay lip service to the strengthening of civil society and to the need for political and administrative decentralisation. Putting these principles into practice is another matter, especially if there are a range of social forces and political groups (such as ethnic nationalist parties or religious extremists) whose commitment to peace-building or democratisation is questionable or hostile.
- *Close attention to the design of democratic institutions.* Even the best designed constitutional and institutional framework cannot guarantee sustainable democracy or resolve conflicts, though it can help. Conversely, though, it is clear that badly designed institutions can damage democracy, institutionalise social divisions, politicise ethnic and other identities, and engender violence (Luckham, Goetz, and Kaldor 2003).
- *Fostering democratic politics and a democratic political culture to bring life and sustainability to democratic institutions.* In the final analysis, democratic politics has to develop from below. It can be encouraged by donor or international NGO support for civil society groups, but equally such support can stifle local initiatives or fail to create dialogue with popularly based groups (such as ethnic nationalist or religious political parties) that have the capacity to break democracy as well as to make it.[15]

---

[15] For an instructive account of how this happened in Bosnia, see Chandler (1999).

The Policy Dilemmas of International Involvement

Recent history is littered with examples of botched or politically controversial international interventions and failed or stalled national reconstruction.

Yet it is also possible to discern a halting and incomplete learning process, through which different actors in the international community have come to recognise their own limitations and failings and to seek norms of good or at least better practice.[16] The best of these reports are detailed and unsparing in their critiques. Even so, their prescriptions tend to be pitched at a general level. They mostly do not address the hidden political and economic agendas of international, and especially military, interventions. They have too little useful to say about how to persuade major world powers and international bureaucrats in the North and national governments and conflict entrepreneurs in the South to alter their policies and practices. And they tend to disregard the various ways in which the goals of international actors may be mutually incoherent or may conflict with those of national stakeholders in post-conflict states themselves.

It is truly very difficult to devise broadly applicable models of good practice - to make appropriate choices between, for instance, early elections and establishing minimal security; between assuring armed groups some stake in the peace process and empowering civil and political society; between universal and more culturally specific

---

[16] Recent examples include studies of the lessons of the international community's egregious failures in Somalia and Rwanda (on the former see Sahnoun (1994), Clarke and Herbst (1997); and on the latter Adelman and Suhrke (1996), Woodward (1997), Kuperman (2001), and Jones (2001)); the Brahimi Report to the UN on international peacekeeping (United Nations 2000) and other studies of the lessons of peace operations (CSDU 2003); the DAC/OECD Guidelines on helping prevent violent conflict (OECD 2001); a series of policy debates in the journal *Disasters* on the need for improved donor policy coordination and coherence in emergencies; a plethora of donor-supported methodologies for conflict assessments and 'conflict-sensitive' development assistance (DFID 2002a); assessment frameworks for good practice in security sector governance (DFID 2002b and Ball et al. 2003); and critiques of the US-led coalition's military intervention in Iraq, most notably by the United States' own Army War College (Record and Terrill 2004), which pulls very few punches in comparing it with the intervention in Vietnam.

conceptions of human rights; or between national reconciliation and post-conflict justice. To pretend otherwise is to show an arrogant disregard for the complexity of the problems and the real conflicts of principle that must be resolved to address them.

Models of good practice are even more difficult to apply than they are to create. Operationalising such models involves difficulties and contradictions in a context in which they are wilfully disregarded or subverted, both by major international players and by those who control violence in the developing world, whether to secure profit, gain political advantage, or pursue myopic political agendas. A case in point is the manner in which the American and British governments not only manipulated intelligence to justify military intervention in Iraq, but also ignored the advice of their own military and security establishments about the problems of post-conflict reconstruction. This advice was generally more realistic and based upon a better understanding of the realities on the ground than the policies implemented by the Coalition Political Authority. In the view of some US Army War College analysts, for example, the intervention in Iraq was a military victory but a strategic and political failure (Echeverria 2004: 13-14), in part because it disregarded their own relatively sophisticated analyses of the problems of post-conflict reconstruction published before the invasion (Crane and Terrill 2003).

Moreover, models of good practice invariably underestimate the contradictions of intervention. The international community has had to steer between the Scylla of intervening with too heavy a hand and the Charybdis of letting conflicts fester and failing to recognise and support locally based efforts to build peace. It has veered toward the first extreme in Bosnia, Kosovo, and even more so Iraq. Its failure to intervene in a timely or effective manner in Rwanda and Somalia and its woeful reluctance to recognise and support a home-grown process of peace-building, reconstruction, and democratisation from below in Somaliland have been at the other extreme.

Rather than attempting to derive policy prescriptions from general principles, it is more fruitful to capture the contested and contradictory

nature of conflict and of post-conflict reconstruction by identifying some generic policy dilemmas (Box 0.1).

Box 0.1: Some policy dilemmas of post-conflict reconstruction

International intervention: ending war and building peace?
- Multilateral action through the UN and regional institutions versus big-power unilateralism and 'coalitions of the willing'.
- International humanitarian law and human rights versus operational effectiveness ('playing to win').
- Development and global justice versus global security concerns (e.g. the 'war against terror').
- Light footprints, sensitive to national contexts, versus 'one size fits all' blueprints.
- Sustainable peace versus easy exit strategies.

Reconstituting state and society
- Security first, versus popular consent and electoral legitimacy.
- A holistic, strategic approach, versus compartmentalisation of economic, security, and governance issues.
- State building from above versus building consensus (and civil society) from below.
- Shutting out 'spoilers' etc, versus opening political space for dialogue.
- Making deals with warlords, ethnic nationalists, religious extremists, versus empowering civil and political society.
- National reconciliation versus accountability for human rights abuses (the issue of impunity).

Constitutional design and political restructuring
- Externally sponsored versus domestically driven constitution making.
- Formal versus process-driven constitution making engaging political and civil society.
- Western liberal versus alternative models of democratic practice.
- Imported constitutional models versus institutions based on national culture and experience.

- Legal and human rights universalism versus alternative conceptions of rights and citizenship.
- Democratic institutions (e.g. design of electoral systems) versus democratic politics and consensus building.
- Power sharing among different groups versus common citizenship and equal rights.
- Power-sharing versus an effective developmental state.

Rebuilding state capacity to deliver development
- Administration by international transitional authorities versus priorities of national stakeholders.
- Humanitarian aid versus long-term development assistance.
- Strategic thinking about long-term goals versus operational priorities of restoring services and public administration.
- Policy coherence among donor agencies versus priorities of national stakeholders.
- Economic stabilisation and adjustment versus longer-term sustainable development.
- Reliance on NGOs to deliver services versus rebuilding state and local administrative capacity.

Security sector transformation
- Prioritisation of security versus building peace and consensus.
- A powerful international security presence versus rebuilding national military and security forces.
- Human security versus state and regime security.
- Prioritisation of police, justice, and law and order versus military security.
- Rebuilding existing military and security institutions versus starting from scratch.
- Rebuilding state security institutions versus recognizing local militias, vigilantes, and other non-state armed bodies.
- Treating disarmament, demobilisation, and reintegration as a technical process versus giving ex-combatants a political stake.
- Cuts in military and security spending versus investment in security and law and order.

The characterisation of these dilemmas in Box 0.1 implicitly reflects the standpoint of international democratic Machiavellis[17] (prototypical figures might be, say, Kofi Annan, Mohammed Sahnoun, Lakhdar Brahimi, or even Clare Short), who accept the broad case for international humanitarian intervention and for the reconstruction of post-conflict states on a more democratic, inclusive, and developmentally sound basis. Other actors, not least the tumultuous and variegated stakeholders in post-conflict countries themselves, might well pose the array of dilemmas differently, even though there would be some common elements. Nor should one forget that, tugging at one or other end of each set of policy choices, there tend to be powerful interests, whose concern is with how the principles can be moulded to support their own special case.

Hence each set of policy choices must be open to dialogue and revision. Sometimes clear tradeoffs have to be made between clashing principles or opposed political and social interests. At other times there may be more scope for conflict transformation: that is, for creative policy choices that seek ways around apparent dilemmas, as well as potential complementarities among seemingly opposed principles. Security policies built on the insight that even military security is best achieved globally through broad international consensus and nationally under legitimate and democratically accountable public authorities, rather than raison d'etat, maximum force and state secrecy, are a pertinent illustration.

---

[17] On democratic Machiavellianism, see Bastian and Luckham (2003).

References

Adelman, H., and A. Suhrke (eds.) (1996), *Early Warning and Conflict-Management,* Copenhagen: Joint Evaluation of Emergency Assistance to Rwanda.

Ahmed, I. I., and R. H. Green (1999), "The Heritage of War and State Collapse in Somaliland", *Third World Quarterly* 20 (1).

Annan, K. (2002), *Prevention of Armed Conflict: Report of the Secretary General,* New York: United Nations.

Ball, N. (2001), "Transforming Security Sectors: the IMF and World Bank Approaches", *Journal of Conflict, Security, and Development* 1 (1).

Ball, N., T. Bouta, and L. van der Goor (2003), *Enhancing Democratic Governance of the Security Sector: an Institutional Assessment Framework.* Report prepared by the Clingendael Institute for the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Bastian, S., and R. Luckham (2003), "Conclusion: the Politics of Institutional Choice" in S. Bastian and R. Luckham (eds.), *Can Democracy be Designed*?, Zed Press, London.

Cawthra, G., and R. Luckham (2003), "Democratic Control and the Security Sector" in G. Cawthra and R. Luckham (eds.), *Governing Insecurity: Democratic Control of Military and Security Establishments in Transitional Democracies,* Zed Press, London.

Chandler, D. (1999), *Bosnia: Faking Democracy after Dayton*, Pluto Press, London.

Clarke, W. and J. Herbst (eds.) (1997), *Learning from Somalia: the Lessons of Armed Humanitarian Intervention,* Westview, Boulder CO.

Cliffe, L., and R. Luckham (2000), "What Happens to the State in Conflict? Political Analysis as a Tool for Planning Humanitarian Assistance", *Disasters* 24 (4).

Collier, P., et al. (2003), *Breaking the Conflict Trap: Civil War and Development Policy,* World Bank, Washington D.C..

Conflict, Security, and Development Unit (CSDU) (2003), *A Review of Peace Operations: a Case for Change,* International Policy Institute, King's College London.

Cramer, C., and J. Goodhand (2002), "Try Again, Fail Again, and Fail Better? War, the State and the 'Post-Conflict Challenge in Afghanistan", *Development and Change* 33 (5).

Crane, C., and A. Terrill (2003), *Reconstructing Iraq: Insights, Challenges, and Missions for Military Forces in a Post-Conflict Scenario,*, Strategic Studies Institute, US Army War College, Carlisle PA.

Doornbos, M. (2002), "State Collapse and Fresh Starts: Some Critical Reflections", *Development and Change* 33 (5).

Downs, G., and S. J. Stedman (2002), "Evaluation Issues in Peace Implementation" in S. J. Stedman et al., *Ending Civil Wars: the Implementation of Peace Agreements,* Lynne Rienner for the International Peace Academy, Boulder CO.

Duffield, M. (2001), *Global Governance and the New Wars,* Zed Press, London.

Echeverria, A. J. (2004), *Toward an American Way of War*,, Strategic Studies Institute, US Army War College, Carlisle PA.

Farah, A. Y., and I. M. Lewis (1997), "Making Peace in Somaliland", *Cahiers d'Etudes Africaines* 146.

Fearon, J. D., and D. D. Laitin (2003), "Ethnicity, Insurgency and Civil War", *American Political Science Review* 97 (1).

Ghai, Y. (1998), "Decentralisation and Accommodation of Ethnic Diversity" in Crawford Young (ed.), *Ethnic Diversity and Public Policy: a Comparative Enquiry*, Macmillan, Basingstoke.

Halliday, F. (2002), "Two Hours That Shook the World" in F. Halliday *September 11, 2001: Causes and Consequences,* Saqi Books, London [book is a collection of his own essays]

Harriss, P., and B. Reilly (eds.) (1998), *Democracy and Deep-Rooted Conflict: Options for Negotiators,* International IDEA, Stockholm.

Hularas, A. (2002), "The Viability of Somaliland: Internal Constraints and Regional Geopolitics", *Journal of Contemporary African Studies* 20 (2).

International Commission on State Sovereignty (ICISS) (2001), *The Responsibility to Protect* International Development Research Centre, Ottawa.

Johnson, C. (2000), *Blowback: The Costs and Consequences of American Empire,* Time-Warner, London.

Jones, B. D (2001), *Peace-making in Rwanda: the Dynamics of Failure,* Lynne Rienner for the International Peace Academy, Boulder CO.

Kaldor, M. (1999), *New and Old Wars,* Polity Press, London.

Kaldor, M., and R. Luckham (2001), "Global Transformations and New Conflicts", *IDS Bulletin* 32 (2),Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.

Koonings, K., and D. Kruijt (1999), *Societies of Fear: the Legacy of Civil War, Violence and Terror in Latin America,* Zed Press, London.

Kuperman, A. J. (2001), *The Limits of Humanitarian Intervention. Genocide in Rwanda*, Brookings Institution, Washington DC.

Lemarchand, R. (2001), *The Democratic Republic of the Congo: from Collapse to Potential Reconstruction*, Occasional Paper, Centre for African Studies, Copenhagen.

Luckham, R., et al. (2001), "Conflict and Poverty in Africa", *IDS Working Paper* 128, Institute of Development Studies, Brighton.

Luckham, R. (2003), "Democratic Strategies for Security in Transition and Conflict" in Robin Luckham and Gavin Cawthra (eds.), *Governing Insecurity*: *Democratic Control of Military and Security Establishments in Transitional Democracies,* Zed Press, London.

Luckham, R., A. M. Goetz, and M. Kaldor (2003), "Democratic Institutions and Democratic Politics" in Sunil Bastian and Robin Luckham (eds.), *Can Democracy be Designed?,* Zed Press, London.

Mubarak, J. A. (1997), "The 'Hidden Hand' Behind the Resilience of the Stateless Economy of Somalia", *World Development* 25 (12).

Nafziger, E. W., and J. Auvinen (2002), "Economic Development, Inequality, War, and State Violence", *World Development* 30 (2).

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2001)*, Helping Prevent Violent Conflict. The DAC Guidelines,* OECD, OECD.

Ottaway, M. (1995), "Democratisation in Collapsed States" in W. I. Zartman (ed.), *Collapsed States,* Lynne Rienner, Boulder CO.

_____ (2002), "Rebuilding State Institutions in Collapsed States", *Development and Change* 33 (5).

Parekh, B. (1994), "The Cultural Particularity of Liberal Democracy" in D. Held (ed), *Prospects for Democracy: North, South, East, West,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

_____ (1997), "Rethinking Humanitarian Intervention", *International Political Science Review* 18 (1).

Record, J., and W. A. Terrill (2004), *Iraq and Vietnam: Differences, Similarities and Insights,* Strategic Studies Institute, US Army War College, Carlisle PA.

Sahnoun, M. (1994), *Somalia: the Missed Opportunities,* US Institute of Peace, Washington DC.

Sen, Amartya (1999), *Development as Freedom,* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Stedman, S. J. et al. (2002), *Ending Civil Wars; the Implementation of Peace Agreements,* Lynne Rienner for the International Peace Academy, Boulder CO.

Stewart, F., and M. O'Sullivan (1999), "Democracy, Conflict, and Development – Three Cases" in Gustav Ranis et al. (eds.), *The Political Economy of Comparative Development into the 21st Century,* Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.

UK Department for International Development (DFID) (2002a), *Conducting Conflict Assessments: Guidance Notes,* DFID, London.

_____ (2002b), *Understanding and Supporting Security Sector Reform*, DFID, London.

United Nations (2000), "Comprehensive Review of the Whole Question of Peacekeeping Operations in All Their Aspects" (Brahimi Report). UN Document A/55/305 S/2000/809, 21 August 2000.

Woodward, D. (1997), *The IMF, the World Bank, and Economic Policy in Rwanda: Economic, Social and Political Implications*, OXFAM Commissioned Paper.

Woodward, S. (2003), "The Balkans: the Dangers of Democratisation Amidst Insecurity" in G. Cawthra and R. Luckham, *Governing Insecurity, Democratic Control of Military and Security Establishments in Transitional Democracies*, Zed Press, London.