ZEUS IFSH

Amanda Guidero

Humanitarian, Development, and Private Security Actors in the Field:

A Security Analysis in Somalia

Working Paper 2 | December 2012

Humanitarian, Development, and Private Security Actors in the Field: A Security Analysis in Somalia

Amanda Guidero

PhD Student, Kennesaw State University
Visiting Fellow at the IFSH in Summer 2012

Abstract

Development and humanitarian organizations often bring lifesaving aid to populations in need. However, in some areas, personnel delivering aid in the field have become the targets of kidnapping and violence. The aim of this article is to address the silence surrounding the use of private security companies (PSCs) in the humanitarian and development realm and offer the theoretical approach of securitization to help humanitarian and development agencies overcome this silence. Furthermore, part of the silence may be explained by the relatively new development of PSC-led efforts to self-regulate according to humanitarian law and human rights which has thus far been nearly absent from most academic work on the question of PSCs in the humanitarian and development realm. Finally, the article will end with a brief case study of the humanitarian crisis in Somalia, as the security environment in Somalia continues to pose a threat to development and humanitarian personnel in the field. It concludes that rather than maintaining silence concerning their presence, humanitarians and development actors should use an extended version of securitization to frame the risks they face in the field. By questioning the morality of action versus inaction, any potential involvement of PSCs in humanitarian and development endeavors can be more explicitly defined.

Despite the increasing security concerns of humanitarian and development organizations in some contexts, there is a pervasive silence in the humanitarian and development arenas concerning the use of PSCs for staff protection, resulting in a lack of industry-established norms and regulations for the use of PSCs[1]. Conversely, the International Code of Conduct for Private Military Service Providers (ICOC) is PSC industry initiative to self-regulate according to human rights and humanitarian law. In light of this PSC led effort, what are the reasons many humanitarians development actors are selecting to remain absent from the global process of PSC regulation within their own industry? Additionally, what strategies can those humanitarian organizations who do admit to hiring PSCs use in order to publicly bring the use-of-PSCs debate into the humanitarian realm? In order to answer these questions, this study will consist of four parts: an overview of the origins and main tenets of the ICoC and how it incorporated human rights and humanitarian law into PSC self-regulatory practices; an exploration of the use of PSCs in the humanitarian and development realms; the theoretical framework of securitization, which can allow humanitarian and development aid agencies who are willing to discuss the use of PSCs to draw attention to the issue of PSC use and regulation; and an examination into the types of scenarios that a securitized humanitarian and development response is appropriate, using Somalia as a case study.

In order to explore the relationship between security and humanitarianism and development in terms of how PSCs are utilized to protect humanitarians and development workers in the field, some concepts must be defined. For the purposes of this paper, humanitarian aid and development projects will be referred to separately, but will be explored as interconnected activities as each has a different function within the same field (humanitarians are responding to crises whereas development actors maintain long term projects). Additionally, many large scale NGOs such as CARE International provide both humanitarian and development aid in the countries where they are located. Also present in these high risk countries are a variety of security providers. The security providers may be locals or expatriates, former soldiers or former police. Although there are many terms associated with security providers such as private military companies (PMC) and private security providers (PSP), they will generally be referred to as private security companies (PSC). The spirit of the term PSC is that they are employed for

---

1   The lack of industry wide norms in the humanitarian and development sphere becomes even more prominent in light of the efforts by the International Maritime Organization (IMO) to regulate the use of PSCs. See www.imo.org for more information.

defense, not to engage offensively in conflict (Volpe, 2008). Not only are PSCs more present in unstable environments, but some countries require humanitarian and development agencies to hire national security providers such as in Somaliland and South Sudan and NGOs that work with the US government in Iraq are required to have armed protection provided by PSCs (Stoddard, Harmer, and DiDomenico, 2008).

I. ICOC: Origins and Notions of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law

The ICoC (2012) was promoted by the Swiss government as an opportunity to involve multiple stakeholders in the process of incorporating human rights and humanitarian law into the regulation of the PSC industry. The stakeholders involved foreign governments, PSCs, and humanitarian organizations (ICoC, 2012). Initially, 58 PSCs, representing 15 countries, became signatories of "the Code" in November, 2010 (ICoC, 2012; Ralby, 2011, p. 14). That number has swelled to 511 PSCs from 60 countries as of October 2012 (ICoC, 2012). At the onset there were two goals of the ICoC. The first was to develop policies regarding PSC personnel conduct, including "rules for the use of force, prohibitions on torture, human trafficking and other human rights abuses" (ICoC, 2012, About the ICoC, para 3). The other goal was to create management and governance policies "including how they vet personnel and subcontractors, manage weapons and handle grievances internally" (ICoC, 2012, About the ICoC, para 3).

The ICOC was designed specifically for PSCs involved in land based operations, including protection of people or objects such as convoys, facilities, etc. or whenever a PSC employee requires a weapon to complete their assignment (ICoC, 2012; Ralby, 2011). The question of the use of weapons features prominently in the discourse of rules and regulations of PSCs because it is the potential use of firearms in an international conflict that separates PSCs from civilians, yet does not fully place PSCs in the position of combatant unless they are incorporated into an official army (Rosemann, 2011). Therefore, PSCs who abuse human rights or commit other crimes enjoy impunity related to their ambiguous status (Rosemann, 2011). Further, Percy (2009) noted that PSCs have managed to gain immunity from local prosecution as a result of the status of forces agreements which were set up to protect military personnel being prosecuted by "states with weak or nonexistent judicial systems" (p. 60). Due to the various grays areas of impunity, PSC personnel who have participated in human rights abuses abroad

4

have suffered few consequences because of the lack of accountability (Percy, 2009). Thus the intervention of the Swiss government and the ICoC's (2012) pursuit of industry led initiatives concerning accountability, rooted in human rights and humanitarian law, is an attempt to counter the ambiguous position of PSCs in foreign interventions and to align PSCs with UN practices (Klees, 2011). Of note is that fact the ICoC was a continuation of the Montreux Document, authored by the Swiss Government and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) in 2006 (Klees, 2011). The Montreux document advised states on best practices for hiring PSCs (Klees, 2011). As such, the ICoC is in effect a guide on how PSCs should operate when hired by a state in a foreign country, though the agreement went into effect after PSCs had already began to enter the humanitarian and development realms.

II. Private Security Companies and Humanitarian and Development Organizations

The entrance of PSCs into the humanitarian and development world dates back to the mid-1990s (Kinsey, Hansen, & Franklin, 2009; Spearin, 2008). NGOs were either unwilling or unable to conduct large-scale demining operations, thus paving the way for PSCs to step in as the PSCs were able to cope with the demands of demining (Singer, 2007; Spearin, 2008). Stoddard, Harmer, and DiDomenico (2008) remarked that the use of PSCs in the humanitarian and development realm increased beginning around 2003. This is in keeping with Volpe's (2008) and Spearin's (2007) analyses that partnerships between PSCs and the US military and State Department developed as a result of PSC enlistment in the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Franke and von Boemcken (2011) noted that the private security industry began to boom with the war in Iraq. Since the drawn down and pull out of troops, there has been a surplus of these organizations looking to expand other markets market (Percy, 2009).

The growth and expandability of the PSCs coincides with increasing security demands on the part of humanitarian and development agencies (Kinsey et al., 2009; Renouf, 2007; Singer, 2007; Spearin, 2008; 2007; Stoddard et al., 2008; Volpe, 2008). However, as indicated by the report by the Aid Worker Security Database (AWSD; 2011), humanitarians and development workers are choosing to withdraw rather than resorting to alternative methods of security to deliver aid and assistance in insecure environments. Additionally, both the AWSD (2011) report

and information from the Afghanistan NGO Safety Office[2] (ANSO; 2011) underscore the dangerous nature of some locations where humanitarians and development actors work such as Afghanistan and Somalia. In these countries, violence targeting humanitarian and development workers continues to increase despite the declining presence of humanitarian and development agents in the field. It is in these contexts that the partnership between humanitarian and development agencies and PSCs is most likely to develop.

Most literature that has been dedicated to the exploration of the relationship between the development and humanitarian sector and PSCs has come from development and humanitarian agencies such as the Humanitarian Policy Group, Humanitarian Practice Network, the Overseas Development Institute, the International Crescent of the Red Cross, and Voice Out Loud, a bi-annual newsletter for humanitarian aid workers. Reference to the ICoC practices are limited at best within the humanitarian and development literature on PSC use as the discussion concerning PSCs in the humanitarian and development realm predated the formalization of the ICoC by a few years. The studies that have come from the aforementioned agencies address how the use of PSCs within the humanitarian sphere may be at odds with the humanitarian pillars of neutrality, impartiality, and independence. The basis of this assertion is that security is derived from the local populations accepting the presence of the humanitarian workers because they benefit from the services being provided. If the agency were to hire a PSC, the organization risks looking like it has a military or political motive (Stoddard et al., 2008; Spearin, 2007; Renouf, 2010). Although humanitarian agencies tend to prefer what they term the acceptance model to secure the safety of their personnel, they have two other options for security as well. The first alternative to acceptance is protection, which is based on protective procedures structures, materials and devices. The other is deterrence, which is obtained by posing a counter threat (Egeland et al., 2011; Renouf, 2010; Spearin, 2007; Stoddard et al., 2008).

The humanitarian concept of acceptance fits with the development idea of a bottom-up approach and local buy-in. A bottom-up approach means that local partners will help determine the development project and assume ownership of the project (Blackburn, Chambers, & Gaventa, 2002). By creating an environment where local citizens feel ownership of the project, development workers are also creating a sense of acceptance both of the project as well as of their presence in the community. This approach to security relies on the community itself to

support projects and therein protects the agents who administer the projects. In either case, the presence of PSCs is viewed as a danger to the humanitarian and development workers because it keeps them from being accepted within a society (Stoddard et al., 2008).

Even literature from security based organizations such as Security Management Initiative and the Cornwallis Group have pitted the presence of PSCs within a humanitarian and development context against humanitarian principles. Again, scholarly work on this subject appeared prior to the signing of the ICoC and has thus been absent from the majority of the literature. However, authors called on PSCs to adopt humanitarian and development principles in order to work in those realms. For instance, Volpe (2008) has argued that the increasing security challenges faced by humanitarians as well as development agencies may necessitate a new approach to security within these contexts. He viewed private PSCs as a potential solution to this changing reality, as long as the PSCs (both industry wide and individual actors) demonstrate an understanding of the development mission. Other authors argued that development and humanitarian agencies formulate more strident guidelines concerning the employment of PSCs in the field. Authors such as Renouf (2007) argued that humanitarian organizations should weigh the impact PSCs will have on the humanitarian crisis in the short term with the long term harm the PSCs may cause. This harm can come in the form of tarnishing the humanitarian organization's name and reputation, the introduction of new (potentially) armed groups to the conflict or crisis, the movement of the industry wide accepted security approach of acceptance towards deterrence, and finally, confusion among the local population in which all interveners are assimilated into one group of occupiers (Renouf, 2007). At the same time, Renouf (2007) reminded agencies that hire PSCs that the humanitarian organization is ultimately responsible for the actions of the PSC and therefore must choose a PSC wisely, including asking others in the field for a recommendation, having a clear plan for what the PSC is expected to do, and perhaps looking into local options. Now that the ICoC is in place, there is at least one mechanism that would help development and humanitarian agencies vet potential PSCs, places parameters within which weapons can be used, and places accountability on the PSCs.

Literature both from security and development agencies and organizations provides insights into the current security needs of humanitarian and development workers. Yet, the security environment is ever changing. For example, Stoddard, Harmer, and Haver (2006) determined that violence targeting humanitarian and development workers had only slightly risen from the mid-1990s to the mid-2000s. However, after their report was issued, violence directed

7

at the same group spiked, peaking around 2008 and then declining as the number of humanitarian and development workers in the field declined, too (AWSD, 2011). If the violence continues to escalate against humanitarian and development aid workers in some countries, where there is also a dire need for development and humanitarian assistance, it is a worthwhile endeavour to examine alternative security strategies to the acceptance model. Both the protective and deterrent approaches to security could potentially incorporate PSCs as a viable security option for development and humanitarian agents in the field, as opposed to those agencies pulling out of a country entirely. The self-regulation of the PSC industry via the ICoC at least begins to reconcile some of the issues associated with the use of PSC in the humanitarian and development realms.

III. A Security Framework

The growth in the number of signatory companies to the ICoC indicates a willingness on the part of some PSCs to adhere to a framework that incorporates humanitarian law and human rights into their policies and procedures. Still, despite the advent of the ICoC, humanitarian and development organizations have had little to say on this matter, either because much of the literature predates the official signing of the ICoC or because the topic is still considered to be taboo in humanitarian and development circles. Consequently, only a limited number humanitarian and development agencies have even acknowledged their use of PSCs in the field. In order for humanitarian and development actors to better regulate and standardize the use of PSCs under exceptionally dangerous circumstances, the use of PSCs must be acknowledged and understood. Within the field of security studies, Buzan, Waever, and Wilde (1998), provided the conceptual starting point from which other theorists, such as Watson (2011) and Floyd (2011) have expanded and altered to fit into a humanitarian context. This framework is relevant as it not only creates the dialogical space in which humanitarian and development organizations can discuss the use of PSCs, but it also enables these organizations to recognize their own role in drawing attention to the important and urgent nature of their work in environments that both require lifesaving assistance for the locals as well as for the humanitarian and development workers.

The security framework developed by Buzan, Waever, and Ole (1998) is based on the theory of securitization which is an exploration of how an issue or referent object can be

addressed through extraordinary action, beyond the political realm (Buzan et al., 1998). The fundamental aspect of securitization is the speech act that a securitizing actor makes to a specific audience that can authorize the extraordinary action to take place (Buzan et al., 1998). Successful securitization depends on the target audience accepting that if decisive action is not taken, the results would be dire (Buzan, Waever, & Wilde, 1998). This takes place three stages according to Lorenzo-Dus and Marsh (2012): In the first stage, the issue is elevated so the referent object is subjectively perceived to be under existential threat. The next stage involves a security discourse by elites in the form of a speech act that defines the object as special. The final stage is legitimization of the security issue through its acceptance by a mass audience. In this stage, the securitizing actor has successfully demonstrated to the audience that extraordinary measures, outside of the normal political framework, are necessary to protect the referent object. Alongside the securitizing actor is the functional actor, who can influence decisions made by the securitizing actor (Buzan et al., 1998).

Table I: Units of a Security Analysis (adopted from Buzan et al. 1998, p. 36)

Referent Object	Securitizing Actor	Functional Actors
The issue singled out for securitization can be political, social, economic, military, or environmental	Agent calls attention to the threat	Actors who significantly impact the decisions made by security actors, but is not a decision maker

Table II: Stages of Securitization

Authors	Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3
Buzan et al. (1998) and Lorenzo-Dus and Marsh (2012)	Issue elevated to Referent Object	Securitizing Actor makes a speech act to inform the target audience of the urgency of the issue	Audience accepts the speech act, legitimizing that special and extraordinary measures are necessary

Past experience has shown that humanitarian—and, by extension, development actors—are extremely efficient securitizing actors (Watson, 2011). The effective mobilization of foreign aid during the winter 2004 tsunami crisis in SE Asia is an example of the aid communities' ability to securitize an issue through mass media coverage of the event (Watson, 2011). Although Buzan, Ole, and Waever (1998) did not prioritize human life over state's interests, human beings should also be considered referent objects (Watson, 2011). By bridging Watson's (2011) addition of human life as a referent object with human security, the role humanitarian and development agencies can play in calling attention to threats again themselves and the resulting existential threat to the aid recipients becomes much clearer.

In order to understand the logic of how humanitarians and development actors can use securitization to protect their ability to deliver life-saving aid and development, the scope of what constitutes a referent object must be expanded. For instance, Watson (2011) placed human lives and dignity as a referent object. This notion of dignity is in keeping with the discourse of human security, which separates the needs of individuals from the state (Dhingra & Singhvi, 2011). As the definition of security increasingly applies to individuals, human security is increasingly becoming the source for international action (ICISS, 2001). Oman (2010) noted that human security incorporates human rights and development by drawing attention to certain needs of individuals—"economic, food, health, environmental, personal, community, and political security"—and then the conditions under which these are threatened (pp. 290-291). Further, Oman (2010) observed that threats to human security usually come in the form of human rights violations, and that calling attention to violations is a "political choice." (p. 295). In calling attention to issues of human security that are based on human rights, the "urgent language of security replaces the familiar terminology of human rights and development, and in so doing transforms the import of these violations, and the response they elicit from us" (Oman, 2010, pp. 295-296). This idea of transforming human rights violations into issues of security is similar to what Watson (2011) recommended in terms of how humanitarian and development organizations can securitize human beings.

When humanitarians and development agencies securitize an issue, they do not necessarily invoke measures that are extraordinary as defined by Buzan, Waever, and Wilde (Watson, 2011). Instead, Watson (2011) argued that humanitarian responses have been

institutionalized and therefore they operate just below extraordinary. An extraordinary response in this context would be an armed response, such as a military intervention, which Watson (2011) described as an "intensification" of securitization (p. 9). In his view, potential responses exist on a spectrum: at the one end are institutionalized responses, based on pre-existing institutions, and on the other are extraordinary measures, which are exceptional. Even though they do not always use extreme measures to achieve their aims, humanitarian and development organizations use "threat-urgency" rhetoric to convey the importance of their work (p. 9). Dire consequences would be the result if the referent object is not attended to in the threat-urgency modality. No international response would mean more humans would die as a result of the threat (Watson, 2011). Legitimate authorities that can securitize the humanitarian issue usually come in the form of UN experts or NGO representatives.

Table III: Stages of Human Securitization			
Author	Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3
Watson (2011)	Humans are identified as Referent Object as humans lives are stake.	Humanitarian or Development Actors make a speech act to inform the target audience of the urgency of the issue Failure to act would result in further loss of lives.	Audience, such as the public, donors, supranational organizations, accepts the speech act, utilizing preexisting institutions to respond or legitimizing intensified (militarized) measures.

Private Security Companies and Securitizing Violence

By recognizing the powerful role humanitarian and development actors can play in securitization, it is possible to see how they may use that role to call attention to risks to their own personnel in the field face. Although these few incidents alone might not appear to constitute an existential threat to all humanitarian and development actors, the result of violence targeting humanitarian and development actors in the field has potentially dire consequences for the people they are providing aid to. If humanitarian aid and development agencies cannot deliver life saving aid and assistance to populations ravaged by war, famine, natural disasters,

etc., the consequences can be dire. Therefore, humanitarian and development actors could use their abilities to mobilize support by drawing attention to their own security needs in order to bring global attention both to the populations at risk, as well as to the dangers related to delivering aid and implementing development projects in those countries.

In calling attention to the dangerous environments where humanitarian and development actors find themselves the targets of violence, those who use PSCs can shed light on how and where PSCs were used. Although Stoddard, Harmer, and DiDomenico (2008) found that there was a general resistance within the humanitarian world to admit the use of PSCs and an even greater hesitancy to admit the use of armed PSCs, a few large international humanitarian and development agencies were willing to discuss the practice. Those humanitarian and development workers who were resistant to the use of PSCs expressed concern that once they employed PSCs, they were at even greater risk of being targets of violence as they become associated with militaristic agents (Stoddard et al., 2008). However, in some countries, such as Somalia and Afghanistan, humanitarians and development actors are specifically targeted for a variety of reasons beyond their affiliation with a PSC (Stoddard et al., 2008).

Moral Implications of Securitization and PSCs

How does securitization assist in helping humanitarian and development actors resolve the dilemma of how to reconcile the use of PSCs in their field? By providing a framework that, in some contexts, can help humanitarian and development actors identify when the use of extraordinary measures is necessary in order to address an issue that would be devastating if left unaddressed. If human life and dignity are viewed as the referent object, is there any greater moral and ethical imperative than to utilize whatever tools at hand to save human lives? When do the ends justify the means in terms of employing force vis-à-vis PSCs? This moral aspect of the debate is framed within the logic of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty's (ICISS; 2001) document *The responsibility to protect*, which has a section dedicated to the moral imperatives related to humanitarian crises. The Commission used language that conveys the way in which humanitarian crises can be securitized, stating "[g]etting a moral motive to bite means, however, being able to convey a sense of urgency and reality about the threat to human life in a particular situation" and that halting human suffering is both politically legitimate and can impact larger regional security (ICISS, 2001, p. 71). Furthermore,

in some of the most dire cases, in cases where national governments fail to adequately respond to the needs of their people, it is the responsibility of the international community to react—politically, economically, and in keeping with securitization discourse, in the most extreme cases, forcefully—in order to avert human suffering (ICISS, 2001; Spearin, 2008; Watson, 2011).

The use of force within a moral context has been debated among scholars. As a result, the ICISS (2001) refers to the just war theory (JWT) as way of morally grounding forceful interventions. Floyd (2011) also used some elements of JWT to provide a moral framework for securitization, which can function as a "moral constraint" in the process of securitization similar to how Michael Walzer addressed moral constraints on war (as cited in Floyd, 2011).The first of his criteria establishes just cause, while the second and third criteria focus on appropriateness of response (Floyd, 2011). In order to successfully carry out a moral securitization, the intentions and capabilities of the aggressor must be assess and all three criterion must be met in order for securitization to be "morally right" (Floyd, 2011, p. 428). For the first criterion, Floyd (2011) specified that the existential threat against the survival of an object must be objective, regardless of where a securitizing actor recognizes it. In the second, Floyd contended that the moral legitimacy of the referent object is established "only when the referent object is conducive to human well-being defined as the satisfaction of human needs" (p. 428). Finally, Floyd (2011) argued that the security response must be proportionate to the capabilities of the aggressor and "the securitizing actor must be sincere in his or her intentions" (p. 428).

According to Floyd (2011), the moral securitization of a referent object depends on an extended definition of securitization. The new definition of securitization rests on the idea that the securitizing discourse is a threat or warning to the aggressor which is followed by a second step. This second step, termed "security practice" (Floyd, 2011, p. 429), requires a "change in relevant behaviour by a relevant agent" (Floyd, 2011, p. 428). Floyd's (2011) definition of securitization helps the audience determine the genuine intentions of the securitizing actor concerning the referent object. Since the intention is for aid to reach the target population, using a PSC can be justified if there is legitimate concern that the humanitarian providers are at risk themselves. This option maybe morally more in line with the aspect of a proportional response, rather than sending a military convoy to deliver aid, which can escalate violence, as was seen in Somalia in the early 1990s.

Table IV: Stages of Moral Human Securitization (Adopted from Floyd, 2011)		
	Stage 1	Stage 2
	Securitizing move: Aggressor has been warned	Security practice: Change in the relevant behaviour by a relevant agent, either the securitizing actor or instructed by the securitizing actor.
Requirements:	The existential threat against the survival of an object must be objective and moral legitimacy must be established.	Securitizing Actor is sincere is his or her intentions. Sincerity is determined by aligning the security practice with the speech act. · The security response must be proportionate to the capabilities of the aggressor.

While Floyd (2011) has contended that her new definition is incompatible with traditional securitization theory and more specifically the Copenhagen school (from where it originated with Buzan, Waever, and Ole) because it allows security analysts to "determine the moral rightness of securitization" (p. 429), she argued that securitization can be judged by that criteria he has laid out to make securitization morally justifiable. Further, Floyd (2011) has argued that responding to existential threats against the referent object requires certain requirements. These requirements come in the form of the "means and degree" of action against the aggressor, unlike Buzan, Waever, and Ole's (1998) argument that the very nature of securitization means that the response lies outside regulation and requirements (as cited in Floyd, 2011, p. 433). When placed in the present context, the application of PSCs in humanitarian and development projects, Floyd provided a framework for determining when to utilize PSCs (in cases where the delivery of desperately needed aid is impeded by the insecurity of aid workers in the field) and establishing requirements concerning how the PSCs are utilized (from conducting risk assessments to armed guards, depending on the nature of the threat to aid workers).

Reframing the role of humanitarian and development agencies within a securitization context can provide a model for when, where, and how PSCs can be employed. Rather than maintaining the separation between the humanitarian and development realms and security, the use of PSCs can serve to bridge the two and create an environment that is conducive to regulation. Furthermore, the advent of the ICoC and self-regulation of PSCs opens the door for

humanitarian and development agencies to engage with PSCs using their own language of human rights and humanitarian law. Openly discussing the use of PSCs in some cases can also lead to the establishment of legal and ethical norms in terms of how and when humanitarian crises are securitized. In these cases, the passive approach of acceptance cannot be assumed. Even if the humanitarian or development organization has a long presence in the area, power struggles in some areas, such as South Sudan and Afghanistan, means shifting attitudes towards humanitarian and development agents (Stoddard, Harmer, & DiDomencio, 2009).

IV. Somalia: A Case Study on Securitization

Somalia is often cited as an example of a country that has both great needs and poses great risks to humanitarian and development agencies (AWSD, 2011; Stoddard et al., 2008). Ranked as the number one most dangerous country for humanitarian workers (as of 2010), it is a country that has collapsed, splintered, and been in perpetual conflict since the 1990s (Linke & Raleigh, 2011; Stoddard & Harmer, 2010). Currently there is an ongoing conflict between Al Shabaab, the largest and most powerful rebel group in Somalia, and Somalia's Transitional Federal Government and its international supporters (Leeson, 2007; Parke, 2010). Its geo-strategic location on the Horn of Africa and bordering both the Indian Ocean, and the Gulf of Aden, and an important shipping route from Europe and Africa to the Middle East keeps Somalia in the global spotlight (Klarevas, 2000; Linke & Raleigh, 2011). As such, individual countries, the UN, and development and humanitarian NGOs have all attempted to intervene in order to stabilize the country and offer aid to the famine and conflict plagued population. Consequently, the discourse of securitization has occurred in past interventions in Somalia and can arguably be applied in contemporary times, given the nature of the threats facing the Somali people as well as the insecure and violent environment in which humanitarian and development actors encounter once inside.

Operation Restore Hope: The Securitization of Somalia

The international community recognized early on in the conflict in Somalia that special measures would be necessary in order to contain and resolve the crisis in Somalia. In the early 1990s, the

United Nations had established a series of peacekeeping/making missions in Somalia known as UNISOM and UNITAF (Linke & Raleigh, 2011). In the United States, President George Bush effectively convinced the American public that a humanitarian intervention was necessary in order to address the famine in Somalia and to save countless human lives (Klarevas, 2000; Rothchild, 2009). The famine was driven in part due to the warring factions who tried to control Mogadishu after the state collapse (Linke & Raleigh, 2011). In December of 1992 the United States deployed 25,000 ground troops with the goal of providing "a stable and safe environment for the delivery of relief supplies and to begin the process of national reconciliation" (Rothchild, 2009, p. 256). Despite the UN and US forces on the ground, militiamen successfully attacked UN inspection teams and US forces, leading to the death of 18 servicemen and subsequent withdrawal of US troops in October, 1993 (Link & Raleigh, 2011).

The intervention in Somalia was the first time for three developments: the UN passed a resolution that allowed for the use of force if provoked for humanitarian reasons; the press played a significant role in advertising the perils of state collapse in Somalia and garnering public support for the intervention, known as the CNN effect; and the American public was actively polled throughout the intervention (Klarevas, 2000; Leeson, 2007; Linke & Raleigh, 2011; Rothchild, 2009). Operation Restore Hope had all of the characteristics of the classic definition of securitization. The US Government and specifically President Bush (senior) played the role of securitizing actor, successfully securitizing the issue of the state collapse and subsequent human suffering in Somalia, elevating the state to the status of referent object. The United Nations and the media both served as functional actors, influencing and to some extent enabling the US actions. The audience was the US public, which initially and overwhelmingly supported the operation in Somalia and believed the operation was worth the costs, financial and in terms of American lives (Klarevas, 2000).Extraordinary action manifested in two ways: the UN authorization of force in instances of provocation and the very fact that a significant number of US troops were sent to a country in Africa in a high profile engagement (Rothchild, 2009). However, the American public quickly withdrew support after media reports of Somali civilians maiming the body of a U.S. marine (Klarevas, 2000). Thus the lesson was that in the early 1990s, securitization of the state collapse and subsequent human suffering was not enough to convince the American public to maintain support of the mission in light of the loss of American lives, a cost the public initially thought would be low (Klarevas, 2000).

Contemporary Issues in Somalia: New Prospects for Securitization

Since Operation Restore Hope, Somalia has continued to hold a place in the international spotlight. The United Nations Development Programme (2012) report on Somalia covered the current crisis facing the Somali people: in 2011, Somalia faced drought and famine, which was exacerbated by the ongoing protracted conflict and the number of displaced persons. Out of a total population just above 9 million, there are 1.5 million internally displaced people, 770,000 refugees, 750,000 people at risk of starvation, and 4 million in crisis (UNData, 2012; UNDP, 2012). These conditions have led to significant numbers of Somalis seeking refuge in the neighboring countries of Kenya and Ethiopia (UNDP, 2012). Additionally, the US, out of concern that aid was falling in the hands of Al Shabaab temporarily suspended aid in 2009 and only reinstated in with the assurance that humanitarian organizations would pull out of the areas—often the most in need— that were controlled by Al Shabaab (Parke, 2010).

Although humanitarian and development organizations who receive aid from the US have restrictions placed on where they can operate, in general, Somalia continues to face a myriad of crises and lacks the infrastructure to address the needs of its people (Parke, 2010). That being the case, many organizations have offered development and humanitarian support to Somali people.

The Somalia NGO Consortium (2012) lists 27 projects by local and international NGOs in Somalia. Those organizations that are present in Somalia face an increasingly difficult environment. In order to help NGOs deal with the increasing difficult conditions in Somalia, the Somalia NGO Consortium set up the NGO Safety program, which provides support to NGOs operating in Somalia (Somalia NGO Consortium, 2012). This support includes advisories and other reports, crisis and medical evacuation support, and training programs for NGOs working in hostile environments. The AWSD (2011) called attention to the fact that south central Somalia was one of the three most dangerous places for humanitarians in 2010 and that as a result, aid has significantly diminished. This has led to an 85% drop in attacks against humanitarian workers between 2008 and 2010, but, again, the AWSD report indicated that was correlated with the reduction in people, not a decrease in violence. Stoddard, Harmer, and DiDomenico (2008) specifically examined humanitarian worker security in Somalia because there is a known threat to aid operations there. Parke (2010) addressed the development approach, arguing that the security situation which prevents civil society and democracy from taking shape makes a

bottom-up approach impossible. Furthermore, humanitarian agencies are left trying to balance alleviating human suffering by delivering aid and the safety of their staff (Parke, 2010).

In terms of staff protection, some humanitarian and development organizations have resorted to using armed PSCs. As of 2008, in Somalia, humanitarian organizations used a higher than average number of armed PSCs, but used less PSCs in other forms overall (Stoddard et al., 2008). Vaux, Seiple, Nakano, and Van Brabant (2002) remarked that Somalia was the first place that NGOs (specifically American) began using PSCs in order to continue operations within the country. This means that there is some recognition that Somalia is a special case. Furthermore, humanitarians agree that acceptance is not viable in some parts of Somalia (Stoddard et al., 2008). Stoddard and Harmer (2010) observed that within insecure environments such as Somalia, humanitarian organizations are increasingly resorting to more extreme security measures or began to remotely operate by relying on local partners and creating headquarters from a distance. Perrin (2009) noted that because of the lack of centralized government in Somalia, the International Community of the Red Cross (ICRC) had to find other ways to ensure the security of its staff. The ICRC broke from its usual practice of operating under the goodwill and consent of the local military and all sides of the conflict, and instead hired local PSCs. The ICRC justified this breach from their normal operating procedures, as well as the removal of all logos from supply vehicles, because in Somalia, they were targeted. Medecins Sans Frontiers (MSF) has also hired PSCs to protect convoys in Somalia (Perrin, 2009). The UN has also partnered with PSCs in various capacities in Somalia (Stoddard et al., 2008; Vaux, Seiple, Nakano, & Van Brabant, 2002).

Due to the dangerous nature of the situation in Somalia, humanitarian and development agencies need to reframe their approach to one that utilizes their position as securitizing agents as a way of drawing attention to the risks the humanitarian and development actors face when in Somalia. Rather than sticking with classical securitization as happened in the early 1990s, humanitarian and development workers can use Floyd's (2011) model of securitization to reconcile the morally questionable conundrum of including PSCs in humanitarian and development operations. The use of PSCs would then become an issue of measuring the capabilities and means of the threat (militia groups threatening the delivery of life saving aid to the Somali population) and designing a response (Linke & Raleigh, 2009). Perhaps one armed guard can deter several would-be aggressors or a well defined risk assessment and response plan would be enough to protect humanitarian and development workers on the ground.

Units of a Security Analysis in Somalia

Referent Object	Securitizing Actor	Functional Actors
1.5 million people internally displaced people, 770,000 refugees, 750,000 people at risk of starvation, and 4 million in crisis.	NGOs, such as CARE, currently operating in and around Somalia and the UNDP, and WFP.	Use of PSCs in development and humanitarian activities required by law in Somaliland, highly recommended throughout Somalia.

Once the role of PSCs is clarified, humanitarians and development actors can then begin to identify their target audience. In this case it should include other members of their community as well as the UN, individual states, and PSCs. In this way those humanitarian and development actors can lay the groundwork for when and where PSCs may be necessary, as is the case in Somalia. Returning to Floyd (2011), the humanitarian and development organizations must demonstrate a sincere desire to relieve the suffering of the Somali population, over half of which is in some form of crisis.

The security response must also be proportional to the threat; humanitarian and development organizations should not over-militarize their operations (such as using armed guards when they are not necessary), but they also need to budget appropriately according to the security risks their field workers face. According to Stoddard, Harmer, and DiDomencio (2008), on average, humanitarians spent less than 2% of their total budget on security in Somalia as directed by the donors, though there is some room for flexibility in the budget for individual projects if the organization is partnered with the UNDP. Nevertheless, in general, rather than trying to fit all security needs into a specific budget, aid organizations need to budget for their security needs. Thus the threat-urgency rhetoric may be best geared toward the donors, who should be more integrated in the decisions pertaining to when, how organizations should hire PSCs and which PSC is actually hired (Perrin, 2009). If humanitarian and development workers cannot fund the most appropriate security measures in Somalia, millions of people would be denied life-saving relief, a dire consequence of inaction indeed.

V. Concluding Remarks

This shifting security environment in which humanitarians and development workers operate has been both positive and negative: In some cases, violence targeting humanitarians is decreasing; however, in others, such as Somalia, violent attacks are on the rise, forcing humanitarian and development agencies to choose between a more aggressive security approach (which accounts for the higher than average use of armed PSCs) or pull out all together. Though PSCs are currently used in the field to provide security to humanitarian and development workers, there is a lack of acknowledgment concerning the present and potential use of PSCs by the organizations who hire them. This silence is partially explained by the relatively recent development of the ICoC, which has not made its way into scholarly literature concerning PSCs in the humanitarian and development realms, as well as the generally accepted idea that bringing in PSCs will compromise humanitarian values. At the same time, PSCs are already in use in the humanitarian and development realms and therefore rather than maintaining silence concerning their presence, humanitarians and development actors should use an extended version of securitization to frame the risks they face in the field. Further, by questioning the morality of action versus inaction and the use of PSCs, based on Floyd's (2011) moral securitization, any potential involvement of PSCs in humanitarian and development endeavors can be more explicitly defined.

References

Afghan NGO Safety Office. (2011). Country Reports. Retrieved from http://www.ngosafety.org /reports.html

Aid Worker Security Database. (2011). Aid worker security report: Spotlight on security for national aid workers: Issues and perspectives. Retrieved from https://aidworkersecurity.org/

Blackburn, J., Chambers, R., & Gaventa, J. (2002). Mainstreaming participation in development. In N. Hanna & R. Picciotto (eds.), *Making Development Work: Development Learning in a World of Poverty and Wealth* (pp. 61-82). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Bollettino, V. (2008). Understanding the security management practices of humanitarian organizations. *Disasters*, *32*(2), 263-279.

Dhingra, A., & Singhvi, N. (2011). Armed conflicts & impact on human security. *Mustang Journal Of Business & Ethics*, 143-150.

Egeland, J., Harmer, A. & Stoddard, A. (2011). *To stay and deliver: Good practice for humanitarians in complex security environments*. Retrieved from http://www.dgvn.de/fileadmin/user_upload/menschl_entw/FKP/Stay_and_Deliver_Feb_17_1_.pdf

Floyd, R. (2011). Can securitization theory be used in normative analysis? Towards a just securitization theory. *Security Dialogue*, *42*(4/5), 427-439.

Franke, V., and von Boemcken M. (2011). *Attitudes, values and professional self-conceptions of private security contractors in Iraq. An exploratory study*. Retrieved from www.bundesstiftung-friedensforschung.de/pdf.../berichtfranke.pdf

International Code of Conduct for Private Security Service Providers. (2012). *About the ICoC*. Retrieved from http://www.icoc-psp.org/About_ICoC.html

International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty. (2001). *The responsibility to protect: Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty*. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre. Retrieved from http://responsibilitytoprotect.org/ICISS%20Report.pdf

Kinsey, C. P., Hansen, S. J., & Franklin, G. (2009). The impact of private security companies on Somalia's governance networks. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, *22*(1), 147-161.

Klarevas, L. J. (2000). The United States peace operation in Somalia. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *64*(4), 523-540.

Kees, A. (2011). Regulation of private military companies. *Goettingen Journal Of International Law*, *3*(2), 199-216.

Leeson, P. T. (2007). Better off stateless: Somalia before and after government collapse. *Journal of Comparative Economics*, *35*(4), 689-710.

Linke, A., & Raleigh, C. (2011). State and stateless violence in Somalia. *African Geographical Review*, *30*(1), 47-66.

Lorenzo-Dus, N., & Marsh, S. (2012). Bridging the gap: Interdisciplinary insights into the securitization of poverty. *Discourse & Society 23*(3), 274 –296.

Oman, N. (2010). Hannah Arendt's "right to have rights": A philosophical context for human security. *Journal Of Human Rights*, *9*(3), 279-302.

Parke, N. (2010). Aid to Somalia: The best and only option. *Journal of International Peace* Percy, S. (2009). Private security companies and civil wars. *Civil Wars*, *11*(1), 57-74.

Perrin, B. (2009). *Humanitarian assistance and the private security debate: Implications for international humanitarian law*. Retrieved from http://www.isisc.org/portal/images/stories/PDF/Paper%20Perrin.pdf

Ralby, I. M. (2011). Maritime security and the ICoC. *Journal Of International Peace Operations*, *7*(3), 14-16.

Renouf, J. (2007). *Do private security companies have a role in ensuring the security of local populations and aid workers?* Retrieved from www.securitymanagementinitiative.org/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_details&gid=47&lang=eng&itemid=28ed

Rosemann, N. (2011). An initiative for the 21st century?. *Journal Of International Peace Operations*, *6*(4), 13-14.

Rothchild, D. (2009). The U.S. role in promoting peaceful African relations. In J. Harbeson & D. Rothchild (Eds.) *Africa in world politics: Reforming political order* (pp. 241-275). Philadelphia, PA: Westview Press.

Somalia NGO Consortium. (2012). *Resources*. Retrieved from http://www.somaliangoconsortium.org/resources/

Spearin, C. (2007). *Humanitarian non-governmental organizations and international private security companies: The "humanitarian" challenges of moulding a marketplace.* Geneva. The Geneva Center for Democratic Control of Armed Forces. Retrieved from http://www.securitytransformation.org/images/documentos/382_FileContent.pdf

Spearin, C. (2008). Private, armed and humanitarian? States, NGOs, international private security companies and shifting humanitarianism. *Security Studies 39*(4): 363–382.

Stoddard, A. & Harmer, A. (2010). *Supporting security for humanitarian action: A review of critical issues for the humanitarian community*. Commissioned by the Montreux X conference conveners. Retrieved from http://www.humanitarianoutcomes.org/resources/SupportingSecurityforHumanitarianActionMarch20101.pdf

Stoddard, A., Harmer, A., & DiDomenico, V. (2009). *Providing aid in insecure environments: 2009 update: Trends in violence against aid workers and the operational response* (HPG report 34). London, UK. Overseas Development Institute. Retrieved from http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/details.asp?id=3250&title=violence-aid-workers-operational-response-2009

Stoddard, A., Harmer, A., & DiDomenico, V. (2008). *The use of private security providers and services in humanitarian operations* (HPG report 27). London, UK. Overseas Development Institute. Retrieved from http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/docs/3703.pdf

Stoddard, A., Harmer, A., & Haver, K. (2006). *Providing aid in insecure environments* (HPG report 23). London, UK. Overseas Development Institute. Retrieved from www.odi.org.uk/resources/docs/269.pdf

United Nations Data. (2012). Somalia. Retrieved from http://data.un.org/CountryProfile.aspx?crName=Somalia

United Nations Development Programme. (2012). *Somalia annual report 2011*. Retrieved from http://www.so.undp.org/docs/UNDP_Som_Annual_report_2011_new.pdf

Vaux, T., Seiple, C., Nakano, G., & Van Brabant, K. (2002). Humanitarian action and private security companies: Opening the debate. Retrieved from http://patronusanalytical.com/ page11/page12/assets/HUMANACT.pdf

Volpe, M, (2008, March). *Private security and USAID: Changing development realities in unstable environments*. In The Cornwallis Group XIII: Analysis of Societal Conflict and Counter Insurgency. Workshop conducted The Pearson Peacekeeping Centre Cornwallis Park, Nova Scotia, Canada. Retrieved from http://www.thecornwallisgroup.org/ workshop_2008.php

Watson, S. (2011). The 'human' as referent object? Humanitarianism as securitization. *Security Dialogue*, *42*(1), 3-20.