

United Nations Peacebuilding and the Protection of Human Security

He Yin¹

Abstract:

Peacebuilding has been the core task of the United Nations peace operations since the end of the Cold War. The discourse of human security began to emerge at the same time. It is necessary to understand the concept of human security within the practice of UN peacebuilding operations. There is a causal relationship respectively between the pillars of peacebuilding (institution building and economic development), and the two core elements of human security (political security and economic security). Peacebuilding has tended to place great emphasis on the task of state-building, which is demonstrated by the dominance of *liberal peace* in peacebuilding. As a result, excessive attention is paid to institution building while economic development is given less concern; human political security is emphasized while economic security is neglected. The result is the building of *illusory peace* and the protection of *illusory human security*. By contrast, China, as a rising country, has developed a model that could be described as *peace through development*, which it implements through its foreign aid and economic activities. Neglected by *liberal peace*, economic development gained more attention through the concept of *peace through development* which is beneficial for the protection of human economic security. Looking forward to the practice of peacebuilding in the 21st century, the way to lasting peace must seek out a balance between *liberal peace* and *peace through development*, between institution building and economic development, and, in terms of human security, between political and economic security.

Key Words: United Nations Peacebuilding, protection of human security, liberal

¹ He Yin is Associate Professor at the China Peacekeeping Police Training Centre (CPPTC). He is currently doing a PhD program on international relations at the China Foreign Affairs University. During the Period from October 2001 to October 2002, he was a UNPOL in the United Nations peacekeeping operations in East Timor. The writing of this paper is sponsored by American Friends Service Committee, and the author would thank Dr. Jason Tower, East Asia Quaker International Affairs Representatives of AFSC for his assistance and suggestions for the paper. The views expressed here are those of the author and do not represent the views of CPPTC or the Ministry of Public Security.

peace, peace through development, balance

Human security is a concept proposed by the United Nations that reflects the characteristics and trends of international politics in the post-Cold War era. Current literature on human security has two obvious flaws: first, the endless debate on the concept and connotation of human security has confused people's understanding of the essence of human security; second, most contemporary literature only broadly discusses the means of achieving, tasks involved and significance of human security. Research conducted from specific practical perspectives are rare.² This article, composed of five parts, seeks to understand the concept of human security within the practice of UN peacebuilding (hereinafter referred to as peacebuilding), exploring how to protect human security through peacebuilding. The first part reviews the discussions concerning the conceptual elements of human security, highlighting the significance of human security in simple terms. The second part clarifies the concept of peacebuilding and delves into the connotations of this concept by distinguishing it from peacekeeping and state-building. The third part illustrates the relationship between peacebuilding and human security by looking at real-world examples of peacebuilding, indicating the causal relationship between the two pillars of peacebuilding and the two core elements of human security. This third part also indicates that liberal-dominated peacebuilding places great emphasis on institution building while under-emphasizing the role of economic development, leading to a situation of *illusory peace* while creating *illusory human security*. The fourth part

² See: UNDP, *Human Development Report 1994: New Dimension of Human Security*, New York: UNDP, 1994; Nani G. Mahanta, *Human Security: Concepts and Definitions*, Tokyo: UN Centre for Regional Development, 2002; Richard Jolly and Deepayan B. Ray, *The Human Security Framework*, New York: UNDP, 2002. Sabina Alkire, *A Conceptual Framework for Human Security*, CRISE Working Paper 2, Queen Elizabeth House, University of Oxford, 2003. George MacLean, "The Changing Perception of Human Security: Coordinating National and Multilateral Responses," United Nations Association in Canada, 1998, available at: <http://www.unac.org/canada/security/maclea.htm>. Gary King and Christopher Murray, "Rethinking Human Security," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 116, No. 4, 2001-2002. pp. 585-610. Edward Newman, "Human Security and Constructivism," *International Studies Perspective*, No. 2, 2011, pp. 239-251. Roland Paris, "Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?" *International Security*, Vol. 26 No. 2, 2001, 87-102. [大马]阿米塔夫·阿查亚著,《人类安全:东方与西方》,李增田译,载《世界经济与政治》,2002年第5期,第57-62页。关信平、郭瑜:《“人类安全”:概念分析、国际发展及其对我国的意义》,载《学习与实践》2007年第5期,第98-106页。封永平:《安全维度转向:人的安全》,载《现代国际关系》,2006年第6期,第56-61页。刘志军、刘民权:《人类安全:概念与内涵》,载《国际观察》2006年第1期,第38-46页。张春:《人类安全观:内涵及国际政治意义》,载《现代国际关系》,2004年第4期,第12-16页。

compares peacebuilding to previous peace models and contrasts competing western and Chinese understandings. It examines the interactions of *liberal peace* and *peace through development* as well as their impact on the protection of human security. The conclusion sums up key findings in the paper.

Human Security

Human security as a new security concept was first proposed in the *Human Development Report 1994: New Dimensions of Human Security* issued by UNDP.³ Academia began to discuss the concept and connotations of human security, but it has been difficult to reach a consensus. As indicated in Table 1, many differences exist within academia concerning the elements of human security. According to UNDP, human security consists of seven elements: economic security, food safety, health, environmental security, personal safety, community security and political security.⁴ However, the views of some UN member states differ in terms of definition of human security. For instance, Canada has claimed that the agenda setting of human security should avoid human insecurity caused by violent conflicts and nonviolent threats. Canada further proposed nine agendas: banning landmines, the establishment of the International Criminal Court, the protection of human rights, the maintenance of international humanitarian law, the protection of women and children in armed conflicts, preventing the proliferation of small arms, prohibition of child soldiers and child labor, and to carry out South-North cooperation.⁵ In 2000, Canada released a diplomatic blue book called *Freedom from Fear: Canada's Foreign Policy for Human Security*. The publication proposed five tasks involved in the protection of human security, i.e., child protection, supporting peace operations, conflict prevention, governance and accountability and public safety.⁶ Japan criticized Canada's

³ UNDP, *Human Development Report 1994: New Dimensions of Human Security*.

⁴ UNDP, *Human Development Report 1994: New Dimension of Human Security*.

⁵ "Canada, Norway Change Their Ways: New Approach Bases Foreign Policy on Human Issues," *Ottawa Citizen*, May 28, 1998, A18.

⁶ Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, *Freedom from Fear: Canada's Foreign Policy for Human Security*, 2000,

definition of human security as too narrow, and only mentioning one facet of human security, “freedom from fear”, while neglecting the other facet, “freedom from want”. In its diplomatic blue paper issued in 1999, Japan's Ministry of Foreign Affairs stated that human security should cover all areas threatening people’s survival, daily life and dignity, including environmental degradation, human rights violations, transnational organized crime, illicit drugs, refugees, poverty, landmines and AIDS and other infectious diseases.⁷ In contrast to Canada’s view on human security, Japan listed poverty as a threat to human security. In other words, Japan took a broader definition than Canada, including both “freedom from fear” and “freedom from want”.

Academia has had a more diversified debate concerning the definition of human security. Buttedahl Paz asserted that human security is composed of five elements: personal and physical security, economic security, social security, political security, as well as ethnic and cultural security.⁸ Jorge Nef argued that human security includes physical, economic, social, political, and cultural security.⁹ Caroline Thomas suggested three essential aspects of human security: basic needs, dignity and democracy.¹⁰

Table 1: Conceptual Elements of Human Security¹¹

UNDP	Canada	Japan	Paz	Jorge Nef	Thomas
Economic Security,	child protection, supporting	freedom from fear, freedom from	personal and physical security,	physical security, economic	basic needs, dignity, democracy.

http://www.hegoa.ehu.es/dossierra/seguridad/Freedom_from_fear_Canada_s_foreign_policy_for_human_security.pdf.

⁷ Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, *Diplomatic Bluebook 1999: Japan’s Diplomacy with Leadership towards the New Century*. Tokyo: Urban Connections Inc.

⁸ Paz Buttedahl, 1994. “Viewpoint: True Measures of Human Security,” *IRDC Reports*, International Development Research Centre, Canada. Vol. 22, No. 3, pp. 1-5, <http://www.idrc.ca/books/reports/V223/view.html>.

⁹ Jorge Nef, *Human Security and Mutual Vulnerability: The Global Political Economy of Development and Underdevelopment*, International Research Development Centre, Canada (2nd edition), 1999.”

¹⁰ Caroline Thomas, *Global Governance, Development and Human Security the Challenge of Poverty and Inequality*, London and Sterling, VA: Pluto Press, 2000.

¹¹ 参见 Sabina Alkire, “A Conceptual Framework for Human Security,” p. 49.

Food Safety,	peace	want.	economic	security, social	
Health Security,	operations,		security, social	security,	
environmental	conflict		security,	political	
security,	prevention,		political	security,	
personal safety,	governance		security, ethnic	cultural security.	
community	and		and cultural		
security,	accountability,		security.		
political	public safety.				
security.					

As we can see in Table 1, different advocates have different cultural backgrounds as well as different security claims; therefore, they have distinct understandings of security concepts. There will be endless debate on the concept of human security. Some academics have noted that the definition of UNDP is too broad to have any concrete meaning, and as a result it becomes “a term that can mean all and nothing”.¹²

As a security paradigm, human security only provides us with an analytical framework for studying security. Sadako Ogata, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, once pointed out that “we should not look at human security just from the point of view of theory and definition, but rather examine what practical steps and measures can enable us to maintain people in, or restore them to, a state of security”.¹³

United Nations Peacebuilding

As the biggest intergovernmental organization, the United Nations has, since its founding, taken the maintenance of international peace and security as its principal

¹² 刘志军、刘民权：《人类安全：概念与内涵》，第 41 页。

¹³ Sadako Ogata, “Enabling People to Live in Security,” Keynote Speech at the International Symposium on Human Security, Tokyo, July 28, 2000, <http://www.unhcr.org/3ae68fcac.html>.

mandate. After the Cold War ended, intra-state conflicts, rather than inter-state conflicts, have posed the main challenges to international peace and security. In this context, multi-dimensional peacekeeping operations have replaced traditional peacekeeping operations, becoming a primary conflict management method.

Debates within policy circles and academia have been as heated on the concept and connotations of peacebuilding as on that of human security. First proposed in 1970 by Norwegian sociologist and one of the originators of modern peace studies, Johan Galtung, peacebuilding refers to the promotion of structures that would create sustainable peace by addressing the root causes of conflict and supporting local capacity for peace management and conflict resolution.¹⁴ Peacebuilding became a familiar concept within the United Nations following Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali's 1992 report, *An Agenda for Peace*, which defined peacebuilding as actions to solidify peace and avoid relapsing into conflict.¹⁵ The *Supplement to an Agenda for Peace* published in 1995 by the UN Secretariat stressed the importance of building state institutions.¹⁶ As is pointed out by Thania Paffenholz, Galtung and Ghali have different understandings of peacebuilding: in Galtung's view, peacebuilding is a way to achieve *positive peace* by building a structure and system on the basis of justice, equality and cooperation; while peacebuilding defined by Ghali is *liberal peacebuilding* which is dedicated to post-conflict institution building in accordance with the western democracy.¹⁷ Paffenholz believes that compared with Galtung, Ghali's understanding of peacebuilding is quite narrow.¹⁸

¹⁴ Johan Galtung, 1976. "Three Approaches to Peace: Peacekeeping, Peacemaking and Peacebuilding," In Johan Galtung, ed., *Peace, War and Defense – Essays in peace research*, Vol 2, Copenhagen: Christian Ejlertsen, pp. 282-304.

¹⁵ Boutros Boutros-Ghali, "An Agenda for Peace, Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peacekeeping," A/47/277 – S/24111, June 17, 1992, II 21.

¹⁶ Boutros Boutros-Ghali, *Supplement to an Agenda for Peace: Position Paper of Secretary-General on Occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the United Nations: Report of the Secretary-General on the Work of the Organization*, General Assembly and Security Council document A/50/60-S/1995/1, January 3, 1995.

¹⁷ Thania Paffenholz, "Civil Society beyond Liberal Peace and Its Critique." In *A Liberal Peace?: The Problems and Practices of Peacebuilding*, edited by Susanna Campbell, David Chandler and Meera Sabaratnam, London and New York: Zed Books, 2011, p. 139.

¹⁸ Thania Paffenholz. "Civil Society beyond Liberal Peace and Its Critique," p. 139.

Another milestone document for UN peacekeeping operation is the *Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations* (also known as "*Brahimi Report*") put forward by the UN Secretariat. Peacebuilding used in this report is a term that defines activities undertaken in post-conflict settings to reassemble the foundations of peace and to provide the tools for building something that is more than just the absence of war.¹⁹ The report further clarifies specific measures to build peace:

“peacebuilding includes but is not limited to reintegrating former combatants into civil society, strengthening the rule of law (for example, through training and restructuring of local police, and judicial and penal reform); improving respect for human rights through the monitoring, education and investigation of past and existing abuses; providing technical assistance for democratic development (including electoral assistance and support for free media); and promoting conflict resolution and reconciliation techniques”.²⁰

In 2007, the UN Secretary-General's Policy Committee agreed on the following conceptual basis for peacebuilding to inform UN practice:

“Peacebuilding involves a range of measures targeted to reduce the risk of lapsing or relapsing into conflict by strengthening national capacities at all levels for conflict management, and to lay the foundations for sustainable peace and development. Peacebuilding strategies must be coherent and tailored to specific needs of the country concerned, based on national ownership, and should comprise a carefully prioritized, sequenced, and therefore relatively narrow set of activities aimed at achieving the above objectives”.²¹

¹⁹ 联合国，《联合国和平行动问题小组的报告》，2000，第2页，A/55/305，S/2000/809。

²⁰ 联合国，《联合国和平行动问题小组的报告》，第2页。

²¹ UN Peacebuilding Support Office, “Peacebuilding and the United Nations,” <http://www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/pbso/pbun.shtml>.

A comparison between peacebuilding and other conflict management methods will provide us with a clear understanding of this concept. First of all, peacebuilding is different from peacekeeping. Peacekeeping means to preserve a safe environment, ensuring the implementation of a signed peace agreement so as to create conditions for other conflict management methods, including peacebuilding. Peacebuilding refers to the range of efforts needed to establish sustainable peace, including delivering humanitarian relief, reassuming public service, economic recovery and promoting national reconciliation.²² Peacekeeping can only preserve temporary peace, while peacebuilding seeks to build sustainable peace by addressing the root causes of conflicts. Galtung believes that peace can be categorized as *negative peace* and *positive peace*, with the former referring to a lack of violence and the latter referring to the establishment of an integrated society including preventive measures that promote mutually beneficial cooperation, as well as individual and social harmony.²³ The concept of peace has changed with the evolution from peacekeeping to peacebuilding, because the former is focused on keeping *negative peace* and the latter seeks to build *positive peace*.

Some note that it is necessary to distinguish between peacebuilding and statebuilding. Oliver P. Richmond and Jason Franks believe that statebuilding aims to build a neo-liberal country with clearly defined sovereign territory, with a focus on political, economic and security structures. Peacebuilding pays attention to individual needs and rights, sustainable communities and governance structures that are sustainable and representative. The compromise between statebuilding and peacebuilding resulted in *liberal peacebuilding*.²⁴ Richmond and Franks further points out that though most of the people from United Nations system and the international community come originally from a peacebuilding perspective, in actual practice, *liberal peacebuilding*

²² Rob Jenkins, *Peacebuilding: From Concept to Commission*, London and New York: Routledge, 2013, p. 21.

²³ Johan Galtung, "Twenty-Five Years of Peace Research: Ten Challenges and Some Responses," *Journal of Peace Research*, 22 (2), 141-158. p. 141.

²⁴ Oliver P. Richmond and Jason Franks, *Liberal Peace Transitions: Between Statebuilding and Peacebuilding*, p. 182.

is dominated by a statebuilding agenda and peacebuilding is simply used as a framework to justify such domination.²⁵ Benjamin Reill points out that “the focus of most UN missions have shifted from one of pure peace-building to one of state rebuilding or, in some cases like East Timor, state creation”.²⁶

Statebuilding, in contrast to peacebuilding, has become the core task of UN multi-dimensional peacekeeping operations in the post-Cold War era. The result has been that multi-dimensional peacekeeping operations have placed excessive attention on statebuilding rather than pursuing a peacebuilding agenda. In other words, peacebuilding, as carried out by multi-dimensional peace operations, is geared towards building liberal, western-style democracies. In this scenario peacebuilding has deviated from Galtung’s understanding of peacebuilding. It ends up creating *illusory peace* and fails in its goal of eliminating the roots causes of conflict and building lasting peace as well as the goal of protecting human security. The third part of this paper will explore the interrelations between the peacebuilding and the protection of human security.

Peacebuilding and the Protection of Human Security

In multi-dimensional peacekeeping operations, peacekeeping can protect human security temporarily, but ultimately the protection of human security can only be achieved through peacebuilding. Experience has shown that post-conflict countries often have the following characteristics: fragmented or non-existent national systems and institutions, severely damaged infrastructure, widespread poverty and troubled economic and social development. Under such circumstances, post-conflict reconstruction has become an onerous task for the country in question and the international community. There are many participants in peacebuilding, given that all parties have their own agendas, resources, and their methods, level of awareness and

²⁵ Oliver P. Richmond and Jason Franks, *Liberal Peace Transitions: Between Statebuilding and Peacebuilding*, p. 1.

²⁶ Benjamin Reilly, “Elections in Post-Conflict Society,” in Edward Newman and Roland Rich, ed., *The UN Role in Promoting Democracy: Between Ideas and Reality*, Tokyo: United Nations Press, 2006, p. 113.

the priority that they place on peacebuilding tasks are different. The list of participants involved should be all-encompassing to meet the needs of peacebuilding and protection of human security. However, in the field of peacebuilding, constrained by the limited resources and limited attention from the international community, policy-makers and practitioners cannot give equal attention to every task on this list. Thus, priorities should be based on the fundamental objective of building sustainable peace, establishing the critical tasks that can affect the overall situation of peacebuilding. This paper demonstrates that for post-conflict societies, peacebuilding should include institution building and economic development as two pillars of the task. Only by carrying out institution building and economic development at the same time, will it be possible to be able to address the roots of conflicts and to build a lasting peace.

In a society transitioning from the experience of violent conflict or war, human security can include everything. Nevertheless, from the view of lasting peace, it has two core elements: political security, which means the establishment of a functioning state and the corresponding institutional systems intended to provide protection of human security so as to protect the “freedom from fear”; and economic security, referring to various economic measures including improvement of infrastructure and job creation, so as to protect “freedom from want”.

It is not difficult to find a causal relationship between the two pillars of peacebuilding and the two core elements of human security: institution building protects political security while economic development secures economic security. Nonetheless, current peacebuilding operations dominated by liberal peacebuilding invest most of the limited efforts and resources available to institution building and pay inadequate attention to economic development. As a result, it seems that post-conflict countries where peacebuilding operations are taking place have established western-style political and economic systems, but they have little development from the fields of economic and social advancement; therefore, the result is *illusionary peace* instead of

real peace.²⁷ Under such circumstances, people's political security is protected to some extent, and their economic security is also protected by the seemingly prosperous "peacekeeping economy". However, human security built on such basis is vulnerable and unsustainable. Therefore, lasting peace can be established only by placing needed emphasis on the other pillar of peacebuilding – economic development. People's political and economic security can only be secured through the dual development of institution building and economic development.

After 9/11, the United State's efforts to rebuild Iraq and Afghanistan went into chaos, provoking a debate over the *liberal peace* model of peacebuilding. Susanna Campbell and others have pointed out that there are two views on this matter. These include, "critical voices" and "problem solvers". "Critical voices" criticize the assumption that liberal peace can lead to sustainable peacebuilding. "Problem solvers" admit that there are flaws in the model, but do not criticize the inherent value of *liberal peace*.²⁸ One typical "critical voice" is Oliver Richmond. A contrasting "problem solver" view would be Roland Paris.²⁹

Those academics who fall in the, "critical voices" camp have focused on criticizing rather than offering solutions. By contrast, "problem solvers" suggest improving the *liberal peace* model. For instance, Paris supports "institutionalization before liberalization", which means building effective political and economic institutions

²⁷ 有关“自由和平”的批判及论述“虚幻的和平”的文献参见：Roland Paris, *At War's End: Building Peace after Civil Conflict*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004; Ian Taylor, "What Fit for the Liberal Peace in Africa?" *Global Society*, Vol. 21, No. 4, 2007, 553–566; M. A. Mohamed Salih, "A Critique of the Political Economy of the Liberal Peace: Elements of an African Experience," in Edward Newman *et al* eds., *Perspectives on Liberal Peacebuilding*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009, 133–158; Oliver Richmond and Jason Franks, *Liberal Peace Transitions: Between Statebuilding and Peacebuilding*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009; Roger Mac Ginty and Oliver Richmond, *The Liberal Peace and Post-War Reconstruction: Myth or Reality?* London: Routledge, 2009. Oliver. P. Richmond, *The Transformation of Peace*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006. Roger Mac Ginty, "Hybrid Peace: The Interaction between Top-down and Bottom-up Peace," *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 14, No. 4 (2010), pp. 391-412. Susanna Campbell, *et al* eds., *A Liberal Peace?: The Problems and Practices of Peacebuilding*, 2011, London: Zed Books.

²⁸ Susanna Campbell, David Chandler and Meera Sabaratnam (eds.), *A Liberal Peace?: The Problems and Practices of Peacebuilding*, p. 1.

²⁹ Roland Paris, *At War's End: Building Peace after Civil Conflict*.

before initiating democracy and market reform.³⁰ Cedric de Coning claims that peacebuilding is a complicated system. By applying complexity theory on the system, he offers suggestions on improving the peacebuilding model.³¹

These debates encourage the rethinking of the *liberal peace* model. However, the “critical voices” fails to bring new suggestions, while the “problem solvers” limit themselves to technical improvements without changing the foundation of *liberal peace*. The two groups do not realize the basic problem of *liberal peace* – that there is inadequate attention given to economic development. To solve this problem, it is important to end the dominance of *liberal peace* in peacebuilding and to bring economic development into the peacebuilding framework. In other words, the ideal peacebuilding model should emphasize building on the two pillars – institutions and the economy. Only in this way can we ensure the two most important kinds of human security – political security and economic security – are achieved. Part 4 of this article will examine the interaction of the two peacebuilding models: institution building-oriented *liberal peace*, and economic development-oriented *peace through development*. The article will also discuss the interaction between the two models of peacebuilding and the implications for human security.

Two Peacebuilding Models and Human Security

For a long time *liberal peace* dominated both the theoretical discourse and practice of peacebuilding, but the result was far from ideal. Some scholars have started to rethink *liberal peace* and look for alternatives beyond experiences from the western model. China’s achievements in the areas of political and economic development since Beijing’s adoption of reforms and the opening-up policy adopted in 1970s, paves the way for a heated discussion over the “China model”. Some believe China’s domestic

³⁰ Roland Paris, *At War’s End: Building Peace after Civil Conflict*, p. 179.

³¹ Cedric de Coning, “Complexity, Peacebuilding and Coherence: Implications of Complexity for the Peacebuilding Coherence Dilemma,” PhD dissertation, Stellenbosch: University of Stellenbosch, 2012, http://scholar.sun.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10019.1/71891/deconing_complexity_2012.pdf?sequence=2.

development experience, international aid and economic behavior demonstrates a peace norm quite different from *liberal peace*.³² It is the view of this author that China's model of development could be labeled *peace through development*. The next section will discuss the nature of *liberal peace* and *peace through development* and their interaction in peacebuilding and impacts on human security.

Liberal Peace

“Liberal peace” literally includes two elements – liberty and peace. To understand the peacebuilding model born from western civilization, we should first understand liberalism and peace in western political culture.

Liberalism in its early form came from humanism and the movement against religious repression in the Renaissance. During the Enlightenment liberalism began to have concrete meaning and became an ideology. In different times, liberalism has had different meanings. Today there are mainly two ways to categorize liberalism: traditional liberalism and modern liberalism. The other is to separate liberalism into classic liberalism and neoliberalism. *Liberal peace* is closely associated with neoliberalism.

Neoliberalism is first of all an economic theory. It was born between the 1920s and 1930s, and developed into a leading political economics theory in the field of global development in 1970s. The Chinese Academy of Social Science points out that “the rise of neoliberalism symbolizes the need of capitalism to transform a national monopoly to an international monopoly in globalization”.³³ “Neoliberalism strongly favors liberalization, privatization and marketization of an economy, and promotes

³² Steven C.Y. Kuo, “China’s Understanding of African Security: Context and Limitations”, *African Security*, Vol. 5: Issue 2, 2012, pp. 24-43. He Yin, “China-EU Cooperation on UN Peacekeeping: Opportunities and Challenges.” In *Europe and China in 21st Century Global Politics: Partnership, Competition, or Co-Evolution?* Frauke Austermann et al eds., London: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013, pp. 43-61. 何银：《中国崛起与国际规范体系：以联合国维和行动为例》。

³³ 中国社会科学院“新自由主义研究”课题组：《新自由主义研究》，载《马克思主义研究》2003年第6期，第20页。

strategies and policies geared towards promoting globalization dominated by hegemonic countries, while opposing public ownership and state intervention in economy”.³⁴

The concepts of democratic peace theory can be traced back to early political philosophers in Europe, such as Immanuel Kant and Adam Smith. In 1795, Kant published *Perpetual Peace*. This text discusses the relationship between democracy and peace. Kant points out that the constitutions of democratic countries ensure that they will take relatively peaceful actions, compared with other countries.³⁵ Proponents of this view have led to the birth of democratic peace theory. Michael Doyle and others have claimed that democratic countries do not go to war with each other because they share of values that are conducive to compromise and cooperation preventing conflict over competing interests from escalating into violence.³⁶ Rudolph Rummel further points out that democratic countries are unlikely to have domestic conflicts.³⁷ Adam Smith went further to include economic liberalization in democratic peace theory and stated that democracy, economic liberalization, and peace enjoy a high level of interdependence.³⁸

Although democratic peace theory is controversial,³⁹ it has received wide political support. After World War I, the idealist president Woodrow Wilson tried to establish an international peace based on liberal democracy. He stated that liberalism is the key

³⁴ 中国社会科学院“新自由主义研究”课题组：《新自由主义研究》，第 18-19 页。

³⁵ Thania Paffenholz. “Civil Society beyond Liberal Peace and Its Critique,” p. 139.

³⁶ 参见 Michael Doyle. “Kant, Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs,” *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 1983, Vol. 12, No. 3: 205-235. Mel Small and J. David Singer. “The War Proneness of Democratic Regimes, 1816-1965,” *Jerusalem Journal of International Relations I, Summer*, 1976, pp. 50-65. 转引自 Thania Paffenholz. “Civil Society beyond Liberal Peace and Its Critique,” p. 139.

³⁷ Rudolph Rummel. *Power Kills: Democracy as a Method of Nonviolence*, New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books. 1997.

³⁸ Adam Smith. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations: A Selected Edition*, Edited by Kathryn Sutherland, London: Oxford University Press, 1998.

³⁹ Margit Bussmann and Gerald Schneider, “When Globalization Discontent Turns Violent: Foreign Economic Liberalization and Internal War,” *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 51, No. 1 (March 2007), pp. 79-97. 转引自 Thania Paffenholz, “Civil Society beyond Liberal Peace and Its Critique,” p. 139; Amy Chua, *World on Fire: How Free Market Democracy Breeds Ethnic Hatred and Global Instability*, New York: Doubleday, 2003。

to international and domestic peace and security, and democracy could ensure that rationality would triumph over impulse. He believed that the only way to build lasting peace in Europe after the war would be for every nation-state to adopt liberal democracy.⁴⁰ During the Cold War, the world was divided into the “free world” and the “communist world”. In this situation democratic peace theory was not commonly discussed in the realm of international politics. Western countries did not see exporting liberal democracy as an important foreign policy. Many non-democratic countries were supported and sustained by the US and its allies which enabled them to maintain domestic stability and domestic systems that often were not democratic.

After the Cold War, democratic peace theory was reborn. In 1989, Francis Fukuyama asserted that liberal democracy had become the ultimate form of government for humankind, a development that he referred to as “The End of History”.⁴¹ Like the democratic peace theory, “The End of History” aroused a lot of debate within the academic world, but it received wide support from the political world. In 1993, Bill Clinton introduced “*A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement*”, which encouraged global expansion of liberal democracy. Liberal democracy started to become a tool for international intervention of the West.⁴² As Samuel Huntington said:

“the collapse of communism in (USSR and East Europe) has convinced people in western countries that liberal democracy won a victory throughout the world, because it is universal.....the west, especially the US, thinks that non-western countries should embrace western values such as democracy, free market, limited government, human rights,

⁴⁰ Woodrow Wilson, 1968, “The Modern Democratic State,” in Arthur S. Link, ed., *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, vol. 5. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press. 转引自 Roland Paris, *At War's End: Building Peace After Civil Conflict*, p. 7.

⁴¹ Francis Fukuyama, “The End of History?” *The National Interest*, No.16, Summer, 1989, pp. 3-18.

⁴² “Confronting the Challenges of a Broader World,” President Clinton Address to the United Nations General Assembly, New York City, September 27, 1993, from *Department of State Dispatch* 4, No. 39, September 27, 1993. 转引自[美]亨利·基辛格著，胡利平等译，《论中国》，北京：中信出版社，2013年，第452页。

individualism and rule of law”.⁴³

Under post-Cold War western hegemony, liberalism and *liberal peace* have had a large impact on theories and practices of international politics. In UN peace operations, the impact is reflected in peacebuilding processes that are dominated by *liberal peace*. There are many definitions of *liberal peace*. According to Oliver Richmond, *liberal peace* means a normative framework consisting of many elements such as good governance, democratic election, human rights, rule of law and free markets.⁴⁴ More people agree with a simple definition from Roland Paris: liberal peace predicts that self-sustaining peace can be realized by political and economic liberalization. In practice, it places an emphasis on election-based democracy, rule of law, human rights and civil society in terms of political institutions, and market economy in terms of economic arrangements.⁴⁵ As Roger MacGinty has pointed out, being favored by dominant countries, international organizations and international financial organizations, *liberal peace* has been the preferred choice in promoting international peace interventions.⁴⁶ In the field of UN peacekeeping operations, the norms of *liberal peace* have led to the discourse and practices of peacebuilding. In countries like Cambodia, East Timor, Liberia and Haiti, once UN peacekeeping missions are on the ground, building new political and economic institutions become the core focus of these missions.

As a result UN-led peacebuilding is narrow in its nature and serves only as part of the broader global peacebuilding architecture. In the framework of western-dominated peacebuilding, particularly represented by UN peacebuilding, *liberal peace* almost means peacebuilding model itself. Even in a broad definition, *liberal peace* is in a position of dominance because of international power structures. In broad definition

⁴³ [美]塞缪尔·亨廷顿著，周琪、刘绯等译：《文明的冲突与世界秩序的重建》（修订版），北京：新华出版社 2009 年版，第 161 页。

⁴⁴ Oliver P. Richmond. *Peace in International Relations*, London: Routledge, 2008.

⁴⁵ Roland Paris, *At War's End: Building Peace after Civil Conflict*.

⁴⁶ Roger Mac Ginty, *International Peacebuilding and Local Resistance: Hybrid Form of Peace*, New York : Palgrave Macmilian, 2011,p,11

of peacebuilding, however, *liberal peace* is by no means the only peace norm. There exist a number of non-western peacebuilding models.

In the next section this article will explore the peacebuilding model used and promoted through Chinese international aid and the influence of this model on the field of international peacebuilding.

Peace through Development

The rapid rise of China brings up an important political economics question: why has China succeeded? The answer can be found by examining the “China model”.⁴⁷ In response to the question of whether there is a “China model”, some scholars agree that the model is developing⁴⁸ or has developed.⁴⁹ Some recognize the achievements of China’s development, but do not agree that it has developed into a model. They believe it is more accurate to use the word “special characteristics”⁵⁰ or “roads”⁵¹ to define the development. Literally, “model” means it can be applied universally, while “special characteristics” or “roads” emphasizes its application in certain cases. Therefore, the debate over the “China model” is related to China’s status as a global power – that is, it has yet to be seen whether China’s model can become one of global governance models. This author does not agree with the assertion that China’s approach can be referred to as the “China model”; nevertheless, the author does agree that the influence of China on global governance should not be neglected. In fact, it is

⁴⁷ 有关争论“中国模式”的文献，参见胡健，《争论中的中国模式：内涵、特点和意义》，载《社会科学》2010年第6期，第3-11页；贾海涛：《中国模式：在现实与想象之间》，载《南京理工大学学报》（社会科学版），2010年第6期，第1-18页；郑永年：《中国模式——经验与困局》，杭州：浙江人民出版社，2010；郑永年：《为什么要提“中国模式”》，《联合早报》，2010年5月4日；李君如：《慎提“中国模式”》，载《学习时报》，2009年12月7日；秦晖：《有没有“中国模式”》，载《南方都市报》2010年4月6日。俞可平：《“中国模式”并没有完全定型》，载《社会观察》2010年第12期，第94-95页；俞可平：《关于“中国模式”的思考》，载《红旗文稿》2005年第19期，第13-15页。

⁴⁸ 俞可平：《“中国模式”并没有完全定型》，载《教书育人》2009年第14期。

⁴⁹ 潘维：《当代中华体制——中国模式的经济、政治、社会解析》，载潘维主编《中国模式：解构人民共和国的60年》，中央编译出版社2009年版。第5、6页。徐贵相：《中国发展模式研究》，北京：人民出版社2008年版。韩保江：《中国奇迹与中国发展模式》，成都：四川人民出版社，2008年版。

⁵⁰ 李君如：《慎提“中国模式”》。

⁵¹ 李君如：《慎提“中国模式”》。

⁵¹ 章兴宣：《‘中国模式’与中国和平发展道路》，载中共中央党校国际战略研究所编，《新战略研究》2013年第3期，北京：九州出版社，2013年，第57-72页。

an approach that has been gaining increasing attention.

Deborah Brautigam has studied China's aid to Africa through using data analysis and case studies. She points out that there is a fundamental difference between the provision of aid by China and the provision of aid by western countries to Africa. China has placed more emphasis on infrastructure construction in comparison to assistance from western countries. China does not set political conditions as an exchange for aid.⁵² Although Brautigam does not use the word "model", she is actually discussing a kind of China aid model that is different from the western one.

Steven C. Y. Kuo takes Liberia as an example to study China's investment, aid and peacekeeping activities. He believes that China's understanding of security in Africa is based on its persistence to Westphalian system of national sovereignty, and years of experience in infrastructure building and development. It has become the "Chinese model of peacebuilding".

Steven C. Y. Kuo proposes a "Chinese peace model", but its definition and explanation need more discussion.⁵³ China's development and international aid efforts indeed provide a different approach from *liberal peace*. But if we study it in-depth, we will discover that it is not as "Chinese" as Kuo suggests. This model includes two pillars: economic development through state investment as a national priority (especially investment in infrastructure) and adherence to the principle of sovereignty and non-interference. This contrasts with the model of *liberal peace* that makes use of political terms for aid operations. The first pillar of the "Chinese model" described by Kuo does not come uniquely from China, because Singapore, Taiwan and South Korea's economic successes hinged on prioritizing economic development.⁵⁴ In some African countries Chinese enterprises establish special

⁵² Deborah Brautigam, *The Dragon's Gift: The Real Story of China in Africa*, pp. 307-312。叶一志：《中国与非洲：互利和援助并存》。

⁵³ 何银：《中国崛起与国际规范体系：以联合国维和行动为例》，第 37-38 页。

⁵⁴ "发展型国家" (developmental state) 一词最早由美国学者查默斯·约翰逊 (Chalmers Johnson) 于 1982

economic zones based on Hong Kong's experience in Mauritius. China's investment in natural resources in Africa, which is criticized by some conservative western media and think tanks, is copied from previous practices of Japan in China – loans, technology and services are exchanged for resources.⁵⁵ Even the second pillar, the exclusion of political terms, is not unique for China: emerging countries such as Brazil, India and Russia also provide aid without political terms. In addition, China's aid operations in many developing countries, including those in Africa, have paid more attention to infrastructure and livelihood issues. This is spillover from the national development experience, where economic development as a national priority. Therefore, instead of creating a "Chinese model", China is promoting an emerging practice and bringing it to the center of the international stage, via its increasing influence.⁵⁶

Today, China plays a significant role in global peacebuilding efforts and *peace through development* is a term that can define China's development and international aid approach.⁵⁷ If the essence of *liberal peace* is a focus on institutions, the core of *peace through development* is economic development. For post-conflict countries, *peace through development* focuses on some aspects neglected by *liberal peace*.⁵⁸ For example, since the 1980s, aid from western countries has rarely gone to agriculture and infrastructure. Instead investment is mainly for the exchange of resources. China's aid focuses on infrastructure, industry and agriculture. Investment is under loan programs and provides services in exchange of resources. For example, under the loan program between China and Angola, China provides commodities made in China, and services from Chinese construction and engineering companies

年在对日本崛起的认识之上提出，之后被用于泛指在工业化方面起步较晚但是成绩斐然的东亚国家。参见 Chalmers Johnson, *MITI and the Japanese Miracle: The Growth of Industrial Policy, 1925-1975*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1982; Meredith Woo-Cumings, ed., *The Developmental State*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1999.

⁵⁵ Deborah Brautigam, *The Dragon's Gift, the Real Story of China in Africa*.

⁵⁶ 何银：《中国崛起与国际规范体系——以联合国维和行动为例》，第 38 页。

⁵⁷ 何银：《中国崛起与国际规范体系——以联合国维和行动为例》，第 38-39 页。

⁵⁸ 参见 Deborah Brautigam, *The Dragon's Gift, the Real Story of China in Africa*; Steven C.Y. Kuo, "China's Understanding of African Security: Context and Limitations.;" Ian Taylor, *China's New Role in Africa*, Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2009.

rather than money.

The Two Models of Peacebuilding and Human Security

The two models represent different approaches to peacebuilding. As shown in Table 2, the two models enjoy different statuses on the international stage, different areas of focus in terms of their approach to peacebuilding, and different considerations for human security. *Liberal peace* is the dominant norm on the international stage while *peace through development* is emerging. The former concentrates on institution building and political security, the latter on economic development and economic security.

Table 2: Difference of the Two Models

	“Liberal Peace”	“Developmental Peace”
International Status	Dominant Norm	Emerging Norm
Areas of Focus	Institution Building	Economic Development
Human Security	Political Security	Economic Security

As mentioned before, institution building and economic development are the two pillars of peacebuilding. Political security and economic security are the key elements of human security. *Liberal peace* and *peace through development* are complementary to each other. Therefore, there is a positive interaction between them that influences peacebuilding and human security. In practice, how do they interact with each other? Little existing literature on peacebuilding recognizes alternatives to *liberal peace*. Paris insists that democracy and liberty are the only choice for peacebuilding.⁵⁹ This view is similar to Francis Fukuyama’s “End of History” theory, which, in the author’s

⁵⁹ Roland Paris, “Alternatives to Liberal Peace?” in Susanna Campbell, David Chandler and Meera Sabaratnam (eds.), *A Liberal Peace?: The Problems and Practices of Peacebuilding*, London and New York: Zed Books, 2011, pp. 159-173.

opinion, is an idealist aspiration. However, only thinking about democracy and liberty neglects the real situation in peacebuilding. The studies of Brautigam, Kuo and this author indicate that in the practice of peacebuilding in Africa *liberal peace* is not the only option.⁶⁰

At the moment, the international peacebuilding system consists of a dominant model and an emerging model.⁶¹ *Liberal peace*, initiated by the West, is at the center of global peacebuilding theories and practices while *peace through development* is an emerging model. The interaction and competition between these models is a question that, thus far, has been neglected by theorists of international relations.⁶² As Yaqing Qin points out, there are two ways to recognize conflict and competition: one is the Western conflict dialectic based on division and categorization, the other is the Chinese golden mean dialectic based on relations and process.⁶³ The former concentrates on conflict, looking for a single certainty in a world and wherein only one conflict party can survive.⁶⁴ The latter concentrates on a harmonious relationship, and suggests that interaction between two conflicting parties does not always lead to zero sum, but could result in something integrated.⁶⁵ It is not clear so far which way is right. Nevertheless, by comparing the cases of peacekeeping operations in Liberia and Haiti, the author believes that the Liberian case, which allowed for competition and coexistence of the two models, ultimately was more successful than the application of liberal peace alone in the case of Haiti.⁶⁶

Conclusion

⁶⁰ Deborah Brautigam, *The Dragon's Gift: The Real Story of China in Africa*; Steven C.Y. Kuo, "China's Understanding of African Security: Context and Limitations." 何银：《中国崛起与国际规范体系——以联合国维和行动为例》。

⁶¹ 何银：《规范竞争：谁的规范重要？——一个被忽视的研究议程》，载秦亚青编：《国际政治与全球治理》，北京：世界知识出版社 2013 年版，第 230-240 页。

⁶² 何银：《规范竞争：谁的规范重要？——一个被忽视的研究议程》。

⁶³ 秦亚青：《关系与过程：中国国际关系理论的文化建构》，上海：上海人民出版社 2012 年版，第 84-99 页。

⁶⁴ 秦亚青：《关系与过程：中国国际关系理论的文化建构》，第 93 页。

⁶⁵ 秦亚青：《关系与过程：中国国际关系理论的文化建构》，第 93-99 页。

⁶⁶ 何银：《中国崛起与国际规范体系——以联合国维和行动为例》。

In a post-Cold War era, peacebuilding has become a core task of UN peace operations. At the same time, the discussion of human security is emerging. For theorists and practitioners, peacebuilding includes a variety of tasks. When we simplify them into two pillars (institution building and economic development) and two essential elements (political and economic security), it is easier to understand the connection between peacebuilding and human security.

The long-term emphasis on *liberal peace* ignores economic development and economic security. It creates an illusion of peace and security. China's aid to many countries has created a new *peace through developmental* model, which emphasizes economic development and economic security.

Although *liberal peace* and *peace through development* may be complementary, the differences and different opinions about models of conflict and coexistence make the interaction between the two models difficult. As Edward Carr points out, international politics is neither pure utopian nor realism; instead, it is/should be the combination of the two.⁶⁷ Advocates of each of the two models, if they think only from their own point of view, cannot make lasting peace. So peacebuilding in the 21st century should be the balance between *liberal peace* and *peace through development*, between institution building and economic development, between political security and economic security. This is the way to lasting peace.

⁶⁷ [英]爱德华·卡尔著，秦亚青译：《二十年危机（1919-1939）：国际关系研究导论》，第 213 页。