

More Ambition, Less Commitment?

Stabilisation and Peacebuilding Efforts Since the 1990s

Dr Jonathan Fisher and Dr Nicolas Lemay-Hébert
University of Birmingham



**EDA
WORKING
PAPER**

October 2018



The Emirates Diplomatic Academy (EDA) is an autonomous federal entity of the United Arab Emirates (UAE) delivering high-impact diplomatic training, and disseminating research and thought leadership that furthers the understanding of diplomacy and international relations.

The EDA Working Papers are reviewed by at least two experts in the field to ensure high quality of the publication series. The views expressed in EDA Working Papers are solely those of their authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the EDA or the UAE Government.

This publication may be reproduced in whole or in part for educational or non-profit purposes without alteration and prior written permission, provided acknowledgment of the source is made. No other use is permitted without the express prior written permission of the EDA.

Emirates Diplomatic Academy
Hamdan Bin Mohammed Street
Al Hosn Palace District
P.O. Box 35567
Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates
<http://eda.ac.ae/>

research@eda.ac.ae

© Copyright 2018 Emirates Diplomatic Academy.
All rights reserved.



Dr Jonathan Fisher

Reader in the International Development Department, University of Birmingham (UK).

His work focuses on: (1) exploring the place of African states in the international system and the role and agency of these states in managing their relationships with, especially, Western donors and institutions; and (2) the production of knowledge on African states and societies, particularly in relation to conflict and security. He is particularly interested in Eastern Africa and is the PI on an ESRC Seminar Series on 'From Data to Knowledge: Understanding Peace and Conflict from Afar' (ES/N008367/1) and an AHRC project on 'Witchcraft and Conflict: Exploring Alternative Discourses of Insecurity'. He is the co-editor of *Civil Wars*.



Dr Nicolas Lemay-Hébert

Senior Lecturer in the International Development Department, University of Birmingham (UK).

He was previously Director of the Center for Peace Missions and Humanitarian Studies, Raoul Dandurand Chair, University of Quebec at Montreal in 2009-2011 and invited professor of Economics at the University of Quebec in Montreal in 2010-2011. He is the co-editor of the *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding* and the *Routledge Series in Intervention and Statebuilding*. His research interests include statebuilding and peacebuilding, the political economy of interventions and local narratives of resistance to interventions.

CONTENTS

Executive Summary	2
Introduction	4
1. Stabilisation and the Growing Importance of the 'Social' in Peacebuilding	6
2. Uganda and Stabilisation as Economic Transformation (1987-c.2001)	10
3. Haiti and Institutional Stabilisation: The Political Nature of a 'Safe and Stable Environment' (2004-2017)	12
4. Cut-and-Run Stabilisation in South Sudan (c.2005-2017)	15
5. Conclusions and Implications for the MENA Region	18
References	20

More Ambition, Less Commitment?

Stabilisation and Peacebuilding Efforts Since the 1990s

Executive Summary

- Stabilisation has increasingly become the central guiding rationale behind international interventions in situations of conflict and peacebuilding. It has also become a core policy discourse used to articulate and describe both the content and ambitions of such interventions.
- The purpose of this EDA Working Paper is to explore what has been the nature of stabilisation missions since the end of the Cold War. It compares three case studies (Uganda in the 1990s, Haiti in the 2000s and South Sudan since the mid-2000s) that have been on the recipient end of stabilisation practices.
- Throughout these years, stabilisation interventions have been based in a transformative agenda - which has moved from pursuing economic and structural reform to more fundamental socio-political transformation. In supporting ambitious 'end states', however, stabilisation operations have become increasingly contradictory vis-à-vis international actors' level of commitment. Indeed, international actors appear to have lost confidence in their ability to influence events on the ground. They have also become more reluctant to accept responsibility for perceived failures of transformative international stabilisation efforts.
- As such, if definitions of stabilisation often include a focus on (re)building representative and legitimate political systems, on human rights and rule of law, as well as on social and economic development, new practices have enabled actors to focus on more narrow objectives and to identify clear exit strategies enabling 'cut and run' policies when needed.
- One ramification of this general trend towards 'cut-and-run' international interventions is the opening up of space for regional actors to impose their own vision of stabilisation to neighbouring states. In the MENA region, this arguably places a burden upon – or offers an opportunity to – regional states to engage more fully and directly in stabilisation theatres.
- This is also evidenced in the growing international support provided to regional-led stabilisation initiatives. On the African continent, for instance, international stabilisation efforts are now largely focused around hybridised UN-regional organisation missions or support for purely regional missions.
- In the end, whether they aim at building a sustainable economy, a safe and secure environment, or stable governance, contemporary stabilisation missions remain inherently political and, as such, continue to play an integral part in the contested statebuilding processes of post-conflict states.

Introduction

'Stabilisation' has increasingly become the central guiding rationale behind international interventions in situations of conflict and peacebuilding. It has also become a core policy discourse used to articulate and describe both the content and ambitions of such interventions. Though this language of stabilisation has become most prominently associated with formal UN stabilisation missions launched since the late 1990s, its essence can be traced back further – to NATO's operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina or, as argued in this paper, to multi-donor 'post-conflict reconstruction' efforts promoted in the immediate aftermath of the fall of the Berlin Wall. What stabilisation actually constitutes – in theory and in practice – has been under-examined in existing scholarly literature. The purpose of this paper, in part, is to explore what exactly has been the nature of stabilisation missions – broadly defined – since the end of the Cold War; what are stabilisation efforts aiming to stabilise, and with what implications?

To do so, we compare and contrast three case studies at different points in time: Uganda in the 1990s, Haiti since the early 2000s and South Sudan since the mid-2000s. We argue that throughout this period, stabilisation interventions have been motivated by a much broader ambition than simply stabilising a precarious political order – they have instead been based in a much more transformative agenda which has moved from pursuing economic and structural reform to more fundamental socio-political transformation. This agenda has occurred in tandem with, and has been co-constituted by, broader international trends since 9/11 and is focused on reshaping Southern societies as a mechanism to 'contain' perceived threats to Northern states (Duffield 2001, 2007). In moving towards a more ambitious 'end state' of stabilisation, however, stabilisation operations have become increasingly contradictory vis-à-vis international actors' level of commitment. This study argues that the more transformative stabilisation as an agenda has become, the less prepared international actors have been to see it through to its conclusions, particularly when encountering challenges. We find that international actors sought to embed themselves in earlier stabilisation missions – at times blurring the lines considerably between the domestic and the external – but have increasingly withdrawn, in practice, in recent years. We underline the growing emergence of 'cut-and-run' stabilisation missions, using the case of South Sudan since the later 2000s. The latter has been a consequence, we suggest, of international actors' loss of confidence in their ability to influence events on the ground, as well as their increasing reluctance to accept responsibility for perceived failures of transformative international stabilisation efforts.

One ramification of this general trend towards 'cut-and-run' stabilisation interventions by Western powers is the opening up of space for regional actors to impose their own vision of stabilisation to neighbouring states. In the MENA region, for instance, US President Trump has recently announced on the 17th of August of 2018 the end of 'funding for Syria stabilisation projects as it moves to extricate the US from the conflict' (The Time 2018), which includes \$200 million that had been planned for Syria programmes. The US 'withdrawal' from Syria is in practice offset by an additional \$300 million pledged by coalition partners, including \$100 million by Saudi Arabia (AP News 2018). This is in line with President Trump's position to ask partners, especially Saudi

Arabia, Egypt, Qatar and the U.A.E. 'to take greater responsibility for securing their home region' (Gordon 2018). It also comes against the backdrop of a series of regional initiatives aimed at advancing stability in the MENA region, including the formation of an 'Islamic military alliance' to fight global terrorism, the Saudi-led intervention in Yemen since 2015, and the active contribution made by some Arab Gulf States to stabilisation efforts in Iraq and Syria through the Global Coalition Against Daesh.

1. Stabilisation and the Growing Importance of the ‘Social’ in Peacebuilding

To understand the nature of stabilisation operations today, it is critical to consider the evolution of the concept, in theory and in practice. It has been suggested by some scholars that stabilisation as a concept entered the realm of peace and conflict with the establishment in January 1996 of the NATO Stabilisation Force for Bosnia and Herzegovina (Mac Ginty 2012, 23; Karlsrud 2015, 42), and that similar ambitions and practices later migrated to UN operations, for instance in Haiti in 2004. The essence of stabilisation – as an internationally-promoted enterprise to restore and maintain order in conflict-affected and post-conflict contexts – can arguably, however, be traced back to the late 1980s/early 1990s, when a range of ambitious international donor coalitions sought to embed themselves in, and direct, post-conflict reconstruction processes in a range of African states including Uganda (from 1987), Angola (from 1991), Mozambique (from 1992) and Rwanda (from 1994).

Stabilisation’s contemporary focus and agenda evolved, however, in particular from the shared experience of France, the UK and the US in Afghanistan and in Iraq in the 2000s, with the doctrines and policies around stabilisation missions developed by these countries in these contexts later permeating the work of the UN in operations in Mali (MINUSMA), Central African Republic (MINUSCA) and elsewhere (de Coning 2016).¹ This stabilisation agenda is in turn linked to the rise of the ‘social’ in counterinsurgency doctrines (see: Wiuff Moe and Muller 2017). The most well-known example of this is the human terrain system (HTS) programme of hiring anthropologists to serve with American military units as a mechanism to improve the image and effectiveness of intervenors (Rohde 2007; Gonzalez 2017).

There is no single definition of stabilisation in the field; some actors, including the UN, have even elected to cultivate ambiguity around the concept by avoiding any clear definition (de Coning 2016). Some, such as the US, define stabilisation through end-states: ‘a safe and secure environment, the rule of law, stable governance, a sustainable economy, and social well-being’ (USIP and USAPSOI 2009, I-5). The United States Institute of Peace and the US Army Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute’s focus on ‘end states’ (see Figure 1 below) enables us to identify clear objectives for each end-state, as well as cross-cutting principles. At the same time, this definition is not too distant from the UK Stabilisation Unit’s definition, where the long-term goal of stabilisation is ‘structural stability’, defined as ‘political systems which are representative and legitimate, capable of managing conflict and change peacefully, and societies in which human rights and rule of law are respected, basic needs are met, security established and opportunities for social and economic development are open to all’ (UK Stabilisation Unit 2014, 1). If these definitions sound as transformative as former definitions of state-building and nation-building, in reality the concept that was buttressing the whole transformative agenda – the concept of failed or fragile states (see Grimm et al. 2014) – has undergone a crucial normative evolution in the past years, shifting meanings and political implications as a result.

¹ These countries are pen-holders on almost all of the resolutions related to UN peacekeeping missions.

Figure 1: Strategic Framework for Stabilisation and Reconstruction (USIP 2009)



Source: United States Institute of Peace and United States Army Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute 2009, 2-8.

Indeed, one of the central themes in the US and UK approaches, as well as in other similar national approaches (including Canada, Germany and the Netherlands) is that stabilisation interventions are designed to bring support to the ability of a 'failed or failing state' to deliver key services (Curran and Holtom 2015, 3; Rotmann 2016). This connection between stabilisation and the state fragility lens in return emphasises a wider change in the landscape of intervention and peacebuilding. The global discourse on state fragility is now moving away from identifying 'fragile states' to focusing on 'situations of fragility' (UNDP et al. 2016, 2; see also: Lemay-Hébert 2019). This is echoed by the OECD, who notes that 'there is an increasing awareness that a binary list [of strong and fragile states] does not do justice to the multi-faceted nature of fragility' (OECD 2016), with the organisation committed to moving towards a universal framework of fragility, phasing out its 'fragile states' list by 2017, dropping the 'fragile states' label (as used in its *Fragile States Reports* from 2005 until 2014) whilst including a multi-dimensional framework around 'states of fragility' (*States of Fragility Reports* since 2014).

Despite this new focus on local complexity, and the importance of 'start [ing] from the context', security remains a key component of most definitions of state fragility (or states of fragility to use the new jargon), which makes the connection with stabilisation all the more obvious. As DFID points out, 'fragility and conflict are mutually reinforcing: states can be pushed into fragility through the eruption of localised or regional

conflicts; and fragility can drive conflict' (ICAI 2015, 1). Similarly, the World Bank notes – conflating fragility with conflict in the same process – that 'almost half of the world's poor is expected to live in countries affected by fragility, conflict and violence (FCV) by 2030.'² In this context, stabilisation is understood as 'defusing crises' and linking this capacity with resilience to political shocks (Rotmann 2016, 5). For Helen Clark, former Administrator of the UNDP, 'building resilience is now central to the way in which the UN is responding to fragility.'³

Hence, the newfound interest in stabilisation mirrors the global shift in the intervention landscape in practice from ambitious undertakings at transforming societies in the 1990s and early 2000s towards narrower, tangible goals, linked to local and international perceptions of what constitutes 'stability' in this context. This has been partly driven by a renewed focus on traditional, non-state leaders who have been identified as crucial actors in 'restoring some semblance of normalcy and security' in Darfur (Tubiana, Tanner, and Abdul-Jalil 2012, 102), in Somalia (Jeng 2012, 272), in Sierra Leone (Martin 2016) or in Iraq through the Anbar Awakening (Andersen 2017). But more importantly, it represents a change of paradigm, with a reduction of expectations vis-à-vis conflict-affected societies as well as a realisation of the limits of liberal interventionism, which serve as a convenient tactical withdrawal from international responsibilities towards targeted societies (Lemay-Hébert and Visoka 2017).

This recent change of paradigm has taken place after a decade of evolution toward more 'integrated', 'multi-faceted', or simply stated more intrusive peace operations, with the high point being the United Nations administrations of Kosovo (1998–2008) and Timor-Leste (1999–2002) at the beginning of this century, but also the international administration of Iraq (2003–2004). Since then, the intervention literature has started to take heed of the 'unintended consequences' agenda (Aoi, de Coning and Thakur 2007) to integrate in its analysis all facets of interventions and not only those accounted for traditionally by peacebuilding actors themselves. Debates around sovereignty and rules of engagement, which were so central in the first half of the 1990s (Thakur and Thaker 1995), gave way to discussions on authority and international administrations at the end of the 1990s (Lemay-Hébert 2011). However, the difficult experiences in Iraq, Timor-Leste and Kosovo led in turn to new discussions on the means of intervention, and to a renewed interest in the concept of local ownership (Lemay-Hébert and Kappler 2016).

It is in this context that the stabilisation agenda should be located. We agree that debates about stabilisation have been unclear mainly due to the fact that they have been 'devoid of the lived experience of the populations subjected to conflict and intervention' (Dennys 2013, 1). We will bring insights from three case studies, each shedding light on a single 'end-state' of stabilisation as discussed before (see Figure 1 above), and demonstrating the increasingly contradictory trajectory of stabilisation initiatives. We will look at Uganda through the end-state of a 'sustainable economy', Haiti through the end-state of a 'safe and secure environment', and finally South Sudan through the end-state of 'stable governance'. The aim of bringing in three case studies is to highlight the interconnectedness of the different end-states of stabilisation (economic,

² See: <http://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/fragilityconflictviolence/overview>

³ See: <http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/presscenter/speeches/2016/06/03/helen-clark-statement-on-working-in-fragile-contexts-including-in-middle-income-countries-at-the-2016-joint-meeting-of-the-executive-boards-of-undp-unfpa-unops-unicef-un-women-wfp.html>.

security and political), focusing on the role of the international actors in these three cases, but also to show the evolution of transformative statebuilding agenda in three specific time periods (Uganda in the 1990s, Haiti in the 2000s, and South Sudan since the mid-2000s). Our argument is that if we are witnessing new attention to transformative statebuilding through the lens of stabilisation, this does not necessarily take place through more ambitious engagement from international actors, even if there remains a discursive commitment to transformative statebuilding objectives. Even if certain peacekeeping missions labelled as stabilisation operations are more 'robust' in their rules of engagement for instance, they are still representative of the more general trend towards 'good enough peacebuilding' and 'cut-and-run statebuilding' – a shifting of responsibility for transformation, *de facto*, from the international to the domestic while still maintaining a discursive claim over the process.

This approach is further evidenced in the growing international support provided to regional-led stabilisation initiatives – a move which has important implications for the MENA region, as the conclusion notes. Indeed, on the African continent international stabilisation efforts are now largely focused around hybridised UN-regional organisation missions (such as the AU/UN Hybrid Operation in Darfur since 2007) or support for purely regional missions (Williams and Boutellis 2014). The African Union (AU) Mission in Somalia (AMISOM) since 2007 has been particularly paradigmatic and influential in this regard. For while previous efforts by international actors to stabilise conflict-affected south/central Somalia have focused on direct engagement – through UN interventions (1992–1995) or more *ad hoc* military efforts (2006) – AMISOM has represented a more indirect initiative. The mission has been promoted, funded, supported and, to some extent, directed by major international actors (notably the US, EU and UK) but led by regional states – initially Uganda and Burundi (2007–) and subsequently Djibouti (2011–), Kenya (2012–), Sierra Leone (2013–) and Ethiopia (2014–), who take on both the burden of operating the mission and the responsibility for its success or failure (Lotze and Williams 2016). Though troop-contributing states have played a pivotal role in initiating and shaping AMISOM (Fisher and Anderson 2015), their ability to do so has relied on the leveraging of international actors' desire to transform Somalia's polity and society without committing troops themselves. As then US president Barack Obama noted in a 2015 trip to Ethiopia: '...the work we're doing in Somalia is a model...a model in which we are partnering with other countries and they are providing outstanding troops on the ground...so that we're doing things that we can do uniquely but does not require us putting troops on the ground, that's the model that we're talking about' (Obama 2015).⁴ The remainder of this paper will use the three case studies introduced above to explore and develop this set of arguments around the trajectory of stabilisation and the *de facto* move from embedded stabilisation to 'cut-and-run' stabilisation since the 1990s.

⁴ This is not to say, however, that the US and other AMISOM funders do not seek to fundamentally transform the Somali state through this indirect mechanism; it doesn't imply the end of any intervention, but rather a reconfiguration of how interventions are negotiated. Interventions aimed at the reconstitution of political authority and recalibration of social order in Somalia are now proposed, negotiated and decided upon by troop-contributing countries and their patrons in donor funding conferences held in Northern capitals, notably the London Somalia Conferences of 2013 and 2017. Similar arguments can be made for a range of African-led stabilisation missions since 2010 including the 2013 African-led International Support Mission to the Central African Republic.

2. Uganda and Stabilisation as Economic Transformation (1987–c.2001)

An early version of embedded stabilisation often overlooked in the stabilisation literature is the international intervention in Uganda that occurred between 1987 and the early 2000s. Though framed – using the policy language of the time – as ‘post-conflict reconstruction’, international intervention in post-conflict Uganda during the 1990s represented an early and significant contribution to what would later come to be conceptualised as international stabilisation. The intervention did not take the form of a traditional UN mission but instead involved arguably a much more direct and entrenched level of international involvement and buy-in to the statebuilding and state reconstruction process. This involved, as noted below, Western donor officials being placed in key ministries and co-designing economic policies, sitting in Cabinet meetings and becoming so intrinsic to the policy-making enterprise that scholars such as Graham Harrison have argued that it became difficult to tell where the Ugandan state ended and the donor community begun (Harrison 2001).

Driven by a consortia of international donors (notably the World Bank, US, UK and UN agencies), these efforts aimed at not only restoring stability but also establishing and building an order which could help sustain stability and lead to longer-term peace and security to a country which had experienced several coups, rule by military government, foreign invasion and civil war in its first two decades of independence. Where similar early stabilisation operations elsewhere on the continent would focus on multi-party democracy and elections as a mechanism to secure this goal, in Uganda the end-state envisaged by intervenors was a transformed economy. Stabilisation in 1990s Uganda meant the construction of a liberal market economy (Wiegratz 2016).

International interest in stabilising Uganda was piqued in 1986, shortly after guerrilla leader Yoweri Museveni and his National Resistance Army/Movement (NRA/M) seized power, following a lengthy insurgency against the second dictatorship of Milton Obote (1980–1985) and its military *junta* successor (1980–1985). Youthful, disciplined and energetic, Uganda’s new government would require support to rebuild a country and polity devastated and bankrupted by civil war and international actors believed that Museveni was someone that they could work with.⁵ Washington and London made clear, however, that while comprehensive and enthusiastic support for Uganda’s reconstruction would be made available – including in the form of military assistance to aid the new regime’s counter-insurgency operations in the north and northwest – this would be contingent upon Kampala agreeing to adopt a suite of policies aimed at fundamentally transforming the contours of the Ugandan economy. The reforms recommended – incorporated largely into a World Bank-backed Economic Recovery Programme (ERP) – focused on the shrinking of the Ugandan state and liberalisation of its economy as a means to foster sustainable economic growth (Dijkstra and van Donge 2001).

The Ugandan leader – who had deposed his predecessor on the basis of a radical socialist manifesto – initially resisted these overtures, establishing a planned economy (Ofcansky 1996, chapter 5). International actors nonetheless sought to use a combination of pressure and persuasion to secure a change of position. In ministerial exchanges in Kampala, London and Washington, senior US, UK and World Bank officials repeated

⁵ Interview with Herman Cohen, Special Assistant to the President and Senior Director for Africa, National Security Council (1987–1989); US Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs (1989–1993), Washington DC, 4 November 2009.

their *quid pro quo* offers of support but also spent several days in Uganda debating the pros and cons of such a move with the Ugandan leader.⁶ The US and World Bank envoys also tasked several senior economists with producing a regular stream of papers and briefings for Museveni's eyes only, delineating the wisdom of implementing the economic reforms they proposed.⁷ This, we argue, is an early indication of the mentality behind early embedded stabilisation approaches – seeking not only to guide and shape transformation but also to be a leading agent in that process.

This dispensation became even more pronounced in Uganda when continued economic decline compelled Museveni and the NRM to accept the donor bargain in 1987, whereupon international actors became an intrinsic part of Uganda's economic stabilisation process. The country's Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development gradually became a hybridised Ugandan-donor operation, as more and more economists and technocrats from the World Bank, UK Overseas Development Administration (Department for International Development from 1997) and US Agency for International Development (USAID) were seconded to work alongside Ugandan officials. This occurred with the enthusiastic agreement of the Ministry's senior civil servant, Emmanuel Tumusiime-Mutebile, who had been persuaded of the merits of pursuing the proposed liberalisation plan. The extent to which international and Ugandan officials co-produced and co-delivered these reforms is attested to by one expatriate UK adviser, Allister Moon, who recalls being invited to sit in on Ugandan Cabinet meetings during the later 1990s (Mallaby 2004: 432-433).

The economic stabilisation pursued in Uganda – like many World Bank/International Monetary Fund structural adjustment packages implemented during the 1980s – involved the radical and fundamental transformation of the country's political economy. State assets and infrastructure were privatised and sold off, civil servants were retrenched, soldiers were demobilised, procurement processes were streamlined, foreign investment opportunities expanded and regulations rolled back (Dijkstra and van Donge 2001). By the early 2000s, Uganda's key Washington lobbyist – the Whitaker Group – was advertising the country to potential investors as 'one of the easiest [in the world] in which to launch a business' (Fisher 2011: 193). Scholars such as Jörg Wiegratz have increasingly argued that this neoliberal transformation of the Ugandan economy also led to a transformation of societal norms themselves. Economic restructuring, he contends, 'changed all sorts of things, including power structures, action options and rationales for various actors', fundamentally shifting Ugandan society's moral economy (Wiegratz 2016: 334-337).

The central point to make in relation to this paper's core concern, though, is the extent to which both the international and Ugandan sides of the relationship committed themselves to the objectives of the stabilisation package, particularly from 1992 onwards. Though the sincerity of Museveni's conversion to neoliberal ideals has rightly been questioned (Hickey 2013), it is clear that his government was fully prepared to implement neoliberal economic reforms across an extended period of time – rather than simply paying lip service to a donor agenda and failing to deliver (Mosley et al 1991). Indeed, as Alan Whitworth and Tim Williamson and others have demonstrated, Kampala took the initiative in this regard at a number of critical junctions – shaping the agenda (Whitworth and Williamson 2009).

⁶ Interview with Charles Cullimore, UK High Commissioner to Uganda (1989-1993), London, 8 October 2008.

⁷ Interview with Robert Houdek, US Ambassador to Uganda (1985-1989), Washington DC, 2 November 2009.

Moreover, from the later 1990s onwards it became increasingly clear to domestic and international observers that the economic reform agenda was being subverted. For the relaxing of regulations and liberalisation of procurement processes was being incorporated into patronage and regime maintenance structures as part of the regime's gradual construction of a fundamentally illiberal polity (Fisher and Anderson 2015; Tangri and Mwenda 2013). Rather than moving to censure the Ugandan government, however, international actors' immediate reaction was to dissemble. World Bank officials in the early 2000s, for example, claimed that engaging governments on issues of corruption was not in its remit – despite its actions elsewhere in Africa contradicting this narrative (Fisher 2011: 255-256).

Though donors took an increasingly critical line on this issue as the 2000s progressed – eventually suspending aid en masse on several occasions towards the end of the decade – their initial reluctance to do so highlights, we suggest, their reluctance – or inability – to distance themselves from the economic stabilisation end-state they had promoted alongside the Ugandan government over the previous decade. Embedded stabilisation, we argue, tied them to the success or failure of the Ugandan project they had invested so heavily in. Though the nature of the intervention had involved constant re-negotiation with actors in Uganda who had their own agency and agendas, international actors had positioned themselves clearly as the primary sponsors of the country's post-conflict reconstruction and stabilisation. They had done so not only discursively but also in practice. As Ellen Hauser (1999) has argued, international actors were loath to criticise a 'showcase' of their economic programmes which they themselves had played such a foundational role in building.

3. Haiti and Institutional Stabilisation: The Political Nature of a 'Safe and Stable Environment' (2004-2017)

The United Nations Stabilisation Mission in Haiti (MINUSTAH) was one of the first stabilisation missions to be labelled as such by the UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations. It is important to note that, not unlike the case of Uganda discussed above, MINUSTAH was an embedded stabilisation mission, with various end states of stabilisation interconnected together.⁸ However, the UN peace mission in Haiti was mostly known for its contribution to bringing about stability and safety to the country, after a period of internal turmoil. Hence, it is through the 'safe and secure environment' end state of stabilisation that the case of Haiti will be explored. As it will be argued here, through the institutional stabilisation agenda in Haiti, policy actors directly engaged with security institutions in Haiti have played a crucial role in the contested statebuilding process in Haiti. Institutional stabilisation is all but neutral or apolitical, and should be understood as part of broader statebuilding processes.

MINUSTAH was established in June 2004 to replace the Multinational Interim Force (MIF) that had been deployed to stabilise the country in February of that year.⁹ That same month, President Jean-Bertrand Aristide was forced to flee Haiti amid political turmoil and violence. The United Nations, the United States, Canada and the European Union were then instrumental in the formation of a government of technocrats, headed by Gérard Latortue, to lead the transition to the elections of 2006.¹⁰

⁸ One of these end states was – and still is – economic stabilisation. For instance, there are constant calls for a 'Marshall Plan' in Haiti. But while the actual Marshall Plan to reconstruct Europe after the second World War represented approximately 2 per cent of France's (then) GDP over three years, Haiti has received 8.2 per cent of its GDP in international aid between 1965 and 1995, de facto receiving more than four Marshall plans per year' (Lemay-Hébert 2014, 210).

⁹ For a discussion of forces involved and mandate, see: Lemay-Hébert 2015.

¹⁰ The mission finally ended in October 2017, setting the stage for a smaller UN mission – the United Nations Mission for Justice Support in Haiti or MINUJUSTH.

During the first years of MINUSTAH's deployment, security sector reform (SSR), although pivotal to the mission's initial mandate, was overshadowed by other elements of the stabilisation agenda, with MINUSTAH focusing on the restoration of the Haitian state's effective authority and the preparation for the 2006 elections (Lemay-Hébert 2014). After the 2010 earthquake, the mission's agenda concentrated on the security of displaced persons, support for national elections and the establishment of a government that could accelerate reconstruction. MINUSTAH has also promoted a rule of law compact with the Haitian authorities, the private sector and other international actors to integrate the stabilisation and economic development agendas. However, this initiative was dogged by political bickering between the executive and the parliament (ICG 2011, 3).

A major impediment to SSR has been the lack of effective coordination between different donor countries, which has been a recurring theme in Haiti. This led MINUSTAH's then Special Representative of the Secretary-General (SRSG), Edmond Mulet, to state that 'the Haiti National Police [HNP] is an example of the international community's failure to work in concert' (Coughlin 2011). Since 2004 police reform has followed a relatively narrow and technical agenda that emphasised training and vetting, an approach challenged by structural constraints and realities on the ground (Donais 2012, 101). As a consequence, despite many achievements, an overarching vision of SSR that would integrate state-building and SSR was absent within MINUSTAH. This set the UN on a course that reinforced the dynamics that had caused social tensions in the first place, notably by playing into the socio-political fault lines that have structured contemporary Haiti, as discussed below.

Hence, the stabilisation agenda in Haiti between 2004 and 2017 took the form of institutional stabilisation, focusing precisely on providing a 'safe and secure environment' (see Figure 1 above). Through the institutional stabilisation agenda, policy actors directly engaged with security institutions have traditionally played a crucial role in the contested statebuilding process in Haiti (Lemay-Hébert forthcoming). Paramilitary institutions were quite instrumental in the quest for power and protection: from the *tonton macoutes* under François Duvalier, to the *attachés* in the immediate post-Duvalier era or the pro-Aristide *Chimères* (or *chimè*) and renegade anti-Aristide military officers (regrouped under the Front for the Advancement and Progress of Haiti and the Revolutionary Front for the Liberation of Haiti). In this context, externally-led SSR policies in Haiti are fraught with risk, having to tread the fine line between strengthening security institutions in a *predatory statebuilding* context and trying to disarm paramilitary groups pursuing distinct political agendas (in a 'continuation of politics by other means' mindset). In such a context, an 'apolitical' security reform process has simply not been an option, despite the technocratic rhetoric of certain international actors.

In a heavily politicised context of social struggle between Haiti's impoverished majority and the wealthy few, accentuated by Aristide's controversial 'exile' and a transitional government perceived as siding with the economic and political elite (in fact, no Aristide supporter was included in the 'national coalition'), MINUSTAH's SSR approach to strengthening security institutions and to disarming rebels was doomed to be seen as highly partisan, and in continuity with past interventions and occupations. While MINUSTAH hesitantly challenged

the hegemonic presence of the disbanded Haitian army in a few localities, it used significantly more repressive means to curb the power of the *Chimères* ('chimeras') in Cité Soleil. In a context of increasing insecurity in Port-au-Prince¹¹, MINUSTAH and the HNP proceeded to 'clean' the 'difficult' urban areas of Cité Soleil and Bel Air. The joint MINUSTAH and Latortue government's approach was quite simply to equate all *Chimères* or 'armed gangs' with 'Lavalas *Chimères*', and then these *Chimères* with bandits (Dupuy 2007, 182). UN forays in these areas to fight 'bandits' led to 100 wounded in October 2005 and between 170 and 205 in December 2005. Half of these persons were women and children, and MINUSTAH's head of mission Edmond Mulet was subsequently criticised for referring to the victims as 'collateral damage' (Buncombe 2007). As Robert Muggah notes, the end result was that these muscular enforcement-led operations 'appeared in some cases both to disperse and simultaneously to radicalise youth and so-called gangs' (Muggah 2010, 7).

There is no denying that insecurity became a major social issue in Haiti after the departure of Aristide, that this hostility degenerated from political violence aimed at the interim government, the NHP and MINUSTAH into more random acts of violent crime and that MINUSTAH/NHP operations managed to bring a modicum of stability in these areas. However, to look at the *Chimères* phenomenon, and the post-2004 surge of violence solely through a security lens is limited at best. This is clearly one of the lessons learned from the stabilisation agenda deployed in Haiti. 'Security issues' are intertwined with political and economic claims, brilliantly summarised by Madison Smartt Bell in the case of the *Chimères*: 'before the term was coined, Haitian delinquent youths were called *malélevé* ('ill brought up') or still more tellingly, *sansmaman* ['the motherless ones'] (...). The *Chimè* [or *Chimères*] were indeed chimeras; ill fortune left them as unrealised shadows (...) These were the people Aristide had originally been out to salvage: *Tout moun sé moun* was his earliest motto' (quoted in Farmer 2011, 136). This is an opinion confirmed by an ethnographic study of the youth in Cité Soleil, whose main finding was that 'youth frame their experiences in terms of a broader social conflict between the 'included' and the 'excluded'' (Willman and Marcelin 2010, 515). In this context, MINUSTAH is accused of responding only to the symptoms of violence rather than the causes of the violence. As interviewees on the ground mentioned, all UN reports look at the district [Bel Air] strictly through the lens of violence.¹²

If MINUSTAH's securitisation strategy has been predominant in Haiti – by the number of troops involved and by its role in Haiti's security landscape – it is worth noting that it was not the only approach existing in Haiti. An example of an alternative approach to stabilisation in Haiti is the 'integrated security and development programme' in the Bel Air district by Viva Rio, a Brazilian NGO. The programme aims at engaging communities in an informal way and bringing 'gangs' into a dynamic process of negotiation and dialogue between themselves, and with the HNP and MINUSTAH. Another example is the Community Violence Reduction (CVR) program, established in 2008 as an attempt by MINUSTAH to do things differently, and which aims to create economic and social opportunities with a view to extracting former gang members from violence. As the CVR team leader puts it, 'we realised that the DDR strategy was ill-adapted to the context, that local dynamics were more complex. (...) If the other sections will deal with the state, this section will focus on the community-level.'¹³ As other CVR officers noted: 'each time the military officers 'screw up,' we have to pick up the pieces.

¹¹ 'Operation Baghdad' was the name given the ghetto uprising by the interim government in an attempt to label the people fighting as terrorists. However, the term was later adopted by the demonstrators themselves.

¹² Interview with Pedro Braum, Viva Rio, 3 February 2011, Port-au-Prince.

¹³ Interview with Stephanie Ziebell, Monitoring & Evaluation Unit Team Leader, Community Violence Reduction Section, MINUSTAH, 8 December 2011, Port-au-Prince (interview translated from French).

(...) We constantly have to stabilise a situation previously destabilised by military units.¹⁴ It might be too soon to see it as a 'model for future interventions' (ICG 2012, 8) – and we also need to be careful with 'one size fits all' mindsets – but this clearly represents an interesting evolution in the security landscape in Haiti.

4. Cut-and-Run Stabilisation in South Sudan (c.2005–2017)

Stabilisation efforts in South Sudan differed considerably from those in Uganda since, as in Haiti, international ambitions in this regard had broadened beyond economic stabilisation towards the securing of a more holistic political transformation. Indeed, in some respects, stabilisation in South Sudan and Haiti since the mid-2000s share many similarities. Both have been focused around large UN missions (the United Nations Mission in Sudan (UNMIS) between 2005–2011 and the United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS) since South Sudanese independence from Sudan in 2011). Both have prioritised the construction and strengthening of security institutions as a core stabilisation mechanism. Both have involved international actors siding with, and bolstering, a particular politico-security elite in pursuing template-style stabilisation goals and both have seen international actors play a critical, and controversial, role in shaping the statebuilding process through their interventions.

Stabilisation in South Sudan has, however, failed dramatically. After eight years of precarious peace, civil conflict returned to the country in December 2013 and regional and international attempts to resolve the crisis have come to little. Where international actors sought to downplay setbacks in their stabilisation activities in Uganda a decade earlier they looked to shift the blame in the case of South Sudan. While remaining discursively committed to stabilising and re-constructing the South Sudanese polity as the end-state of their interventions, intervenors no longer wish to be seen as actually responsible for the failure of these efforts and are instead prepared to transfer blame for this to local actors as a failsafe strategy. This does not, however, mean acknowledging any previous role they may themselves have played in contributing to this failure, or reflecting on the broader international-local power relationships and ambiguities that their involvement has fostered and sown into the new state's political fabric. This 'cut-and-run' stabilisation, we suggest, is problematic and in the case of South Sudan has poisoned relations between UNMISS and the government.

International actors – particularly the UN, US and UK – played a longstanding and critical role in bringing the so-called Second Sudanese Civil War (1983–2005) to an end. The conflict, which officially ended with the signing of the 2005 Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA), focused around the politico-economic marginalisation and exploitation of southern Sudan by the Sudanese government, with the Sudan People's Liberation Army/Movement (SPLA/M) of the former launching a rebellion against the latter in June 1983 (Arnold and LeRiche 2013). The Clinton Administration (1993–2001) offered extensive support to the SPLA/M as part of its broader effort to contain and undermine the Islamist Omar al-Bashir government in Khartoum, which hosted *Al-Qaeda* leader Osama bin Laden between 1991 and 1996 (Rosenblum 2002). Among the powerful cabal of SPLA/M champions in Clinton's Africa team were figures who would later come to play a central role in supporting UN

¹⁴ Interview with Dieusibon Pierre-Mérit, CVR Officer, Community Violence Reduction Section, MINUSTAH, 8 December 2011, Port-au-Prince; and Jacques Juvigny, CVR Officer, Community Violence Reduction Section, MINUSTAH, 8 December 2011, Port-au-Prince (interviews translated from French).

and international stabilisation and statebuilding efforts in independent South Sudan, notably Susan Rice – Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs under Clinton and UN Ambassador (2009-2013) and National Security Adviser (2013-2017) under Barack Obama – and Gayle Smith, White House Africa chief under Clinton and White House development chief (2009-2015) and administrator of USAID (2015-2017) under Obama.

The George W. Bush Administration also offered its support to the SPLA/M's cause, partly driven by pressure from its conservative Christian base to assist the putatively 'Christian Africans' of southern Sudan against the 'Muslim Arabs' of Khartoum (Copson 2007). Indeed, according to Washington's then second most senior Africa diplomat, Mark Bellamy, Bush viewed the securing of a resolution to the Sudanese conflict as his 'top Africa priority' during his first term (2001-2005)¹⁵ and the US, together with the UK and Norway, engaged extensively in the facilitation and negotiation of the CPA. This agreement, signed in January 2005 between the SPLA/M and Khartoum, ended the war and laid the foundations for South Sudanese independence six years later – but was criticised for excluding the range of other rebel movements involved in the twenty-year conflict from the final political settlement which established the autonomous Government of Southern Sudan (Munive 2013). Washington was also instrumental in pushing for a UN peacekeeping mission – UNMIS – to be created to stabilise the war-torn territory and support the implementation of the Agreement; UNMIS was replaced by UNMISS when South Sudan became independent in July 2011.

Through UNMIS, UNMISS and a range of bilateral initiatives, international actors became an integral part of the construction of the new South Sudanese state and polity from 2005 onwards – the enterprise becoming, in the 2012 words of Wolfram Lacher, 'the international community's next big state-building project' (Lacher 2012: 5). With the EU and US alone investing over half a billion dollars annually in stabilising the country and supporting the assembling of a new state from independence onwards, international actors embedded themselves in South Sudan's statebuilding process, as they had fifteen years earlier in neighbouring Uganda. The end-state they pursued in South Sudan, however, was not economic transformation but institutional transformation; as in Haiti, however, the focus in this case was the security sector. Stabilisation in South Sudan meant reconstituting the relationship between violence and political authority through disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration of certain militias and former rebels. The programmes pursued by intervenors, however, were instead incorporated into the SPLA/M elite's own illiberal statebuilding efforts, with access to security sector reform funds becoming a core rent fought over by competing members of the country's politico-military aristocracy (Lacher 2012; de Waal 2014). This, as Munive suggests, was the result of a lack of interest in or attention to local context on the part of intervenors in the design and implementation of stabilisation interventions in the country.

By 2013, therefore, international intervention in South Sudan had helped build a precarious governing consensus. This was highly vulnerable to disaffected elites rebelling as a mechanism to 're-negotiate' their access to international rents. In December that year conflict broke out between the two central SPLA/M factions of president Salva Kiir and former vice president Riek Machar and the country returned to civil war, with brutal

¹⁵ Interview with William Mark Bellamy, US Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs (2000-2001), Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs (2001-2003) and Ambassador to Kenya (2003-2006), Washington DC, 8 May 2012.

massacres and human rights abuses being committed by both sides and the various militias excluded from the CPA and subsequent internationally-facilitated political settlement seeking to use the crisis to force their way to the table of any subsequent division of spoils (de Waal 2014).

What is most pertinent to this study's analysis, though, is the reaction of international actors to this major setback in their stabilisation and statebuilding ambitions. Where challenges in Uganda and Haiti had been met with dissimulation or doubling down, the immediate international response in South Sudan – between late 2013 to spring 2014 – was exit. Almost overnight, US, UK and other leading donor missions flew all but a miniscule skeleton staff out of Juba, South Sudan's capital, and returned them to headquarters.¹⁶ Having been embedded in the country's stabilisation and statebuilding throughout the previous decade, international actors felt little obligation to remain when these efforts were demonstrated to have failed; for the next year there would be virtually no international presence in South Sudan – beyond that of UNMISS staff.

More significantly, though, the longer term response has been to shift responsibility for stabilisation failures from its funders and proponents – the international community – to national actors. A discourse of scolding and blame-shifting has emerged in international engagement on South Sudan since 2013 raising important and challenging questions about the trajectory of stabilisation as a form of international intervention. In May 2014, for example, UK development minister Lynne Featherstone made clear that 'Britain is already leading the international response to the crisis...but, above all, responsibility for the well-being of the people of South Sudan sits with the leaders of South Sudan'.¹⁷ More recently, allocation of 'responsibility' has been a key theme in comments by senior UN and US officials, with the US' permanent representative to the UN, Nikki Haley, making clear on her first trip to Juba in October 2017 that 'every decision [the US makes on South Sudan] going forward was going to be based on his [Salva Kiir's] actions'.¹⁸

The point here is not that South Sudan's leaders do not bear the bulk of responsibility for ongoing instability and crisis in the country – they clearly do. Our argument, however, is that international actors have also played a critical role in the construction of South Sudan's state and political economy and are therefore not simply bystanders but part-authors of the current situation. They also continue to exercise a major influence over the country's politics through UNMISS, to the extent that it has been accused by Juba as operating as a 'parallel government'.¹⁹ Rather than acknowledge or reflect on their own position, however, they have sought to promote a deeply ambiguous notion of stabilisation as simultaneously their central concern but not their responsibility – quite unlike approaches taken to stabilisation in Uganda fifteen years earlier. While scholars such as David Chandler (2012) have suggested that rhetoric of this kind is part of a broader shift towards attempts to engender 'resilience' within intervened societies, we argue that in the case of South Sudan it speaks to an unresolved tension in contemporary stabilisation missions whereby international actors no longer feel confident in their ability to effect substantive reform – or, at least, arrest situations of insecurity – but have not developed a more realistic language in which to frame their role and perceived responsibilities.

¹⁶ One of the authors was an Honorary Research Fellow in the UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office's Africa Directorate at the time and witnessed this first hand.

¹⁷ Liberal Democrats, "Lynne Featherstone: New British aid package for South Sudan", 20 May 2014 (available at https://www.libdems.org.uk/lynne_featherstone_new_british_aid_package_for_south_sudan, accessed 20 November 2017).

¹⁸ David Lewis, "Take greater responsibility for your people, refugee chief tells South Sudan", Reuters, 19 June 2017 (available at <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-un-refugees/take-greater-responsibility-for-your-people-u-n-refugee-chief-tells-south-sudan-idUSKBN19A0VO>, accessed 20 November 2017); Elise Labott, "Nikki Haley issues stern warning in South Sudan", CNN Online, 26 October 2017 (available at <http://edition.cnn.com/2017/10/25/politics/nikki-haley-warning-south-sudan/index.html>, accessed 20 November 2017).

¹⁹ BBC News Online, "South Sudan President Salva Kiir hits out at UN", 21 January 2014 (available at <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-25826598>, accessed 20 November 2017).

5. Conclusions and Implications for the MENA Region

A number of implications can be drawn from our case studies. First, international actors have played, and continue to play an integral part in the contested statebuilding processes of post-conflict or post-disaster states. Even with the 'label' of stabilisation – which stands in stark contrast with more ambitious labels such as 'regime change' or 'nation-building' – international actors are not neutral, apolitical actors, standing above local politics on the ground. Stabilisation programmes deployed on the ground, whether they aim at building a sustainable economy, a safe and secure environment, or stable governance will contribute to stabilising (or destabilising) a very political order on the ground and be co-constitutive of the end-results. International actors are embedded in this political order, contributing to stabilise or destabilise it, but in no case being detached from it in practice.

This leads us to the second implication of our case studies, that is the political purpose that this new focus on stabilisation serves for international actors. If definitions of stabilisation usually include a focus on (re)building representative and legitimate political systems, on human rights and rule of law, as well as on social and economic development, in reality stabilisation represents a break in the transformative logic of intervention. We argue that this focus on stabilisation enables international actors to distantiate themselves – in discourse if not in practice – from the end results on the ground. International actors are increasingly weary of lofty, transformative interventionary agendas, after the mixed results of post-1999 Kosovo and Timor-Leste and post-2003 Iraq. The concept of stabilisation hence enables actors to focus on specific goals and to identify clear exit strategies enabling 'cut and run' policies when needed. In an era of 'good enough' peacebuilding, this is clearly a very useful feature of stabilisation missions for international actors. However, this normative evolution is also reflective of the international actors' loss of confidence in their ability to transform political orders on the ground, as well as their reluctance to accept responsibility for perceived failures of international efforts. Our case studies cover over thirty years of evolution of stabilisation doctrine and practice, but we strongly believe that stabilisation – especially associated with concepts such as resilience and 'good enough' peacebuilding – will remain in the political landscape of intervention practices for many more years to come.

This study has focused primarily on Africa and the Caribbean in evidencing evolving stabilisation trajectories. These regions have been traditionally viewed as largely marginal to the core geostrategic and security interests of major international actors²⁰, and apt sites in which to undertake policy 'experimentation', be it in the form of economic, developmental or statebuilding intervention. What are the implications of our analysis, though, for regions more central to global security strategies – notably the MENA region?

This region remains one of only a few in which Western powers continue to be prepared to despatch their own forces to in an effort to secure stabilisation – as the 2011 NATO intervention in Libya and debate in London and Washington regarding intervening in Syria after 2013 reveals. The disastrous consequences of the 2003 US-led war on Iraq and ambiguous results of the so-called 'Arab Spring' are also felt more acutely by Western powers in this region and continue to condition how international actors view the potential for promoting statebuilding and political transformation efforts there.

²⁰ The case of Cuba during the Cold War represents, of course, an obvious exception.

The logic of 'cut-and-run' stabilisation is nonetheless evident in the MENA region too, as evidenced in the Libya intervention (Kuperman 2015) or the recent development in Syria. This arguably places a burden upon – or offers an opportunity to – regional states to engage more fully and directly in stabilisation theatres which global powers willingly enter and willingly vacate prematurely. The Saudi-led intervention in Yemen since 2015 represents perhaps a likely future model of international stabilisation efforts in the region.

References

- Abboud, Samer (2018) "Why an Arab stabilisation force in Syria won't work", *Middle East Eye*, 19 April, <https://www.middleeasteye.net/columns/why-arab-stabilisation-force-syria-won-t-work-1026796721>
- Andersen, Lars Erslev (2017) "The Locals Strike Back: The Anbar Awakening in Iraq and the Rise of Islamic State", in: Louis Wiuff Moe and Markus-Michael Muller, eds. *Reconfiguring Intervention: Complexity, Resilience and the 'Local Turn' in Counterinsurgency Warfare*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 187-206.
- Aoi, Chiyuki, Cedric de Coning and Ramesh Thakur (2007) "Unintended Consequences, complex peace operations and peacebuilding systems", in: Chiyuki Aoi, Cedric de Coning and Ramesh Thakur, eds. *Unintended Consequences of Peacekeeping*. Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 3-20.
- Arnold, Matthew and LeRiche, Matthew (2013) *South Sudan: From Revolution to Independence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bumiller, Elisabeth and Thom Shanker (2009) "Commander's Ouster is Tied to Shift in Afghan War," *The New York Times*, 11 May, <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/05/12/world/asia/12military.html>
- Buncombe, Andrew (2007) "Civilians caught in crossfire during Port-au-Prince raids". *The Independent*, 2 February.
- Chandler, David (2012) "Resilience and human security: The post-interventionist paradigm", *Security Dialogue* 43 (3): 213-229.
- Chomsky, Noam, Paul Farmer and Amy Goodman (2004) *Getting Haiti Right This Time*. Monroe: Common Courage Press.
- Copson, Raymond (2007) *The United States in Africa: Bush Policy and Beyond*. London: Zed Books.
- Coughlin, Dan (2011) "WikiLeaks Haiti: US Cables Pain Portrait of Brual, Ineffectual and Polluting UN Force". *The Nation*, 6 October.
- Curran, David and Paul Holtom (2015) "Resonating, Rejecting, Reinterpreting: Mapping the Stabilisation Discourse in the United Nations Security Council, 2000-14". *Stability: International Journal of Security & Development* 4(1): 1-18.
- De Coning, Cedric (2016) "Is Stabilisation the New Normal? Implications of Stabilisation Mandates for the Use of Force in UN Peace Operations". *Complexity for Peace Operations*, 4 October, available at: <https://cedricdeconing.net/2016/10/04/is-stabilisation-the-new-normal-implications-of-stabilisation-mandates-for-the-use-of-force-in-un-peace-operations/>

- De Waal, Alex (2014) "When kleptocracy becomes insolvent: Brutal causes of the civil war in South Sudan", *African Affairs* 113 (452): 347-369.
- Dennys, Christian (2013) "For Stabilisation". *Stability: International Journal of Security & Development* 2(1): 1-14, <https://www.stabilityjournal.org/articles/10.5334/sta.an/>
- Dijkstra, Geske and van Donge, Jan Kees (2001) "What does the "showcase" show? Evidence of, and lessons from, adjustment in Uganda", *World Development*, 29 (5): 841-863,
- Donais, Timothy (2012) "Reforming the Haitian National Police: From Stabilisation to Consolidation," in Jorge Heine and Andrew Thompson, eds. *Fixing Haiti: MINUSTAH and Beyond*. Tokyo: UNU Press, 97-114.
- Duffield, Mark (2001) *Global governance and the new wars: The merging of development and security*. London: Zed Books.
- Duffield, Mark (2006) *Development, security and unending war: Governing the world of peoples*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Dupuy, Alex (2007) *The Prophet and Power: Jean-Bertrand Aristide, the International Community, and Haiti*. Plymouth: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Farmer, Paul (2011) *Haiti After the Earthquake*. New York: PublicAffairs.
- Fatton Jr., Robert (2007) *The Roots of Haitian Despotism*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 2007.
- Fisher, Jonathan (2011) *International perceptions and African agency: Uganda and its donors 1986-2010*. Unpublished DPhil thesis, University of Oxford: Oxford.
- Fisher, Jonathan and Anderson, David M (2015) "Authoritarianism and the securitisation of development in Africa", *International Affairs* 91 (1): 131-151.
- Gonzalez, Roberto (2017) "Ethnographic Intelligence: The Human Terrain System and Its Enduring Legacy", In: Louis Wiuff Moe and Markus-Michael Muller, eds. *Reconfiguring Intervention: Complexity, Resilience and the 'Local Turn' in Counterinsurgency Warfare*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 51-73.
- Gordon, Michael (2018) "U.S. Seeks Arab Force and Funding for Syria", *Wall Street Journal*, 16 April.
- Grimm, Sonja, Nicolas Lemay-Hébert and Olivier Nay (2014) "Fragile States: Introducing a Political Concept", *Third World Quarterly* 35(2), 197-209.
- Hallward, Peter (2007). *Damming the Flood: Haiti and the Politics of Containment*. London: Verso.
- Harrison, Graham (2001) "Post-conditionality politics and administrative reform: Reflections on the cases of Uganda and Tanzania", *Development and Change* 32 (4): 657-679.

Hauser, Ellen (1999) "Ugandan relations with Western donors: What impact on democratisation?", *Journal of Modern African Studies* 37, 4: 621-641.

Hickey, Sam (2013) "Beyond the poverty agenda? Insights from the new politics of development in Uganda", *World Development* 43: 194-206.

Independent Commission for Aid Impact (2015) *DFID's Scale-Up in Fragile States*. Available at: <http://ica.i.independent.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/Fragile-States-ToRs-Final.pdf>

International Crisis Group (2012) "Towards a Post-MINUSTAH Haiti: Making an Effective Transition," *Latin America/Caribbean Report N°44*, 2 August.

International Crisis Group (2011) "Keeping Haiti Safe: Police Reform," *Latin America/Caribbean Briefing No 26*, 8 September.

Jeng, A. (2012) *Peacebuilding in the African Union: Law, philosophy and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Karsrud, John (2015) "The UN at War: Examining the Consequences of Peace-Enforcement Mandates for the UN Peacekeeping Operations in the CAR, the DRC and Mali". *Third World Quarterly* 36(1): 40-56.

Kuperman, Alan (2015) "Obama's Libya Debacle". *Foreign Affairs* 94: 66-77.

Lacher, Wolfgang (2012) *South Sudan: International State-Building and its Limits*, SWP Research Paper RP4. Berlin: German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP).

Lemay-Hébert, Nicolas (forthcoming) "Living in the Yellow Zone: The Political Geography of Intervention in Haiti", *Political Geography*.

Lemay-Hébert, Nicolas (2019) "From Saving Failed States to Managing Risks: Reinterpreting Fragility through Resilience", in: John Lahai, Howard Brasted, Karin von Strokirch and Helen Ware, eds. *Governance and Political Adaptation in Fragile States*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 75-101.

Lemay-Hébert, Nicolas (2015) "United Nations Stabilisation Mission in Haiti (MINUSTAH)," in: J. A. Koops, N. MacQueen, T. Tardy & P. D. Williams, eds. *Oxford Handbook of United Nations Peacekeeping Operations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 720-730.

Lemay-Hébert, Nicolas (2014) "Resistance in the Time of Cholera: The Limits of Stabilisation Through Securitization in Haiti," *International Peacekeeping* 21(2): 198-213.

Lemay-Hébert, Nicolas (2011) "The 'Empty-Shell' Approach: The Setup Process of International Administrations in Timor-Leste and Kosovo, Its Consequences and Lessons". *International Studies Perspectives* 12(2): 190-211.

- Lemay-Hébert, Nicolas and Stefanie Kappler (2016) "What Attachment to Peace? Normative and Material Dimensions of Peacebuilding". *Review of International Studies* 42(5): 895-914.
- Lemay-Hébert, Nicolas and Gezim Visoka (2017) "Normal Peace: A New Strategic Narrative of Intervention". *Politics and Governance* 5(3): 146-156. <https://www.cogitatiopress.com/politicsandgovernance/article/view/972>
- Lotze, Walter and Williams, Paul D (2016) *The surge to stabilize: Lessons for the UN from the AU's experience in Somalia*. New York, NY: International Peace Institute. Mac Ginty, Roger (2012) "Against Stabilisation". *Stability: International Journal of Security & Development* 1(1): 20-30, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/sta.ab>
- Mallaby, Sebastian (2004) *The World's Banker: A story of failed states, financial crises and the wealth and poverty of nations*. New York, NY: Penguin Press.
- Martin, Laura (2016). "Practicing normality: An examination of unrecognizable transitional justice mechanisms in post-conflict Sierra Leone". *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*, 10(3): 400-418.
- Morris, Loveday and Karen DeYoung, "Saudi Arabia says it's open to sending troops to Syria as U.S. draws down", *The Washington Post*, 17 April.
- Mosley, Paul; Harrigan, Jane and Toye, John (1991) *Aid and power: The World Bank and policy-based lending*, volumes 1 and 2. London: Routledge.
- Muggah, Robert (2010) "The Effects of Stabilisation on Humanitarian Action in Haiti", *Disasters* 34(S3), S444-S463.
- Munive, Jairo (2013) "Context Matters: The Conventional DDR Template is Challenged in South Sudan", *International Peacekeeping* 20 (5): 585-599.
- Nagl, John (2007) "The Evolution and Importance of Army/Marine Corps Field Manual 3-24, Counterinsurgency," *Small Wars Journal*, <http://www.smallwarsjournal.com/blog/2007/06/the-evolution-and-importance-o/>
- Obama, Barack (2015) "Remarks by President Obama and Prime Minister Hailemariam Desalegn of Ethiopia in Joint Press Conference", *White House Office of the Press Secretary*, 27 July 2015, <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2015/07/27/remarks-president-obama-and-prime-minister-hailemariam-desalegn-ethiopia>
- OECD (2016) *OECD States of Fragility 2016 Report*. Brief Number 11.
- Ofcansky, Thomas (1996) *Uganda: Tarnished pearl of Africa*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Podur, Justin (2012) *Haiti's New Dictatorship: The Coup, the Earthquake and the UN Occupation*. London: Pluto Press.

- Rohde, David (2007) "Army Enlists Anthropology in War Zones," *The New York Times*, 5 October, <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/10/05/world/asia/05afghan.html>
- Rosenblum, Peter (2002) "Irrational Exuberance: The Clinton Administration in Africa", *Current History* 101 (655): 195-202.
- Rotmann, Philipp (2016) "Toward a Realistic and Responsible Idea of Stabilisation". *Stability: International Journal of Security & Development* 5(1): 1-14.
- Sonne, Paul and Karen DeYoung (2018) "Trump wants to get the U.S. out of Syria's war, so he asked the Saudi king for \$4 billion", *The Washington Post*, 16 March.
- Thakur, Ramesh and Carlyle Thayer (1995) *A Crisis of Expectations: UN Peacekeeping in the 1990s*. IBoulder: Westview Press.
- The New Arab (2018a) "US 'ends Syria stabilisation funding' after Saudi pledge", 17 August.
- The New Arab (2018b) "Saudi Arabia pledges \$100 million to US-backed reconstruction efforts in Syria", 17 August.
- Tubiana J, Tanner V, and Abdul-Jalil MA (2012) Traditional Authorities' Peacemaking Role in Darfur. *Peaceworks* 83. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace.
- United Kingdom Stabilisation Unit (2014) *The UK Government's Approach to Stabilisation*.
- UNDP et al. (2016) "Working in Fragile Contexts, Including in Middle-Income Countries". Joint Meeting of the Executive Boards of UNDP/UNFPA/UNOPS, UNICEF, UN-Women and WFP, 3 June.
- United States Institute of Peace and United States Army Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute (2009) *Guiding Principles for Stabilisation and Reconstruction*. Washington: USIP.
- Whitworth, Alan and Williamson, Tim (2009) "Overview of Ugandan economic reform since 1986", in Florence Kuteesa, Emmanuel Tumusiime-Mutebile, Alan Whitworth and Tim Williamson (eds), *Uganda's economic reform: Insider accounts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wiegatz, Jörg (2016) *Neoliberal moral economy: Capitalism, socio-cultural change and fraud in Uganda*. London: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Williams, Paul D and Boutellis, Arthur (2014) "Partnership peacekeeping: Challenges and opportunities in the United Nations-African Union relationship". *African Affairs* 113, 451, pp.254-278.
- Willman, Alys and Louis-Herns Marcelin (2010) "If They Could Make Us Disappear, They Would! Youth and Violence in Cité Soleil, Haiti" *Journal of Community Psychology* 38(4), pp. 515-531.

Wiuiff Moe, Louise and Markus-Michael Muller (2017) "Introduction: Complexity, Resilience and the 'Local Turn' in Counterinsurgency", in: Louis Wiuiff Moe and Markus-Michael Muller, eds. *Reconfiguring Intervention: Complexity, Resilience and the 'Local Turn' in Counterinsurgency Warfare*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 1-27.