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Abstract

Even the most obvious actions require justification. The need for justification of peacebuilding involvements is always present. This thesis argues that justification is particularly needed when there is a prevalent power asymmetry between an external state and a host community. The dissertation addresses how the attempts of states to justify their engagement in peacebuilding should be evaluated in the light of justification theory. The study’s research questions are addressed by developing a theoretical framework based on justification theory that is combined with empirical case studies. As a result, the starting-point for this dissertation is both descriptive and normative. It builds upon and develops the theory of justification offered by Rainer Forst, by testing Forst’s formal criteria of reciprocity and generality on two case studies, the Republic of South Africa and the Russian Federation.

The thesis attempts to scrutinize the role played by the justifications made by external states engaged in peacebuilding. The focus on how Russia and South Africa view, act, and try to justify their peacebuilding efforts, serves to further nuance our theoretical understanding of the justification of external states in peacebuilding processes. The study is exploring which justification strategies are being used and how. By combining ethical analysis with empirical research and by building on an analysis of the case studies, the study presents two typologies of the attempts at justification which Russia and South Africa make in their foreign policy discourse. In order to accomplish this, the thesis uses different methods, including case studies, expert interviews, and document analysis.

This study is written within the critical discipline of social ethics. By making a critical analysis of the official Russian and South African foreign policy discourses on peace engagements, this dissertation aims to contribute to existing literature both empirically and theoretically. The analysis shows that Forst’s formal criteria are useful, but not sufficient, to analyse states’ justificatory attempts. The study aims to contribute both to our understanding of Russian and South African engagements in peacebuilding processes abroad, as well as justification of peacebuilding and the role of ethics and morality in foreign policy generally.
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1. Introduction

There is a tension between internal and external actors when it comes to peacebuilding. This is based on the assumption that while the internal actor should lead the process, most often external actors do. The global community of states, most notably the United Nations (UN), often takes the lead in supporting a post-conflict community while it gets back on its feet. Besides global multilateral initiatives, an increasing number of initiatives are driven by regional organisations. In addition, different states are also engaged in peacebuilding on a bilateral basis. Inherent in peacebuilding systems, regardless of the terms of cooperation, there is an inevitable power asymmetry between the states involved. This applies in particular between the state that has experienced civil war and the external states supporting the peace process and places a demand on external states to provide justifications for their involvement in peacebuilding processes. The need for justification is always present, and the pressure increases the more powerful the external state is.

Justifying the obvious?

Why would we assume that peacebuilding needs to be justified? When the concept of peacebuilding was first introduced in the international arena, the inherent value of doing a good and morally right thing was strongly emphasised and acknowledged. Yet, peacebuilding is a difficult task that challenges central aspects of international law in that it involves external states within the territory of another state. Arguably, even the most obvious actions require justification.

The concept of peacebuilding has developed as a response to conflict resolution, and as a way of breaking cycles of violence after the many intra-state conflicts which arose after the Cold War. During the last decades of the twentieth century, and the first of the twenty-first century,
the most common type of armed conflict has been civil war.\(^1\) Arguably to a greater extent than traditional warfare between states, civil wars affect civilian populations in ways that violate human rights and hamper the provision of basic needs. Continuous human rights violations seem to have led to new armed conflicts and wars,\(^2\) demonstrating a need to break the cycle of violence and prevent relapses. It is in this context that peacebuilding has developed as both a concept and a practice.

The justification of external states in peacebuilding is interesting to study for at least three reasons. First, international peacemaking and peacebuilding are, by definition, a set of actions or initiatives which are closely supported, implemented, and governed by various actors outside the country (often called the host country) where the peace is supposed to be built. The main purpose of peacebuilding is to initiate processes aiming at improving the structures and living conditions for people living in conflict-affected societies. However, the peacebuilding activities of external actors’ rest on several assumptions and underpinnings that can clash with the local dimension of a peacebuilding process, a condition which, from an ethical perspective, makes this external dimension problematic. This originates from the fact that peacebuilding missions frequently seek to promote national autonomy and self-governance, but do so by means of international interventions. Even though these initiatives are designed to support national authorities, the power exercised by external states is inevitably intrusive, no matter how well-intentioned the peacebuilding engagements may be.\(^3\) Furthermore, the ethics of peacebuilding are therefore closely connected to the paradox that outside engagement is often used to foster self-governance.

Secondly, peacebuilding needs to be justified when it challenges the main principle of the present international system - the principle of sovereignty. A breach of this principle means breaking an international norm, something which always requires justification. Yet justification is also needed when there is consent from the host state. Arguably the principle of sovereignty is still affected in the event of consent, but from the point of view of international law it is not considered a breach. In addition, as this thesis argues, justification is in particular needed when there is a prevalent power asymmetry between the external state and the

---

\(^1\) Civil war is used interchangeably of intrastate armed conflict and state-based conflict and refers to organized violence within a state.

\(^2\) Thoms & Ron 2007:677, 703-705

\(^3\) Paris 2009:1
host community. As a result, the starting point for this dissertation is both descriptive and normative.

Thirdly, most external states try to justify their peacebuilding engagements. But how this is done has not been sufficiently covered in previous research in ethics. It seems intriguing to ask to what degree and in what ways external actors are justifying their engagements in post-conflict societies. It is also intriguing to ask whether they are using morality in their argumentation. Additionally, how are these justificatory attempts to be understood and assessed? I address these questions by developing a theoretical framework based on justification theory in combination with empirical case studies.

This dissertation is related to the moral issue of international responsibility on the one hand, and the principle of sovereignty on the other. It focuses on finding normative criteria for adequate justification of actions by external actors in the context of peacebuilding. As of today, there is no suitable theoretical framework within which to analyse the arguments of external actors within the ethics of peacebuilding after a civil war. This dissertation therefore aims to fill this theoretical gap by developing and proposing a modified theoretical approach.

I argue that justification theory is the most suitable approach, and the theoretical discussion is anchored in theories of just war, justification, and global justice. My theoretical framework is primarily based on research by Rainer Forst, Jürgen Habermas, and John Rawls, and I develop a conceptualisation of ‘attempts to justify’ and ‘justification strategies’. This is helpful in creating a bridge between the normative discussion of justification and the empirical findings of the case studies. The main focus of previous research has tended to be the parties to a conflict, or intervention during war, and less on the role and justification of external actors during the post-conflict phase. Importantly, efforts are being made to develop a framework for jus post bellum, or justice after war, in relation to the just war tradition and global justice, and there is also a growing body of research which examines the moral imperative of the responsibility to rebuild.4

This study is written within the critical discipline of social ethics, here understood as a branch of philosophy and theology, and a discipline which deals with systematic critique of morality. As I will show, much previous research on the topic of peacebuilding, peace intervention, and jus post bellum has been written within legal studies, peace

---

studies, and philosophy, something that lends this dissertation particular relevance for audiences outside of the discipline of ethics.

Norms and actors

Peacekeeping and peacebuilding actions are influenced by the normative underpinnings of the liberal peace, commonly understood as the combination of peace, democracy, and free markets. The liberal peace, in turn, promotes a transformation process of democratization, economic liberalisation, and pacification as the foundation of peacebuilding. Yet, the critics of liberal peacebuilding are several and the paradigm has been scrutinised and examined numerous times. The critique is often centred on the possibility of inefficiency and potential further harm and directed towards the risk of imposing Western liberal models on weak states. In addition, a common critique concerns an overemphasis on issues connected to democratization, economic reforms as well as rule of law.

The ethical aspects of intervention and the use of force have been on the agenda for many researchers. However, for the most part these works focus particularly on intervention, and do not consider the type of actions that follow the initial military intervention, in particular the peacebuilding process. Since peacebuilding is more focused on long-term change and the creation of sustainable peace, I revisit the argument that it is evident that the transformation of norms during this process needs to be examined. One way of doing that is to assess the arguments that external states’ make use of to justify their involvement in peacebuilding.

Externality in peacebuilding can be understood on different levels or dimensions. In this dissertation, external state actors are central to the study. Yet, it is noteworthy that in peacebuilding at large, an external actor could also be a domestic actor but one who is external to the process, for example a person or group from another community than the

---

5 Richmond 2006:292
7 Richmond 2006:292
9 This is by no means a new argument, and it has previously been assessed by several scholars, also with a focus on peacebuilding, see for example Wolff & Zimmermann 2016, Zimmermann 2014
ones involved in a non-state conflict. The different layers make the factors deciding on externality dependent upon the type of conflict or issue at hand. This variation reveals a vagueness in the notion of externality and how outsiders and/or externals are understood, which is important to recall when analysing different contexts. Importantly, this dissertation focuses on the role of other states as international external actors.

An argument often made by international actors involved in peacebuilding activities is that the situation in post-conflict societies would have been worse if the international community had failed to act, and that peacebuilding is the “right thing to do”. That type of argumentation raises at least two concerns, first, the issue of counterfactual assessments, and second, who or what can assess the outcome. This is further problematized by evidence that peacebuilding actions and willingness to help do not always benefit the target group, or those concerned. Theoretically, it makes sense to assume that the recipients should decide when the efforts are to be deemed legitimate or not. However, this is not always the case; paradoxically, it is often external actors who are effectively involved in identifying legitimate local leaders even though this decision is supposed to be made at a local level.\textsuperscript{10}

States seem to engage in peacebuilding activities in different ways and for various motives. This might be accounted for by factoring in a state’s desire to present itself in a favourable light as well as by paying attention to the power of reputation, both for the domestic constituency as well as for international actors. Power dimensions are clearly crucial in international relations and this reputational focus may undermine the legitimacy and the moral dimension of peacebuilding due to the risk of primarily focusing on measurable actions rather than on addressing the most substantial needs. This view is supported by Timothy Murithi, who argues that unethical behaviour by external actors in peacebuilding settings can undermine efforts to bring order and stability.\textsuperscript{11} Kristoffer Lidén, who has been researching the role of the liberal peace in world politics, states that current peacebuilding debates tend to focus on the issue of political objectives and the consequences of contemporary peacebuilding, and what those objectives ought to be. Current debates have been unable to address the normative question of “why”.\textsuperscript{12}

Most research on the role of external actors in peacebuilding processes tends to focus on powerful and influential (Western) countries.

\textsuperscript{10} Paris & Sisk 2009:4
\textsuperscript{11} Murithi 2009:9, 72
\textsuperscript{12} Lidén 2009:617
Yet the group of most influential countries in the international arena with regard to peace and security issues is undoubtedly the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) (France, the United Kingdom, China, the United States, and Russia). In many debates and in much research, there has been an explicit focus on the traditionally dominant Western international actors, such as the US, the UK and France, while non-Western approaches to peacebuilding have been largely absent.

Taking critical theory seriously

The baseline of this dissertation is grounded in ethics as a critical discipline. This accords with the theoretical discussion, which situates this dissertation in critical theory, but is also visible in the empirical parts of the thesis. This needs to be elaborated further.

This dissertation focuses on emerging powers in the international arena, more specifically two of the BRICS countries - South Africa and Russia. I will discuss this choice further below. As the agency of states might shift over time and (re)emerge, the group of most influential states in world politics is changing. This is, as Oliver Stuenkel puts it, likely leading to the world’s decision-making elite becoming less Western, with fewer common interests, and more ideological diversity. This necessitates a greater and more nuanced understanding of (re)emerging powers’ views on various topics in world affairs.14

Any country would make an interesting case to analyse in relation to the justification of peacebuilding engagements. However, given that previous research has largely focused on states situated in the global West or North, it will be fruitful to analyse these two particular countries in order to study them with regard to agency and justificatory strategies. The selection of these particular BRICS states as case studies is warranted by three factors. The first concerns the identity-formation stage at which these countries currently find themselves. The Republic of South Africa and the Russian Federation are both countries engaged

---

13 BRICS is an acronym for the grouping of the world’s leading emerging economies, namely Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa. According to one of the collaboration’s official websites, it practises three tracks or levels of interaction: ‘Track I: Formal diplomatic engagement between the national governments, Track II: Engagement through government-affiliated institutions, e.g. state-owned enterprises and business councils, Track III: Civil society and “people-to-people” engagement’. What is BRICS? (2018)
14 Stuenkel 2014a:4
in building their identity with regard to foreign policy and their position in world politics.\textsuperscript{15} South Africa wants to show the new identity of the state, distancing itself from apartheid. While Russia, on the other hand, is struggling with accepting its less powerful role and sometimes distancing itself from its past, while emphasising a multipolar world.\textsuperscript{16} The second factor concerns the variation these two cases offer: there are important differences in the position and room for manoeuvre of each country with regard to agency in the international arena. This variation is also connected to their respective position in the international community, besides hard as well as soft power.\textsuperscript{17} The third factor concerns the starting point of each of these countries with regard to global justice. Neither of them is satisfied with how the international community is structured; both want more global justice and to be taken seriously. The third factor ties into critical theory.

What connects the BRICS in general, and South Africa and Russia in particular, to critical theory is that they are pursuing change in the global system and that they are dissatisfied with the current structure of the world order. Collaborations such as BRICS or Third World Approaches to International Law (TWAIL) exemplify this critique of the global order. For example, BRICS, although initially an economic collaboration, has grown to cover other areas. It is a strategic organisation initiated by the member states and their quest for cooperation as regionally important states. TWAIL offer a different, yet also critical, perspective on the international community. It is also different in that it is more a social and academic movement than a formal organisation.

TWAIL’s critique of what it sees as the current neoliberal system of international law is highly relevant for the discussion of the role and justification of external actors in international relations and post-conflict peacebuilding, not least in that a number of external actors typically use international law as a way of legitimizing their actions. The critique is being extended, in particular against the undermining of the sovereignty of underdeveloped states. This is of particular importance since the discussion of redefining state sovereignty is being justified

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{15} Alden & le Pere 2004:283, le Pere 2017:101, Trenin 2009:64, Mielniczuk 2013:1077
Foreign policy is in this dissertation broadly understood as a government’s strategy in dealing with other nations, and activities are ranging from international trade policies to military interventions. In all types of policy areas, decision-making is crucial to understand the shifts and continuities in grand policy strategies.

\textsuperscript{16} Alden & le Pere 2004:283, Mielniczuk 2013:1077, 1080, 1085 Yet, recent events in Russian foreign policy indicates a hardening line.

\textsuperscript{17} For a discussion on different types of power, see Nye 2008:94ff}
through the ideological apparatuses of the northern states and the international institutions, which these control.\textsuperscript{18} TWAIL and BRICS offer different types of critique, but both offer critique which can be connected to critical theory. Further, critical theory is based in a critique of how the world is structured, as are TWAIL and BRICS.

BRICS is an interesting collaboration for many reasons. It started mainly as an economic collaboration and is sometimes considered a counterpart to the G8 countries (i.e. Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Russia, the UK and the US), and hence offering alternative perspectives on world development. The parallel with the G8 is somewhat contradictory. Russia, for example, has been part of both alliances but, due to developments in Ukraine and the annexation of Crimea, is excluded from the G8 (instead G7+). The BRICS countries are taking on a larger role in the economic field, but their role in peace and security issues is underexplored. Thus, it seems interesting to ask what these countries’ strategies for peacebuilding support look like, as well as how and why they prioritise and structure their efforts. It might be reasonable to ask whether they prioritize and structure their peacebuilding initiatives differently from traditional powers. And most importantly, are they trying to justify their peacebuilding engagements by presenting individual alternatives or an agreed-upon programme that differ from the strategies of the more established peacebuilding countries? This is addressed by the research questions of this study, which will be presented shortly.

A shared premise for the five BRICS countries is that they cherish the principle of sovereignty, and even though the collaboration has been primarily economic, they have occasionally also achieved joint security policies.\textsuperscript{19} This is exemplified by their joint stance on sanctions against Iran and their position on the intervention of Libya in 2011.\textsuperscript{20} Additionally, there have been high-level meetings where joint efforts to peace and security have been addressed, and security topics have begun to appear more frequently in key BRICS documents.\textsuperscript{21} However, the prospect of formulating a common security agenda remains slight and efforts have tended to focus on the prevention of armed conflicts.\textsuperscript{22}

\textsuperscript{18} Chimni 2006:14  
\textsuperscript{19} Stuenkel 2014b:1, Nikonov 2013:2  
\textsuperscript{20} Nikonov 2013:2, Odeyemi 2016:1-16, Important to note, the events on Iran and Libya took place just before South Africa formally became a member of the alliance.  
\textsuperscript{21} Abdenur 2017:72, Panova 2015:119  
\textsuperscript{22} Abdenur 2017:73-75
South Africa is the newest member of the BRICS alliance and is considered one of the leading economies on the African continent. Having the African continent represented amongst the BRICS is symbolically important, and South Africa, as the continent’s economic giant and self-appointed spokesman for African development, has been strengthen by its joining BRICS. However, as scholars such as Chris Alden and Maxi Schoeman have argued, South Africa, though emboldened by the invitation, is realising that playing a greater international role carries with it unanticipated costs, complications, and challenges, not least in relation to the unresolved issue of South African identity, domestic limitations linked to material capabilities and internal politics, and the divided continental reaction to South African leadership. South Africa has undoubtedly assumed a larger role in continental affairs in the last ten to twenty years, and is expected – and itself expects – to take the lead in many peace and security efforts, to promote regional economic integration, and to fund development projects in other developing countries, primarily on the African continent.

Neil MacFarlane argues that Russia cannot be understood as an emerging power in the conventional sense of the phrase. Yet Russia is taking on a substantial role within the BRICS, even though the role of Russia in world politics has shifted during recent years and in particular after the initiation of the Ukrainian crisis. Scholars such as Roger E. Kanet and Rémi Piet argue that there has been a shift in Russia’s foreign policy from the West towards Eurasia and East Asia, initiated as early as 1996 when President Yeltsin appointed Evgenyi Primakov as foreign minister. Kanet and Piet argue that this development has been even more evident during President Vladimir Putin’s third term. Russia has a prominent role within the international system, above all as one of the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC), a position which both provides an opportunity to influence

---

23 The criteria for the BRICS countries have been formulated differently in terms of: (1) the outstanding size of their economies, (2) strong growth rates, leading to their increasing significance in the world economy, and (3) the demand for a stronger political voice in international governance structures, one that corresponds to their economic status. See Morazán et al. 2012:4. Another model is offered by Neil MacFarlane and includes the following three characteristics: regional dominance, aspiration to a global role, and contestation of US hegemony. MacFarlane 2006:41
24 South Africa was formally included as a member in 2011
25 Alden & Schoeman 2013:111
26 Morazán et al. 2012:15–16
27 MacFarlane 2006:56
28 Kanet & Piet 2014:1
world politics and brings great responsibility. Russian involvement in peace issues has long been dominated by a focus on the post-Soviet sphere. However, and partly given its role on the UNSC, the Russian Federation has long been involved in peacebuilding in different ways via the UN structures.

The BRICS countries make an important critique of the global system of international cooperation and global justice. This is in many regards legitimate in the eyes of smaller and/or less influential states in the search for global equality: all countries should be taken seriously, and all voices heard. However, and importantly, this needs to be accompanied by critical self-reflection to avoid neo-imperialistic tendencies amongst the BRICS themselves in relation to peacebuilding initiatives. While the need for an awareness of power is necessary on all fronts, it is clearly most important among the actors with most power and influence.

Building on an analysis of the case studies, I develop a typology of the attempts at justification which South Africa and Russia make in their foreign policy discourse. Here, the understanding of the attempts to justify becomes crucial for the connection between the theoretically normative discussion of justification and the empirical findings. The focus on the responsibility of external actors in post-civil war contexts will thereby contribute to an ongoing research debate on both a theoretical and an empirical level. I suggest a model based on two criteria for justifying peacebuilding on a theoretical level and evaluate their applicability based on empirical information in order to develop, further nuance and better articulate the theoretical argument. The main focus on the role of justification by external actors in peacebuilding aims to contribute to the field in its scrutiny of applied justification. It is fruitful to use the two countries as case studies, as the focus on how Russia and South Africa view, act, and try to justify their peacebuilding efforts, serves to further nuance our empirical understanding of the justification of external states in peacebuilding.

The contribution this dissertation aims making to the research debates in justification theory, ethics of peacebuilding, and critical peace studies is hence to scrutinise the role of justification and legitimisation

---

29 Whether the Russian actions in the post-Soviet sphere are to be seen as peace missions is a much debated issue. Given that it is the states’ own perceptions that are studied here, and that Russia frames several of their actions as peace missions, this will be adopted, yet discussed.

30 A discourse is here understood as “a particular way of talking about and understanding the world (or an aspect of the world)”. Jørgensen & Philips 2002:1
of external actors in peacebuilding. There is a deliberate choice not to focus on legitimacy since this is primarily a political manoeuvre whereas justification is about justice and hence a question of ethics and morality. This enquiry is pursued in a series of stages, and the theoretical discussion is anchored in justification theory as well as the just war tradition and global justice.

Aims and research questions

The aims of this dissertation are threefold. The main aim is to explore how compatible justification is with, and to what extent it could be applied to, the externality of peacebuilding actors while also assessing and analysing the ways in which justification theory can enhance our understanding of the ethics of peacebuilding. A second aim is to explore how external states try to justify their involvement in peacebuilding efforts. This aim is pursued by analysing foreign policy discourses of South Africa and Russia. The third aim is to articulate criteria for reasonable justification of external states involvement in peacebuilding.

This thesis thus has an analytic, an explorative and a normative component. I conduct a critical analysis of external agency in peacebuilding engagements where the analysis is centred on the attempts to justify involvements in peacebuilding. In addition, I explore the justification of South Africa and Russia as peacebuilding actors, both descriptively and normatively. The normative component is further strengthened by the articulation of a theory for external engagement in peacebuilding initiatives, towards a justificatory order of peacebuilding.

The main research question of this dissertation is articulated as follows: How can peacebuilding be justified? To answer this question, the dissertation addresses three sub-questions. The first is: In what ways do external states justify their engagements in post-conflict societies? This question is primarily of a descriptive and explorative character, addressing the trends and prioritisations that have been made regarding peacebuilding initiatives by South Africa and Russia during the period of study. This question helps to systematize the analysis of the different types of collaborations which the states have initiated with regard to peacebuilding initiatives, such as the UN, regional organisations, or bilateral agreements. It also addresses how peacebuilding ought to be understood and justified in the two cases.
The second question is: *How are these justificatory attempts to be assessed?* This is a question with both explorative and normative characteristics. It is explorative in addressing the understanding of justificatory attempts and how they relate to other factors such as historical or contemporary events taking place either at a local or global level. It further explores to what extent the formal criteria of reciprocity and generality is applicable to the political action of states trying to justify their peacebuilding involvements. This question is also normative in that it addresses how these justificatory attempts should be assessed.

The third and final question is: *What are plausible criteria for justified peacebuilding?* This is a normative as well as critical question, one that seeks to develop theory. The question also addresses what kind of justification is applicable to peacebuilding. It is critical in that it challenges current thinking around peacebuilding as well as the involvement of external actors in peacebuilding initiatives. It is normative in that it suggests a model for justified peacebuilding, and therefore makes proposals as to how peacebuilding should be justified.

There is an important nuance in the terminology used in framing these questions as it relates to justification. Attempts to justify peacebuilding engagements are not per definition understood to be the same as the philosophical ideal of justification. This crucial nuance is further explored in the theoretical chapter, but it is central to highlight it in relation to the research questions since it has implications for how to understand the questions. Before embarking upon a systematic examination of the research questions, let us turn the discussion to the role of ethics in foreign policy and peacebuilding.

**Ethics, peace and power**

Although there is a growing research literature on normative and ethical dimensions of peace, there are still gaps to be filled. One of the main contributions in this thesis is to theorize ethics in peacebuilding, and the justificatory attempts of external states. Previous research has often had a focus on the conceptual implications or has been centred on the more general legitimacy of international interventions.\(^{31}\) Peacebuilding, on the other hand, has been neglected in previous research debates around applied ethics, political legitimacy, and justification.\(^{32}\)


\(^{32}\) Higashi 2012
It is important to study the moral justifications of peacebuilding since they are connected to the theoretical foundation for our actions. Ethical principles like ‘do good’, ‘do no harm’, ‘equality’ and ‘justice’ are guidelines for what is right. These are not only applicable at an individual level. I argue, following other scholars, that these principles should also be the guiding principles in international cooperation albeit in a different way than for individuals. In the international arena, a number of values and ideologies influence relationships and decision-making.

When it comes to how to understand the structure of the international society, as well as what role ethics and morality has in this structure, this dissertation acknowledges a descriptive realist position and a non-realist normative position. This positioning recognizes the importance of power as governing an anarchic international community in the sense there exists no supra-state authority and that the hierarchy amongst states is unclear. States gain recognition if they show that they can handle and maintain their sovereignty. The interests of a state, which can be very differently formulated, are always the starting point for the individual state. This positioning also recognises that the influence which some actors have is asymmetrical in comparison to other actors, and that political, economic, and ideological aspects exert an enormous influence on the international system. In the field of international relations, power is commonly defined as an ability to affect others to achieve the outcomes one wants. This is often a designation for coercion and military strength, hard power, as opposed to attraction and diplomatic cooperation, or soft power. Hard power is the kind of power to which the realist paradigm most often refers. This kind of power seems only able to make a limited contribution to the discussion of peacebuilding since peacebuilding is a process in which military options are replaced by political options. Therefore, a discussion of soft power seems more reasonable: peacebuilding is often a question of power as well as of power asymmetries. It was stated at the beginning of this chapter that the need for justification is always present, but also that this need increases the more powerful the external state is. This has to do with the degree of power asymmetry: the more powerful a state is, the more responsibilities it has.
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33 For further discussion on these imperatives and their practical implications in peacebuilding, see for example Goetze 2017:9, 145, 195; Neufeldt 2016b, Neufeldt 2014
34 Nye 2008:94 The combination of hard and soft power is commonly referred to as smart power.
The ethics and justification of peacebuilding are connected to the role of ethics in foreign policy, which has attracted much scholarly attention over the years and in relation to which several approaches have been articulated. The diversity of approaches can be divided into two strands, one arguing that morality does not have a role in politics, a perspective commonly understood as realism. The other strand instead recognizes the role of morality in politics, what sometimes referred to as idealism or moralism. These types are not to be confused with those positions that are conventionally designated political realism and political liberalism. Political realism is generally understood as a view of international politics as governed by states that are conflictual and competitive actors driven by national interest and their own security as well as by a struggle for power. The position developed in this dissertation acknowledges descriptive realism in that it sees national interest as the primary goals for states. Yet it is non-realist on a normative level. This allows morality to provide perspectives for critical assessment of the attempts to justify political actions. States act based on their interests and the power they have. Yet they are also dependent on each other and arguably use factors other than power and material interests to justify their actions. Furthermore, critique matters, which is why it is reasonable to be descriptively realist but normatively non-realist. On this view, critical theory makes an important contribution because morality provides formal criteria for justification. This offers the possibility of critically assess states’ attempts to justify political actions such as engagement in peacebuilding.

The assumption guiding this study is that ethics has a role to play in foreign policy in general and in the role and justification of external actors in peacebuilding in particular. In this vein, some studies have approached the question of what it means to be an ‘ethical actor’, i.e. ethical state, in international relations. This is important when trying to
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35 Chandler 2003:295ff, Chandler argues that there has been a shift, “from the openly declared pursuit of national interests in foreign policy, to the growing emphasis on ethical or moral duties to protect the rights and interests of others, often in areas where western states have little economic or geo-strategic interest.” p.295 He is critical towards the assumptions about the increasing emphasis on principles and values in international affairs. p. 297

36 This can also be discussed in terms of pluralist vs. solidarist approaches to the international society, in line with the English School. See for example Allison 2013:15, or Lidén 2014:23ff

37 Korab-Karpowicz 2018
understand the ethics of peacebuilding since just peacebuilding is preferably conducted by a just and legitimate state. The answer proposed by previous research suggests that an ethical state has foreign policies which actively promote human rights and democratization, and limits its own arms trade. Studies have focused on the United States (Neufeldt 2016a; Coker 2001), the United Kingdom (Chandler 2003, Dunne and Wheeler 2001), the European Union (Aggestam 2008, Smith 2001) and New Zealand (Hon. Goff 2007) as ethical actors. This offers intriguing debated, but needs to be further nuanced and examined, for example by a more narrow focus within foreign policy and by looking at other states.

I will contribute by using a critical normative approach towards attempts to justify external actors’ actions in peacebuilding, and thereby addressing the ethics of the agency of peacebuilding actors. One of the main parts of this thesis is the theorizing of the role of ethics in and justification of peacebuilding, which addresses the post-conflict phase that often exists somewhere between war and peace. I contribute to the research fields by using a normative approach to justification in combination with a critical discussion of political legitimacy, ethics, and the politically legitimate and justified agency of peacebuilding actors. Furthermore, this study develops tools for a critical assessment of states and their governments’ actions from an ethical perspective. An analysis of attempts to justify certain actions enables critical scrutiny of the arguments used as justificatory attempts, which further permits a critical scrutiny of how moral arguments used as justificatory attempts are connected to ethical principles.

In sum, the point of departure for this dissertation is the question of ethics of peacebuilding as a part of foreign policy. This thesis takes a descriptive realist position but a non-realist normative position, and it seeks to provide a contribution to the discussion of the role of ethics in politics by highlighting the importance and significance of ethics as a critical instrument for evaluating moral and political action.

Understanding the ethics of peacebuilding

How should we understand the ethics of peacebuilding? I conceptualize it as critique of the moral issues which arise in peacebuilding activities. As already alluded to, this is exemplified by the justification of external
states in peacebuilding processes. The ethics of peacebuilding is therefore a question of responsibility, expectations, communication, and justice. In addition, to understand the ethics of peacebuilding we need to understand the ethics of war and the ethics of peace. Since this dissertation is situated at the intersection of the ethics of peacebuilding, justification theory, and *jus post bellum*, it speaks to different bodies of scholarship. The main body of literature to which this dissertation speaks is that treating the ethics of peacebuilding and of justification since its main theoretical discussion is oriented around justification theory. These are substantial bodies of literature but, by delimiting this study to the justification of peacebuilding and thereby combining theoretical research with empirical case studies, this thesis delimits and makes manageable its focus.

The understanding of the ethics of peacebuilding is an emerging research topic in which previous research has investigated several different aspects of post-war justice. Scholars have focused on transitional justice between the warring parties, reconciliation, and forgiveness as well as negotiation and mediation. The ethics of peacebuilding is a fairly new field of research within both peace research and ethics. It connects to the fields of the ethics of development as well as to global ethics and also sustainable peace. However, in the current research debate there are as yet no satisfactory answers to moral questions about the justification of external actors engaged in peacebuilding. By looking more closely at the just war tradition, the absence of a fully comprehensive response becomes apparent while additionally confirming the importance of the ethics of peacebuilding as a research topic in its own right.

The scholarly debate on the ethics of peacebuilding includes a number of clearly different approaches whose specific focus varies. In *The Ethics of Peace and War*, Iain Atack discusses cosmopolitan responses to the problems related to peace, armed conflict, and war. His cosmopolitan baseline is that the equal value of every human being as a member of a universal moral community can facilitate the development of alternative, nonviolent, and peaceful responses to political and social conflicts. This cosmopolitan position seems similar to the one presented and argued for by Nigel Dower in his position articulated as pacifism.
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38 Philpott 2012; Philpott & Powers 2010; Murithi 2009
39 Atack 2005:1
40 Dower 2009:159. The cosmopolitan view is also discussed in Dower 2007
Atack’s position on the ethics of peacebuilding is that peacebuilding must be rooted in cosmopolitan values, not only the multilateral institutions associated with internationalism. He argues that this stand is important in order to ensure that peacebuilding initiatives do not become another instrument for Great Power hegemony. In this work he does not go very deep into the issue of peacebuilding but sketches an overview and provides examples that are both practical and theoretical in how they discuss the internationalist and cosmopolitan perspectives.

The ethics of peace is closely connected to the ethics of peacebuilding. However, the ethics of peace tends to focus on issues such as different forms of global justice, transitional justice, reconciliation, and good governance. Conceptually, these are important features both for the ethics of peace and the ethics of peacebuilding. However, one characteristic feature of peacebuilding is the transition phase in which post-conflict societies inevitably find themselves following an armed conflict or war. Importantly, the transition between the phases is complicated and conceptually unclear. Previous research on ethical aspects of peacebuilding has mainly focused on the dynamics between the warring parties and between the warring parties and the civilian population. In addition, previous research has mainly focused on questions related to reconciliation and domestic responsibility and structure.

The justification and legitimacy of peacebuilding efforts are clearly related to the ethical underpinnings of international intervention and development cooperation. However, in the fields of global politics and ethics in war and peace there has been more research on justification and legitimacy than on the ethical dimension of peacebuilding. Murithi argues that an understanding of ethics in peacebuilding is necessary for the establishment and implementation of an effective process for building sustainable peace.

There is, however, a need to go deeper into the debate in order to grasp the core of the ethics of peacebuilding, something that Murithi does in his book The Ethics of Peacebuilding. Murithi focuses mainly on the moral knowledge of peacebuilding, in relation primary to issues such as conflict resolution, negotiation, and mediation but also to forgiveness and reconciliation. He also discusses moral dimensions of peacebuilding, arguing that the understanding of ethics in peacebuilding is essential for its success and sustainability but that this needs to be

41 Atack 2005:141
42 Murithi 2009, Atack 2005
43 Murithi 2009
further developed. He provides a clear demonstration of the strongly moral dimensions of peacebuilding processes as well as an overview of the moral issues for scholars, politicians and practitioners involved in peacebuilding.\textsuperscript{44} Murithi’s study makes a vital contribution towards identifying the moral gaps in contemporary peacebuilding, something which functions as a starting point for further theorizing. As mentioned, he focuses on negotiation, mediation, forgiveness, and reconciliation processes, particularly the morality of conflict resolution, the virtue of forgiveness, and the value of reconciliation. While this makes an important contribution to our understanding of the ethics of peacebuilding, it tends to focus on domestic and individual aspects.

Another scholar engaged in the debate is Reina Neufeldt, who argues that there are currently two main moral theories which exert influence on practical peacebuilding.\textsuperscript{45} These are, according to Neufeldt, based on duty-based and consequentialist thinking respectively. Consequentialist reasoning is

\[\ldots\text{typically framed as the mandate for peacebuilding to be effective,}\]
\[\text{and more specifically, to achieve one of two ends effectively: (1) to stop}\]
\[\text{the recurrence of violent conflict (negative peace); or (2) to achieve a}\]
\[\text{measure of social, political and economic reconstruction (positive}\]
\[\text{peace).}\] \textsuperscript{46}

This type of reasoning is an obvious hallmark of the UN and its work on peace issues, since effective outcomes and overall impact are typically emphasized. In addition, Neufeldt shows that researchers regularly use consequentialist language in relation to peacebuilding while calling for the maximising of its impact.\textsuperscript{47} Duty-based thinking, on the other hand, is derived from the Kantian tradition and focuses on the normative obligations of particular acts. One example of this can be found in several of the guiding documents within the UN, where actions are framed as international responsibilities, duties, and obligations to act.\textsuperscript{48}

Neufeldt argues that “there is a need to act upon a more holistic ethic of peacebuilding practice”, especially since “the existing scholarly

\textsuperscript{44} Murithi 2009
\textsuperscript{45} Neufeldt 2014
\textsuperscript{46} Neufeldt 2014:429
\textsuperscript{47} Neufeldt 2014:430
\textsuperscript{48} Neufeldt 2014:431–432
works are limited in their explanatory abilities.” It is important to stress Neufeldt’s conclusion about the need for a more holistic ethical approach to peacebuilding, especially since peacebuilding is a multidimensional task, morally as well as practically. This is a major contribution to the field and is clearly related to the justification of external actors in peacebuilding.

Another discussion within the ethics of peacebuilding has emphasized the ethical implications of the shortcomings of liberal peacebuilding missions. Lidén (2009) addresses the potential problems that arise when exploring the normative premises of liberal peacebuilding and its critics. He advances a critique of the contemporary liberal peacebuilding paradigm and presents three ideal types of peacebuilding approaches: the re-liberal, the social, and the multicultural peacebuilding approach. Re-liberal peacebuilding emphasizes a strong focus on state institutions, one that is stronger than a neo-liberal approach. Social peacebuilding, by contrast, involves a culturally adapted provision of materials, resources, security, political influence, and education without making political conditions apart from that of non-violence. Lastly, multicultural peacebuilding is about promoting identities and forms of life that compose the cultural geography of a host society. This would allow for a full accommodation and adaptation to local cultures and mo-ralities.

Lidén further discusses whether liberal peacebuilding missions are justifiable as an instrument of global governance and his argumentation ties into a debate over power dimensions in the international arena. He also nuances the meaning of ‘liberal’ peacebuilding, and clarifies that this is a nuanced concept, both with regard to theories in international relations as well as philosophy. He has, in addition, further investigated the nature and justification of liberal peacebuilding, and whether it has been coherent with the official ethical justification in UN mandates. He reaches the conclusion that the motives and structural conditions of peacebuilding is not corresponding to its official justification as an instrument for hindering civil war.

49 Neufeldt 2014 This specific article is centred on the field level actors carrying out peacebuilding activities and working within communities on the ground, and Neufeldt discusses what constitutes “right” and “good” at this practical level.
50 Lidén 2009:620
51 Lidén 2009:621ff
52 Lidén 2009, 2013, 2014
53 Lidén 2014:1, 29, 36, 50
54 Lidén 2014:59
Lidén summarises his reconstruction of the ethical justification of peacebuilding in four parts, which is of importance for the framing of this dissertation. This is A) that states have a collective responsibility to promote peace in accordance with human rights within the confines of state sovereignty. This is further stressed as a reflection of the basis of the UN and the UN Charter in its role to

1. To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace;

2. To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;

3. To achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion; and

4. To be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends.55

Lidén’s reconstruction additionally consists of the statement that B) civil war is an impediment to peace and human rights. This is seen as a strong motive for ending civil wars. Further, Part C) consists of three aspects and is built up as follows:

1. Liberal peacebuilding – defined by the transformation of war-torn countries into liberal democracies – is a universal source of civil peace.

2. It is also the most legitimate form of peacebuilding, as it actively promotes human rights without violating state sovereignty (thereby also contributing to the development agenda of the UN Charter).

55 Lidén 2014: 29-30
It even contributes to international peace and security by expanding a zone of peace between liberal states. Given these arguments and premises, this takes Lidén to D) that liberal peacebuilding based on the above is ethically desirable, and should be a central concern of states, international organizations and the UN in particular. I interpret Lidén’s findings as strong indicators for the necessity of political will of both local actors and external states being in tandem.

Another account from previous research that is offering insights on the justification of peacebuilding is articulated by Catherine Goetze. Goetze identifies three preoccupations, or worldviews, as the main discourse on peacebuilding and international involvement in crises. These are elite leadership, freedom, and social justice. Goetze argues that three construct, together and as well as one by one, the complex discourse of justification for international involvement in crisis situations. This fits well into the discourse on liberal peacebuilding and the three political ideas converge in a liberal and cosmopolitan core.

This section on previous research serves the purpose of showing what we know about the ethics of peacebuilding. These works have all been of importance for the framing of this dissertation. Let us now continue to a presentation and discussion of previous research on justification, including an explanation for my choice of the scholars whose works provide the underpinnings for my theoretical framework.

Theories of justification

The understanding of justification of peacebuilding is further developed in relation to the works of Rainer Forst, Jürgen Habermas, and John Rawls. First, these theorists offer reasonable models of justification which are regarded as helpful for developing our understanding of the justification of peacebuilding. A second reason is that all three scholars are addressing political processes in relation to theories of justification, which is of great importance given the focus on justification of engagement in peacebuilding, which here is understood and analysed as a normative political process. Thirdly, they address different types of political agency and institutions, which is of high relevance for a theory of

---

56 Lidén 2014:30
57 Lidén 2014:30
58 Goetze 2017:13
justified peacebuilding. In this dissertation, it is the moral justification
of the political actions of peacebuilding initiatives that are scrutinized
and studied.

Rawls, Habermas, and Forst all work in a Kantian tradition even
though each offers a different take on what justification entails. The
Kantian legacy in their thinking is helpful for several reasons. First, to
some extent they share some crucial assumptions, for example, about
reason. Second, they are familiar with each other’s terminology and
have been in continual dialogue with each other on the particular ques-
tion of justification. All three scholars have written extensively, both
directly and indirectly, on matters of justification, and only a selection
of their extensive scholarly work will be taken into consideration.

John Rawls was a well-known political philosopher working princi-
pally in the Anglo-Saxon liberal tradition. Rawls’s famous work *A The-
ory of Justice*, first published 1971 and revised in 1999, has been por-
trayed by several commentators as one of the most influential books in
contemporary political philosophy. In it Rawls presents an account of
distributive justice, which he makes use of to develop his account of a
theory of justification. Rawls presents a model of justice based on the
original position with its veil of ignorance. This theory is used by Rawls
in order to argue for his particular view of social justice as well as to
offer an understanding of reflective equilibrium. Other key works for
Rawls’s theory of justification are *The Law of Peoples* (1999) and *Po-

tical Liberalism* (1993), both of which play an important role for the
framing and development of this dissertation’s theoretical framework.

*The Law of Peoples* focuses on international politics, while *Political
Liberalism* adds to a discussion of political legitimacy. Much criticism
has been levelled at Rawls’s accounts, and some of these will be further
explored in Chapter Three.

In addition, German sociologist, philosopher, and Frankfurt School
theorist Jürgen Habermas plays an important role in at least two ways.
Firstly, Habermas challenges Rawls’s position and theory of justifica-
tion. Second, he offers his own version of a theory of justification. In
addition, Habermas explicitly address the question of legitimacy. His
most relevant works for this dissertation is *Legitimation Crisis* (1975)
(in German 1973) and *Justification and Application* (1993) (in German
1991). *Legitimation Crisis* principally offer insights as to how legiti-
macy can be conceptualised, but it also discusses critical practical ques-
tions in relation to truth. In *Justification and Application*, Habermas of-
fers an account of justification understood as validity in relation to his
model of communicative action. In it, he discusses reason-giving as an
account for practical reason as well as his understanding of discourse ethics and ethics (which is a peculiar one, further discussed in Chapter Three). In other works, such as *On the Pragmatics of Communication* (2000), Habermas ties the practice of reason-giving to the meaning of a speech act because a speech act has inherent claims that need reasons. He thereby opens up for both criticism and a discussion on the epistemology of justification.59

The scholar of greatest importance for this study is the Frankfurt School political theorist and philosopher Rainer Forst. Forst takes the discussion of justification further by elegantly engaging with the arguments of both Rawls and Habermas. Forst is the leading scholar in this field and his contemporary contributions offer nuanced accounts of justification which seem applicable to the justification of external states’ engagement in peacebuilding. The key work in this respect is Forst’s *The Right to Justification: Elements of a Constructivist Theory of Justice* (2014) (in German 2007), in which he first presents his theory of justification in full.60 This particular work is also of great importance in understanding the different positions taken by Rawls and Habermas in Forst’s interpretations of them. Other key works by Forst are *Normativity and Power: Analysing Social Orders of Justification* (2018) (in German 2015) and *Justification and Critique: Towards a Critical Theory of Politics* (2013) (in German 2011). *Justification and Critique* sets out to call for a new perspective, one that is immanent in social and political practices, and explicates Forst’s understanding of society as an order of justification. In addition, Forst addresses the difference between legitimation and justification. His most recent book, *Normativity and Power*, sets out to present a new approach to critical theory and aims to go beyond the traditional ideal and realist positions by showing how normativity and power are closely related concepts. All three of these works contribute to formulating, developing, and defending Forst’s theory of justification and are further discussed in Chapter Three. Let us now turn to how this study relates to the literature on *jus post bellum*.
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59 Bohman and Rehg 2017
60 This book was originally published as *Das Recht auf Rechtfertigung. Elemente einer konstruktivistischen Theorie der Gerechtigkeit* in 2007, by Suhrkamp Verlag.
Just war, *jus post bellum*, and peacebuilding

The quest for justification and legitimacy in the use of military force and intervention has over time created what is known as the ethics of war or the just war tradition. In international law, philosophy, and theology, there are two distinct traditions in how one approaches ethics and war: *Jus ad bellum*, the reasons why war is fought; and *Jus in bello*, how war is fought.61 The tradition of just war thinking can be traced far back in the history of ideas, and the origin of this notion derives from early Jewish and Christian philosophers.62 Arguably, the third topic within just war, *jus post bellum*, can also be found in the early thinking.63 In recent years, the philosophical tradition of just war theory has started to pay more attention to how wars end, *jus ex bello*, and justice after war, *jus post bellum*.64 This last idea focuses on the governing practices after a war ends, including peace treaties, reconstruction, reconciliation, and war crime tribunals as well as war reparations. Influential theorists in this debate include Brian Orend and Larry May. However, this third notion of just war theory needs further theorization since it does not fully explore the ethical dimensions of peacebuilding. It is partly in connection to this theoretical debate that I aim to make a contribution.

*Jus post bellum* benefits from the thinking about *jus ad bellum* as well as *jus in bello*.65 We could, for example, find guiding principles from the right to fight or, put differently, the reasons to justify war, which may also be applicable to the reasons for justifying interventions during as well as after a war. Consequently, there is a need to clarify the difference between *jus ad bellum* and *jus post bellum*.

---

61 Walzer 1977/2006:21; Frowe 2015:1
63 Fabre 2016:1f
64 Fabre 2016:1, Fabre 2012, Moellendorf 2008. Yet there are also those sceptical towards including *jus post bellum* as a third category of just war theory. See, for example, Lazar 2012. In addition, another critique is the resemblance between preventing war (*ad bellum*) and preventing a relapse to war (*post bellum*). The principles of just war principles are: (1) legitimate authority; (2) just cause; (3) right intention; (4) last resort; (5) reasonable prospect of success; (6) proportionality; and (7) that wars can be fought by using ways which are not ruled out as immoral in themselves. In general, they seem to be more definitional criteria than principles, especially since they provide an understanding of either the circumstances under which going to war can be justified or of how to fight in war. Frowe 2015:52ff
65 Yet, there is disagreement on whether just post bellum is to be seen as part of just war theory, Walzer has argued it is not, while for example Orend has argued that it should. Walzer 2012:35, Orend 2007: 571ff
Orend is one of the leading scholars in the *jus post bellum* debate, together with May, Cécil Fabre, and Alex Bellamy, among others. However, and interestingly, they do not share a common conviction that *just post bellum* should be added or included in classical just war theory. While Orend, May, and Fabre have argued for this expansion, Bellamy has questioned the relevance of including *post bellum* in the just war tradition, mainly since this can be seen as either to some extent already addressed by the just war principles or largely unrelated to just war theory. At the same time, scholars such as Fabre have argued that there are traces of *jus post bellum* reasoning present already in the early sources of the just war tradition.\(^6^6\)

Fabre has summarised the current thinking on *jus post bellum* as showing a degree of consensus in contemporary war ethics on the following aspects of post-war justice:

\[\ldots\] belligerents must sue for peace not merely once they have achieved their just war aims, but sometimes even though they have not won the war; demands for unconditional surrender are morally impermissible; victorious belligerents must aim to restore the political sovereignty and territorial integrity of their defeated enemy; some form of compensation for wartime wrongdoings should be paid to victims; assistance should be given to the defeated enemy and its civilian population towards the reconstruction of their country; wrongdoers should be put on trial; and, crucially, a stable and durable peace should as far as possible be the overarching aim of erstwhile belligerents when dealing with one another.\(^6^7\)

While this summary of the state of the art of the *jus post bellum* literature identifies several important aspects of the conditions for post-war justice, it also becomes clear that this primarily concerns interstate war, even though the classical interstate discourse has been opened up to allow for studies on the implications for intrastate contexts. Yet it also shows that contemporary war ethics has not focused much on the justification of external states in post-war contexts. The primary focus has been on belligerents. To some extent, then, it could be interpreted as if just war theory is not the main scholarly platform for discussing the ethics of peacebuilding. However, just or justified transitions from war
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\(^{6^6}\) Fabre 2016:1  
\(^{6^7}\) Fabre 2016:2
to peace, and peace after war, have been on the agenda for several just war theorists.68

Yet, the core of the just war tradition, which is a rich tradition rather than a theory, is mainly focused on justification. This tradition addresses the question of if and when war could be just, and the just war tradition can largely be understood as having a negative function in that its criterion needs to be met in order for a war to be just. It is negative in that a war is not justified if the conditions are not met. Even if there are arguably similarities between *ad bellum* and *post bellum*, an important difference for this study is that the external states involved in peacebuilding are not going to war.

Importantly, there is research on ethics in connection to the responsibility of rebuilding after war. However, it has tended to focus on the context of interstate wars or on who is responsible for the rebuilding process.69 In this latter strand, two positions have developed. The first position advocates for a *Belligerents Rebuild Thesis*, which holds that those who have been involved in fighting should be responsible for rebuilding. The second position argues that responsibility should be seen as collective and that the international obligation to rebuild should be assigned primarily according to the agent’s ability to rebuild.70 This second position has been proposed as a *Universal Rebuild Thesis*, which argues that the obligation to rebuild after war is universal.71 This is further explored in Chapter Two.

However, as has been mentioned, much of the just war-thinking tends to focus primarily on interstate wars. Additionally, it seems to approach the question of external engagement in peacebuilding from a deductive approach, searching for theoretical criteria by which to judge which actors should be responsible for rebuilding. In addition, previous research has addressed which conditions might serve as the basis for post-war duties and how these conditions should be weighed when they clash or point to different actors. This review of previous research shows that we need more research on the justification of external states in peacebuilding in intrastate post-conflict contexts, particularly from ethical perspectives and using inductive approaches. This further warrants the approach taken by this dissertation.
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68 Fabre 2016, May 2012, Orend 2013
70 Pattison 2013:1
71 Peperkamp 2016:406
Previous research demonstrates that the international community plays a crucial part in the dynamics of the development both during and after civil war. This can be through direct involvement during the conflict, whether through direct interventions or third parties, or indirectly through diplomatic efforts. It can also take the form of direct or indirect involvement after the conflict has ended, when the peace deal has been signed and the fighting has stopped. It is this latter phase upon which this dissertation is centred. It contributes to existing research by addressing justification and legitimisation connected to the involvement of external actors in peacebuilding efforts.

Peacebuilding could and arguably should be assessed through moral reasoning. This has been the case within two strands of previous research, as previously outlined. The first strand is concentrated on moral reasoning in evaluating peacebuilding, which is primarily realized in relation to the notion of just peace. The literature on the moral reasoning behind peacebuilding and just peace tends to focus primarily on issues of reconciliation. This often focuses primarily on local societies and does not always pay attention to the role and justification of external states. This explains why it is interesting to explicitly focus on external states: external states often affect the processes. The second strand of research is within the just war tradition, primarily in relation to the notion of jus post bellum. Here, there is a clearer focus on external states but in relation to jus post bellum there remain areas in need of development.

An introductory note on methodological choices

I answer the research questions by assessing South African and Russian international institutionalised political agency in the area of peacebuilding, based on critical analysis of their foreign policy documents as well as textual data generated from expert interviews. By utilising a power sensitive approach in relation to the selected cases, I address global injustices and the power dynamics that can influence attempts to justify involvement itself. While there is a challenge in combining an interpretivist content analysis with a power analysis, a power-sensitive approach facilitates critical theory and takes seriously the critique of power structures.
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This thesis uses different methodological approaches, including case studies, interviews, and an interpretivist content analysis of documents. In addition, theoretical scrutiny of central notions and discussions of meta-theoretical levels help to develop its theoretical and empirical contributions to the literature on justification. The thesis also gains insights from case studies, most notably those based on fieldwork and including expert interviews. It thereby provides contextualised knowledge of, and evaluative theory based on particular contexts. This methodological design is based upon an ethical analysis.\(^7\) However, an ethical analysis is not the most suitable method for analysing the political documents or political processes of states trying to justify becoming engaged in peacebuilding initiatives because it is designed for philosophical, not empirical, investigation. In each case, a content analysis of relevant documents in terms of the guidelines behind peacebuilding initiatives is therefore supplemented by expert interviews. The perspectives offered by the case studies further enrich and challenge the theoretical framework.

In the peacebuilding process, several different actors are present at different levels in the post-conflict society, but this dissertation focuses specifically on state actors, namely South Africa and Russia. It concentrates on the selected countries’ role as peacebuilding actors and offers a systematic mapping of the missions, operations and types of collaborations in which they have been involved. It also contributes an assessment and analysis of the justificatory efforts of South Africa and Russia in relation to peacebuilding within their respective foreign policies.

Another crucial factor in regard to methodology and materials is access to relevant documents. Much of this dissertation is built on textual analysis. This makes it crucial to have access to, for example, action plans, white papers, strategic plans, foreign policy objectives, and statements as well as government reports. While several of these documents are official documents available to researchers, others are not, which has made fieldwork an important part of the project.

Combining ethical analysis with empirical research

One of the main components of this thesis is the development of a theoretical contribution on justification as it relates to peacebuilding. For

\(^7\) Ethical, or normative analysis, is understood as the activity of identifying, making, and assessing, arguments in relation to moral values of right and wrong.
this purpose, normative dimensions which draw on a philosophical conceptualization of the ethical aspects of legitimisation and the justification of peacebuilding, are crucial. This is combined with empirical research in the two case studies. The combination of empirical research and ethical analysis is not always straightforward and, while perhaps most beneficial within applied ethics, also poses several challenges. One such challenge is the potential discrepancy between a theoretically elaborated normative theory and the empirical information and data.

The combination of empirical research and ethical analysis forms part of a larger scholarly trend in which the role of empirical research in ethics and moral philosophy is receiving growing attention.\textsuperscript{74} In some areas of applied ethics, such as medical ethics, business ethics, and some branches of political philosophy, the utilization of ‘empirical ethics’ research has increased during the last fifteen years. This relatively new approach to empirical ethics integrates socio-empirical research and normative analysis and has been portrayed by some as a further development of applied ethics. Distinct from descriptive ethics, empirical ethics aims to be both descriptive and normative as well as a development within applied ethics.\textsuperscript{75} This combination of description and normativity allows for addressing both how certain political actions \textit{are} justified, and how they \textit{should} be justified, in order to reach the full potential of justification.

There are strengths and challenges inherent in this empirical ethics approach. One strength in the combination of ethical analysis and empirical research is that it has been shown to be capable of revealing aspects and features which would otherwise have gone unnoticed. However, as Ulla Schmidt puts it:

\begin{quote}
[...] it is obviously significant how empirical research is done. It must clearly be conducted in a way that lends sufficient plausibility to the results brought into constructive reflections.\textsuperscript{76}
\end{quote}

Schmidt’s emphasis on sufficient plausibility shows the importance of combining different methods and approaches in order to ensure the greater credibility of results generated from empirical studies. In addition, Schmidt argues that it is of crucial importance to recognize the

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{74} Schmidt 2009:67
\textsuperscript{75} Musschenga 2005:467
\textsuperscript{76} Schmidt 2009:85
\end{footnotesize}
connection and similarities as well as the differences between theoretically elaborated ethics and ordinary, everyday reflections as mapped by empirical research. Yet she further stresses that empirical research which aims to be constructively relevant should not be carried out as though its object is coextensive with normative theory. In addition, data-material should not be treated as though it displays normative theory in the same way as does scholarly, academically developed theory. Similarly, Schmidt stresses that neither informants nor participants in empirical studies, nor the material derived from them, should be viewed or treated as if they were ethical “mini-theorists”. She illustrates this convincingly with the help of Paul Ricoeur’s theorization of the same phenomena. Schmidt states that

Ricoeur’s emphasis on the notion that a critical potential of interpretation of a given practice requires that products of meaning are viewed as autonomous in relation to their “author”.77

The content in this citation increases the need for awareness and thoroughness in studies combining ethical analysis and empirical research. Further, it highlights the need for the conceptual work bridging the philosophical analysis and the empirical research.

The theoretical discussion in this dissertation is informed and challenged by the empirical studies, hopefully leading to a more nuanced argumentation in the final chapter. This also leads to an articulation of a theory of a justificatory order of peacebuilding which is anchored in an understanding and analysis of contemporary foreign policy discourses. With this design, it would seem possible to capture both theoretical considerations and relevant policy dimensions with hands-on applicability, making this study relevant to both academics in ethics and peace research and practitioners in the fields of foreign policy and peacebuilding.

The question of how the theoretical part of this dissertation is connected to the case studies is of central importance. This is utilized as a way of taking critical theory seriously. Theory is used to reconstruct, develop and modify formal criteria for moral justification. Political justification is also addressed for the fulfilment of these formal criteria. Yet political justification is necessary but not sufficient, which is why we also need moral justification. Based on this theoretical perspective,
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77 Schmidt 2009:86
I assess how South Africa and Russia are trying to justify their engagement in peacebuilding by means of different justification strategies. This allows for two steps: the first assesses states’ attempts to justify their engagements in peacebuilding; the second allows for a critical assessment of the theoretical tools and returns us to a discussion of the applicability of the formal criteria. This raises the question of whether the theory of justification and the right to justification needs modification and further development so as to provide adequate tools for a critical assessment of the justificatory attempts of political actors. This crucial question is returned to in Chapter Seven.

Outline of the study

This dissertation is outlined as follows. This introductory chapter has provided an account of the aims and the research questions. This chapter has also presented previous research and provided a brief discussion of the methodological approach. This has allowed for an initial positioning of this study.

Following this first introductory chapter, Chapter Two provides further explication of and analytical work on the central concepts of peacebuilding and agency. The first part of Chapter Two is a conceptual discussion of the understanding of peacebuilding, which it relates to the just war tradition in combination with empirically-driven peace research. The concept of peacebuilding is theoretically distinguished from its siblings, peacemaking and peacekeeping. The second part of Chapter Two, which is devoted to a discussion of agency in peacebuilding contexts, provides analytical tools for assessing the agency of external states and their engagement in peacebuilding settings. Here, different understandings of sovereignty become important as does the correlation between individual, collective and institutional agency, and particularly in relation to collective and shared responsibility.

Chapter Three introduces and discusses the main theoretical framework, i.e. how justification is understood in this dissertation. This understanding is based on an approach of global justice which is primarily developed in dialogue with Rainer Forst’s theory of the right to justification. Here, I discuss different dimensions of justification, such as the difference between moral and political justification, and the potential linkage between justification and legitimacy. I also develop my analytical tools: justification strategies and attempts to justify.
Chapter Four deals with method and material. A brief discussion of method has been introduced here in the Introduction so as to provide an overarching discussion; Chapter Four presents these methods in depth. Chapter Four also explains how the typologies have been constructed and addresses the challenges and shortcomings that follow on particular methodological choices. These include discussions of access, interview design, textual data, and language but also what it means to combine empirical research with ethical analysis. Further, the choices made with regard to material are explained and discussed.

The two succeeding chapters present the two cases, the Republic South Africa and the Russian Federation. The structure of these two follows a similar scheme, starting with an introduction of the cases that includes a historical overview of the main events crucial for understanding contemporary peace engagements and important shifts and nuances in their foreign policy discourses, respectively. Following the overview of their engagements in peacebuilding in the respective time periods, I offer a presentation of findings from the analysis of the cases and their strategies of trying to justify their peacebuilding engagements. Both chapters review these findings in the format of a typology in which the three main lines of justificatory attempts are crystallized, presented, and discussed. Further, the analyses address 1) how South Africa’s and Russia’s understanding of peace and peacebuilding is explicated in the material, 2) their own understanding of their position of power, and 3) to what extent their attempts to justify involvement in peacebuilding could be assessed based on Forst’s model of justification. Both chapters conclude with a summary of the findings.

In the final chapter, the insights and critique that have emerged throughout the dissertation are articulated and summarized in the form of reflections and conclusions. The research questions are revisited and the results from the analyses systematically addressed even as the theoretical argument is informed and challenged by the empirical results. Modification and development of the theoretical framework furthers its accuracy and relevance. I also discuss how the findings are relevant for a discussion of ethics and global justice and propose a preliminary framing of a theory of a justificatory order of external engagement in peacebuilding initiatives.

78 The names of the states, the Republic of South Africa and South Africa, as well as the Russian Federation and Russia, are used interchangeably even though the shorter versions tend to appear more often. The use of “the political leadership of South Africa” or “the political leadership of Russia” likewise refers to the states respectively.
2. Justification of Peacebuilding and External Agency

This chapter offers a critical and conceptual discussion of current understandings of peacebuilding and external agency for the purpose of clarifying central concepts in this study. The first part of the chapter focuses on how the concept of peacebuilding has been developed and how it should be understood, as well as its relation to the just war tradition and critical peace research. The second part of the chapter presents a discussion of agency, in particular external political agency, and how it should be conceptualized in the context of how external states justify involvement in peacebuilding activities.

The historical development of peace missions

The chapter will start with a brief genealogy of the concept of peacebuilding since this will be helpful for our understanding of the role of ethics in peacebuilding. Peacebuilding has evolved and developed over the last decades within a triangle of peaceful political conflict resolution, social and economic development issues, and international law and justice. The development started with a shift of focus from negative to positive peace. One pioneer, who coined the notion of peacebuilding in order to create positive and sustainable peace, was the Norwegian peace researcher Johan Galtung, whose research has greatly influenced both scholars’ and practitioners’ understanding of peacebuilding. In Galtung’s terminology, the condition of a society after war can be defined as either a negative peace, i.e. an absence of violence, or a positive peace, i.e. sustainable conditions for peace. 79 Peacebuilding as such leads to an emphasis on long-term sustainable peace rather than the absence of violence. Within this dissertation, there is an explicit focus on the peacebuilding processes after intrastate war and armed conflict.

79 Galtung 1964:2ff; Wallensteen 2015:10, 290
Among the measures for creating peace are to be found several commonly used themes or stages within the peace process. These have been conceptualized as peacemaking, peace enforcement, peacekeeping, and peacebuilding and have changed over time, historically as well as conceptually. An overview of this development, conceptualised as generations, will be helpful for the assessment of the external states peacebuilding involvement.

**Five generations of peace missions**

Over the years, United Nations missions have evolved into different generations of peace efforts. The first generation of peace missions is known as traditional peacekeeping. This is characterized by missions deployed with military mandates only where there is a peace to keep, typically following a truce or ceasefire and with the purpose of acting as a buffer zone between warring parties. This generation was developed in the spirit of the League of Nations and was commonly used during the Cold War, but there are still active missions of this kind today, as for example in Cyprus.

The historical context of UN-led peace missions sheds light upon the remarkable development of these different generations. During the early generation of operations, the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) to the Suez marked a ground-breaking innovation. This was due primarily to the shift from small unarmed observer teams to an UN-seconed fully-armed contingent. The mission was under very strict limits in regard to the use of force. However, this UNEF mission was profoundly influential on later generations of UN peace missions.

The second generation of peace missions has been characterized by an increase in civilian tasks related to political transition as well as multidimensionality. This shift from the first to the second generation coincided with the end of the Cold War, when the demand for peace operations increased. What is more, the opportunities for deploying UN peace missions increased due to reduced tensions and less frequent use of vetoes in the UN Security Council. While this lead to peace missions
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80 The main focus here is the UN, since this is the most important global actor for international peace and security. However, in addition to the UN, and often in collaboration with UN actors, several other actors are involved in peacebuilding initiatives. These are the various non-governmental organisations as well as various governments.

81 Kenkel 2013:125

82 Kenkel 2013:126
becoming easier to dispatch, they were now typically sent to increasingly complex contexts.\textsuperscript{83}

What is important to note in relation to this second generation of UN peace operations is that their mandates, as with the first generation, remain governed by Chapter VI of the UN Charter. This imposes on the operation strict limits to the rules of engagement, and they are only allowed to use force as self-defence, even though they are deployed amid ongoing violence.\textsuperscript{84} It was in this context, in 1992, that UN Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali published \textit{An Agenda for Peace}, clarifying the role of upcoming peace operations for the UN, as well as the difference between Chapter VI and Chapter VII mandates. The mandates cover issues such as \textit{preventive diplomacy}, \textit{peacemaking}, and \textit{peacekeeping}, which are defined in \textit{An Agenda for Peace} as follows:

\begin{itemize}
  \item Preventive diplomacy is action to prevent disputes from arising between parties, to prevent existing disputes from escalating into conflicts and to limit the spread of the latter when they occur.
  \item Peacemaking is action to bring hostile parties to agreement, essentially through such peaceful means as those foreseen in Chapter VI of the Charter of the United Nations.
  \item Peacekeeping is the deployment of a United Nations presence in the field, hitherto with the consent of all the parties concerned, normally involving United Nations military and/or police personnel and frequently civilians as well. Peacekeeping is a technique that expands the possibilities for both the prevention of conflict and the making of peace.\textsuperscript{85}
\end{itemize}

This document initiated different efforts by the UN as well as regional bodies to develop sustainable approaches to the reconstruction of war-torn societies.

The notion of positive and sustainable peace was further developed in \textit{An Agenda for Peace}.\textsuperscript{86} This was an attempt to engage with a sea-change in the international system after the end of the Cold War and an

\textsuperscript{83} Hillen 1998:141, in Kenkel 2013:127
\textsuperscript{84} Kenkel 2013:128
\textsuperscript{85} UN General Assembly, A/RES/47/120B 1992: paragraph 20
\textsuperscript{86} UN General Assembly, A/RES/47/120B 1992
increase in intrastate conflicts. This approach, in symbiosis with scholarly and policy developments within conflict resolution, has led to a generational development of conflict resolution approaches in which the more inclusive and multidimensional idea of peacebuilding has been portrayed as a way of linking elite and grassroots levels.

The third generation of UN peace operations should be seen as a response to the failures in Somalia, Rwanda, and Bosnia. It was at this point that the term peace enforcement was introduced as a subheading of peacemaking. These operations are characterized by wider mandates and have a clearer focus on the use of force. The increased attention towards peacebuilding that followed should be understood as a recognition of the need to go beyond analyses of peacekeeping and peacemaking and instead adapt a more holistic view. This has in addition addressed the need to strengthen pre-emptive and proactive strategies.

Humanitarianism and respect for human rights started to gain more ground, a development which has challenged traditional understandings of state sovereignty. In the wake of this more humanitarian focus, the Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations, commonly known as the Brahimi Report, and the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty’s (ICISS) Responsibility to Protect (R2P) were published. The Brahimi Report criticized the weakness of the UN and made concrete recommendations about how to improve the organisation and its work on global peace and security through peace missions.

The R2P norm explicitly focuses on the protection of civilians and has contributed to a shift from the traditional security of states to human security, focusing on human beings as the referent object in need of protection.

The fourth generation of UN peace operations is peacebuilding. The concept of peacebuilding was articulated in 1992 in An Agenda for Peace where it includes robust operations that combine the regulated
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87 Richmond 2010:328a
88 UN 2013
89 Kenkel 2013:128-130
90 Knight 2003:241
91 The Brahimi report was published in 2000, and the ICISS report that is the doctrinal R2P document came out in 2001.
92 Kenkel 2013:131
93 R2P has sparked a lot of debate and has been criticized for being a neo-colonial tool used by powerful states to intervene in less powerful states. This makes the norm controversial, both in a political but also in a legal context. R2P does not have legal status in international law but is rather developed as a political concept or norm.
use of force with enhanced civilian tasks with a broader mandate than previous generations. In this seminal document, peacebuilding is defined as actions that

[...] identify and support structures which will tend to strengthen and solidify peace in order to avoid a relapse into conflict.94

This is of crucial importance since it shows that it is the post-conflict period that is central, and in particular the focus on prevention of renewed conflict. *An Agenda for Peace* specifies the definition of peacebuilding as consisting of

[...] comprehensive efforts to identify and support structures which will tend to consolidate peace and advance a sense of confidence and well-being among people. Through agreements ending civil strife, these may include disarming the previously warring parties and the restoration of order, the custody and possible destruction of weapons, repatriating refugees, advisory and training support for security personnel, monitoring elections, advancing efforts to protect human rights, reforming or strengthening governmental institutions and promoting formal and informal processes of political participation.95

This citation shows that there is a range of activities included in peacebuilding, which is of importance here since it specifies the kinds of political action which external states are required to justify. The different generations of peace missions are of importance for this dissertation because this provides a framework for analysing South Africa’s and Russia’s understanding of the peacebuilding activities that they are trying to justify.

This fourth generation was developed after the end of the Cold War, in an era when a one-size-fits-all mentality, based on free-market capitalism and liberal democracy, was emphasized as the main solution. This one-size-fits-all approach has received much criticism, and as a result more context sensitive approaches have been developed. That development has led to a discussion of what kind of peace is supported by international peace missions. This dissertation aims to further nuance the discussion of justification and legitimacy of external states peacebuilding efforts based on the arguments they adhere to. By focusing on two of the BRICS countries, South Africa and Russia, I explore how

94 UN General Assembly, A/RES/47/120B 1992: paragraph 15
95 UN General Assembly, A/RES/47/120B 1992: paragraph 55
states that are not seen as liberal peace agents try to justify their engagement in peacebuilding. This relates to the emerging literature on the topic of regional powers and their role in peacebuilding.96

The concept of peacebuilding in this dissertation is primarily understood as part of the third and fourth generations of conflict resolution, with multidimensional ideas and activities that aim to build long-term, durable, and quality peace. As Oliver Ramsbotham, Tom Woodhouse and Hugh Miall have noted, this concept, rather than attempting to eliminate conflict, tends to shift the focus towards the transformation into peaceful nonviolent processes of social and political change.97

Before discussing the different forms of peace in more depth, let us briefly turn to the fifth and ongoing generation of UN peace operations: hybrid missions. These missions are characterized by deployment of troops and police personnel under mixed command, in that both the UN and regional organisations deploy personnel to the same missions under separate chains of command and with distinct mandates. This fifth emerging generation of peace missions reflects a growing shift in the division of labour in the global system of peace operations. Since the mid-1990s, most Western powers have withdrawn from seconding personnel to UN missions.98

The UN Peacebuilding Commission

Alongside the development of UN peace operations, the United Nations Peacebuilding Commission (UNPBC) was established in 200599 in order to support post-conflict peacebuilding in countries emerging from conflict by ensuring sustained international attention.100 In tandem with the Commission, the General Assembly created a robust peacebuilding architecture, including the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) and the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF).101102

96 Call & de Coning (eds.) 2017; de Coning, Mandrup and Odgaard 2014; Richmond and Tellidis 2013
97 Ramsbotham, Woodhouse and Miall in Richmond 2010:327
98 Kenkel 2013:135
99 The UNPBC was established based on the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) Resolution 60/180 and United Nations Security Council Resolution 1645
100 Kmec 2017:304
101 OCHA 2011:3
102 The UNPBC consists of 31 elected UN member states, and each state serves for renewable terms of two years. The members are elected by the General Assembly, The Security Council, and the Economic and Social Council who elect seven members each. Alongside these, the five top providers of military personnel and civilian police to United Nations missions have one seat each, as do the five top providers of assessed
Not all UN missions have an explicit mandate for peacebuilding; this varies among the different generations, which range from ceasefire monitoring missions, such as the mission to Cyprus, to more inclusive peacebuilding missions, such as the recently concluded mission to Liberia. Additionally, although the generations of peacebuilding have developed over time, as the examples show, first generation missions remain active today.

The definition of peacebuilding has been framed by the United Nations Peacebuilding Commission (UNPBC) as follows:

Peacebuilding is rather the continuum of strategy, processes and activities aimed at sustaining peace over the long-term with a clear focus on reducing chances for the relapse into conflict.\(^{103}\)

This citation is of importance for this study in that it highlights the complex task of peacebuilding and that the UNBPC sees peacebuilding as different interconnected strategies, processes, and activities. This allows for different interpretations and understandings of peacebuilding, as will be clearer in the chapters on South Africa and Russia.

The UNPBC acknowledges that there is considerable overlap of goals and activities along the spectrum of development from conflict to peace, as, for example, in relation to humanitarian support and developmental aid. It is crucial to address this overlap when making an empirical analysis, since it is in the empirical details that the divisions between the areas often become blurred. The theoretical conceptualization is often more straightforward. The UNPBC and the UNSC have argued that it is useful to understand

\[\ldots\] peacebuilding as a broader policy framework which strengthens the synergy among the related efforts of conflict prevention, peacemaking, peacekeeping, recovery, and development, as part of a collective and sustained effort to build lasting peace.\(^{104}\)

The UNBPC’s definition builds on the generations of peace missions as presented above. However, the division and interrelatedness between contributions to United Nations budgets and of voluntary contributions to the United Nations funds, programmes and agencies, including a standing peacebuilding fund. Both Russia and South Africa have served on the Peacebuilding Commission. Source: UN Peacebuilding Commission, Membership, 31 Members for 2018


\(^{104}\) UNSC/10888 21 January 2013, Alliance for Peacebuilding 2012:13
the different areas of conflict prevention, peacemaking, peacekeeping, recovery, and development are of crucial importance. This is the case because the different tasks build on each other but also because it gives different actors the possibility to engage and justify their engagement in one or several of the related activities.

**Different types of peace and different types of peacebuilding**  
Peacebuilding can include a variety of activities, from high-level diplomacy to facilitating local dialogue. In addition, peacebuilding addresses structural issues and long-term relationships between warring parties. Hence, peacebuilding tries to overcome the contradictions which lie at the root of the conflict.\(^{105}\) There are several different types of peacebuilding, for example, political, structural, and social. Political peacebuilding is often considered to be about agreement and legal issues, including formal negotiations, diplomacy, etc. By contrast, structural peacebuilding focuses on infrastructures and includes building economic, military, social, and cultural systems, which support a culture of peace through activities such as voter education, disarming warring parties, police training, building schools, and good governance. Social peacebuilding concerns relationships and includes dealing with feelings, attitudes, opinions, beliefs, and values through dialogue processes, community-building activities, and training.\(^{106}\) There are also overlaps between these.

Although the focus of this dissertation is on external peacebuilding, the latter can be initiated and implemented by both internal and external actors. Arguably, peacebuilding initiatives can include at least three different dimensions. The first dimension is local or indigenous peacebuilding, where actors range from the local government and local authorities and agencies to local civil society organisations and community initiatives. This also includes national peacebuilding. The second dimension is regional collaborations between states and/or organisations. There are several regional associations of states, such as the African Union (AU), the European Union (EU), and the Organisation of Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), not to mention bilateral relations. Thirdly, there is most often an international and global dimension of peacebuilding, where actors such as the UN are involved. The United Nations and its different agencies are the main peacebuilding
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\(^{105}\) Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, & Miall 2016:35-36  
\(^{106}\) Schirch 2008:5
actor, but the UN consists of its member states. In addition, peacebuilding activities can also be carried out by organisations such as the World Bank and others.107

Given the principle of sovereignty governing interstate relations, the second and third dimensions are the most interesting for a discussion of justification of external states. The first dimension does not have the same requirements for justificatory arguments. The reason for focusing on external states rather than regional or global organisations is connected to the delimitation as well as the feasibility of the study.

The historical development of the concept of peacebuilding is of importance here since it provides a context for how peacebuilding can be understood. Different states might potentially refer to different things in the context of peacebuilding. By analysing how states try to justify peacebuilding, it may also be possible to arrive at a better understanding of how they understand the concept. As will be demonstrated in the two case studies, Russia and South Africa seem to have a different but nonetheless related understanding of peacebuilding.

In brief, peacebuilding is here understood to be the transitional post-conflict reconstruction phase after armed conflict or war, one that seeks to rebuild institutional capacity for durable peace. The focus of this dissertation is on peacebuilding initiatives following intrastate conflicts. The understanding of peacebuilding in this dissertation has primarily been understood as part of the third and fourth generation of conflict resolution, those multidimensional ideas and activities that aim to build long term durable and quality peace.

The conceptual development of peacebuilding

Since the beginning of the twenty-first century, peacebuilding has been the object of inspiring scholarly attention, and within this scholarly debate several concepts have been proposed which might further our understanding of peacebuilding. These include liberal peacebuilding, local peacebuilding, hybrid peacebuilding, and pragmatic peacebuilding.

107 There can also be non-state actors such as international and trans-national non-governmental organisations or networks; foreign NGOs which intervene in a foreign country; or academic research institutions and think tanks. There can also be other, less frequently considered actors, such as multinational corporations, transnational churches and other religious movements as well as diaspora organisations. What all of these have in common is that they are foreign or external to the post-conflict society, which is also the definition of externality governing this thesis. Yet the focus in this study is on states.
as well as, perhaps most recently, adaptive peacebuilding. These offer somewhat different understandings of what peacebuilding is and what is should entail. This conceptual development complements the historical by further nuancing the critique that has been made of peacebuilding and how the concept has been further developed in critical discussions within scholarly and policy communities alike.

One of the dominant understandings of peacebuilding is *liberal peacebuilding*. This is a paradigm of internationalising or exporting liberal norms, institutions and practices, often characterized by a dichotomy between local and international actors. According to Roger Mac Ginty, liberal peace is defined as

\[\text{[...]}\text{taken to mean the dominant form of internationally supported peacemaking and peacebuilding that is promoted by leading states, leading international organizations and international financial institutions.}\]

However, during the last decade several scholars have raised concerns about the ‘liberal peacebuilding project’ and its normative premises as well as what it actually means to promote values such as democracy, market economies, and human rights in other countries. Most critics of the dominant thinking of liberal peacebuilding do not reject the importance of human rights, democracy, and the work of the United Nations, yet they argue that liberal peace is too narrow a definition in that it does not recognise all the elements of the peacebuilding spectrum. They also level a critique at the top-down tendencies governing liberal peacebuilding.

The critique of liberal peacebuilding has resulted in what has been called the local turn and the development of *local peacebuilding*. This conceptualization increases the focus on ‘the everyday’ as well as the role and meaning of local actors. This development of the understanding of peacebuilding was presented in *An Agenda for Peace*, which, as Mac Ginty has noted, does not even mention the word ‘local’. This is largely a quest for more context-sensitive peacebuilding that allows for local ownership in the peace process. In view of the emergence of the
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local turn, scholars such as Birgit Bräuchler have instead argued for a cultural turn. The push towards culture, according to Bräuchler, was

[...] fostered by a worldwide trend to revive local traditions, political structures and cultures, often connected with processes of decolonisation, decentralisation and nation-building, or in opposition to processes of globalization.

By addressing and contextualizing the local and the cultural, Bräuchler and Naucke stress and critically nuance our understanding of who the local could be and how political the concept of the local is. This is relevant from the perspective of external states in peacebuilding since it highlights the need to take into consideration not only their understanding of peace and peacebuilding but also those of local communities.

In relation to the discussion of local peacebuilding, the concept of hybrid peacebuilding has been developed. This concept understands peacebuilding as a practice that applies top-down and bottom-up approaches simultaneously. This is not to be seen as advocating for a particular form of peacebuilding, nor as the empty idea that everything is hybrid, but rather as a description of the conditions for peacebuilding activities. In addition, it moves away from binary combinations such as modern versus traditional, Western versus non-Western, legal-rational versus ritualistic-irrational.

Building on the local and cultural turn as well as on hybrid peacebuilding, yet another conceptualization has evolved. This is the development of the conceptualization of pragmatic peacebuilding. The pragmatic or practical focus in peacebuilding as such is not very new, but its inclusion of pragmatic rather than local or hybrid peacebuilding suggests a difference. This is further strengthened by scholars such as Louise Wiuff Moe and Finn Stepputat, as well as Cedric de Coning, who explicitly argue that the politics of international peacebuilding are undergoing a pragmatic turn. David Chandler conceptualises pragmatic peacebuilding as a critique of liberal peacebuilding that problematizes the idea of institution-building both from the top-down and from
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the bottom-up perspectives. Pragmatist positions direct criticism towards preconceived solutions and instead argue that problems should be handled in a concrete and relational context while allowing for context specificities.\footnote{Chandler 2017:12}

All in all, this conceptual development shows that peacebuilding is a challenging task. Most of these conceptualizations have a common focus on the relationship between external and local actors, who the local actors are, and how local and external actors are building sustainable peace. International interveners are often seen as ‘principal liberal peace agents’.\footnote{Mac Ginty 2010:392} However, this has been challenged and nuanced by the concepts of pragmatic but also \textit{adaptive peacebuilding}. Adaptive peacebuilding is yet another concept, perhaps the latest suggestion in the peacebuilding literature, and has been conceptualized by de Coning, among others. Given the UN’s new ‘sustaining peace’ policy concept, developed as an answer to the review of the UN peacebuilding architecture in 2015,\footnote{UN Security Council Resolution 2282, 27 April 2016, UN Doc. S/RES/2282} there is a need to adapt to the new focus. de Coning argues that this new focus is redirecting UN peacebuilding towards a priority of firstly, identifying and secondly, supporting the social and political capacities sustaining peace, rather than identifying and addressing conflict drivers in order to prevent imminent relapse into violent conflict.\footnote{De Coning 2018:300-304} The development of peacebuilding has been driven by the failures generated by earlier peacebuilding activities. The problems of criminal violence, corruption, political exclusion, and continued instability that have often followed upon peacebuilding initiatives, together with a push from emergent powers opposed to Western dominance, have sparked a turn towards the Global South as a potential source of more legitimate responses to large-scale organised violence. The United Nation Peacebuilding Commission (UNPC) is the platform where a broad representation of UN member states meets to discuss peace and security issues outside of the General Assembly.\footnote{Call & de Coning (eds.) 2017:2} However, there remains a visible desire to reduce Western dominance in peace and security related issues, which indicates that power politics plays a role also within the UNPC.

As has been demonstrated, since the first works on conceptualizing peacebuilding appeared in the 1970s, a large number of scholars have
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contributed invaluable insights to this multidisciplinary field, helping to develop our understanding of the concepts of both peace and peacebuilding. Currently, the main part of the research on peacebuilding is to be found within political and social science and is mainly empirically driven theoretical research. This body of research is further strengthened by ethical and philosophical critical reasoning, which is often closely connected to debates about just peace as well as the just war tradition and, particularly of late, the notion of *jus post bellum* or justice after war. The conception of war and peace which underpins the present study shall now be briefly explained, before the discussion is directed towards a conceptual clarification of relevant concepts related to peacebuilding.

**Type of conflict**

In the just war tradition, the main scholarly focus lies on interstate wars, i.e. wars between states. However, as has been noted, the most common conflict type which the world today faces is intrastate wars, i.e. civil wars.\(^{123}\) In addition, the scholarly debate on justification of war has primarily focused on interstate wars. Yet the focus is slowly shifting towards also including intrastate wars, even if most reasoning still tends to focus on wars between states.\(^{124}\) These factors - the primary focus in earlier just war theory and the most common conflict type today being civil wars - account for the focus on peacebuilding after civil war in this dissertation.

A relevant question at this point is what implications different types of conflicts have for the justification of peacebuilding. Interstate wars provide a set-up in which one state has declared war against another. This raises issues of international law and just war principles in the very context of interstate wars. Civil wars are instead largely governed by the principles of sovereignty and non-intervention.

In order to understand what a post-conflict phase is, it makes sense to have a conceptualization of civil war. This study adopts the definition put forward by Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, and Miall, which states that a civil armed conflict is characterized by the pursuit of incompatible goals by different groups and where

\(^{123}\) Themnér & Wallensteen 2014:541. I use the terminology of civil war, civil armed conflict, intrastate armed conflict, and intrastate war synonymously throughout this dissertation.

\(^{124}\) Parry 2018:315
[...] parties on both sides resort to the use of force. It is notoriously difficult to define, since it can encompass a continuum of situations ranging from a military overflight or an attack on a civilian by a single soldier to an all-out war with massive casualties.\textsuperscript{125}

This offers a broad definition of conflict that allows for several subtypes and different intensity. However, this is interpreted as an adequate definition here since it is the post-war phase that is our primary interest.

**Type of peace**

The type of peace that is supposed to be built is of importance for peace-building since it shapes the prioritizations and initiatives. As well as the just war tradition, there is a scholarly tradition of just peace studies which is of relevance here. Nigel Dower has emphasized that even though several scholars are engaged in the philosophical discussion of the concept of just peace, the ethics of peace tend to come second after the ethics of war.\textsuperscript{126} Nevertheless, the distinction between war and peace is an important discussion since peacebuilding, by definition, comes after war or armed conflict and there are arguably connections between a pre-conflict and a post-conflict phase.

In this dissertation, the notion of peace is understood as a societal stage characterized by long-term stability, development, prosperity, and respect for human rights. Since the end of the Cold War, scholars have advanced our understanding of the diversity of kinds of peace, in particular by nuancing the varieties of peace in post-conflict societies.\textsuperscript{127} Paul F. Diehl offers an overview of these varieties in scholarly works which include different labels or conceptualizations of long-term peace, such as democratic peace, territorial peace, capitalist peace, precarious peace, adversarial peace, pre-peace, conditional peace, or cold peace. However, as Diehl argues, a central feature of each of these terms remains the absence of violent conflict, i.e. some form of negative peace. However, in order to arrive for a better understanding of peace as well as peacebuilding, it is necessary to focus more on positive peace.\textsuperscript{128} The relationship between negative and positive peace has also been further developed in regard to notions of strong peace, strategic peace, sustainable peace, or more recently, quality peace.\textsuperscript{129}
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The more recent category of “quality peace” after civil war has been conceptualized by Madhav Joshi and Peter Wallensteen. Their conceptualization builds on five dimensions which show that peace is a multifaceted concept dependent on several factors. The dimensions 1) security after armed conflict, 2) negotiations and governance, 3) economic reconstruction, 4) transitional justice and reconciliation, and 5) civil society, are all interlinked. This development from negative-positive peace to quality peace shows a more nuanced understanding of peace, and what it should entail. This has implications also for our understanding of peacebuilding. Quality peace therefore offers a refinement of the traditional understanding of the dichotomy of negative and positive peace. It offers a timely and central contribution.

In relation to the establishment of sustainable, positive, and quality peace, external actors and, in particular, external states are important actors, in several ways. These external states support various parts of the peace process, and can have different interests, scope and capacity in doing so. The study will focus on the conceptualization of the agency of these external state actors in the latter part of this chapter but let us first turn to a discussion of concepts that resemble while also differing from peacebuilding.

What peacebuilding is not

Conceptually, there are several areas that are closely connected to peacebuilding. As was demonstrated in the conceptual overview, peacebuilding is closely related to peacemaking, peacekeeping, and peace enforcement. What distinguishes peacebuilding is the primary focus on the prevention of a relapse into armed conflict in the post-conflict phase. Peacemaking and peace enforcement are primarily concerned with ending violence and atrocities, i.e. settling a peace, whereas peacekeeping focuses on keeping the warring parties apart. Peacebuilding is more long-term and addresses societal change. Peacebuilding processes often bear similarities to notions such as state-building and nation-building as well as to development and humanitarian aid. The differences between these related concepts are explained in the following.
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Peacebuilding, state-building and nation-building

It is not the aim of this dissertation to analyse the possible overlaps, parallel activities, or even contradictions in relation to state-building, nation-building, and peacebuilding. However, these processes are assumed to be interconnected in a context after civil war and can potentially create synergies or challenges in the process. In addition, they sometimes seem to be used interchangeably in foreign policy discourses. It is therefore valuable to briefly discuss the concepts in order to further position this study within ongoing research debates as well as to bring clarity to the analysis of the cases.

The basic division is that state-building mainly addresses the creation of a functioning state structure, including institutions, infrastructure, and governmental bodies. It aims to strengthen a state so that it fulfils the legal definition of a state, which means having a) a permanent population, b) a defined territory, c) a government and d) the capacity to interact with other states.\(^{131}\) In addition, there is a need for state recognition, which is usually more of a political than a legal question. This is evidently important after war, in particular in those cases where all state structures have been torn apart, which is a common consequence of civil wars. Peacebuilding was largely developed as a consequence of the critique of the apolitical, non-contextual, and technocratic focus within state-building processes. This is explained by two factors: first, the growing realization that technocratic state-building was not working; and second, the recognition of an overarching trend towards good governance and democratisation.\(^{132}\) In addition, state-building is not solely a process which occurs after armed conflict or civil war but can also take place in any type of societal development.

Nation-building, by contrast, is regarded as describing something slightly different from both state- and peacebuilding; this process focuses on creating a shared feeling or common foundation for a national identity.\(^{133}\) The concept of a nation is often characterized, for example, as a shared basis for language and culture. A strong nation is not necessarily the same as a strong state, even though it might be pacifying. However, a strong nation can also give rise to greed and grievances, which might result in conflict, for example, if minorities are not included in the nation-building process. This is very much a domestic process. Peacebuilding, however, is concentrated on the process of
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building a strong and sustainable peace, which does not necessarily coincide with a strong nation. As stated earlier, this includes addressing issues such as the forming or reforming of security, politics, and justice institutions but also governmental institutions that can deliver social services\textsuperscript{134} as well as restoring trust and relationships between people.

Clearly, peacebuilding, state-building, and nation-building overlap in places, particularly when it comes to post-war societies. Most of them face similar challenges when it comes to the relationship between domestic, regional, and international actors. What distinguishes peacebuilding primarily is its explicit focus on preventing renewed conflict as well as the temporary transition from war to peace. In addition, and in contrast to state-building, there is often a more explicit political goal of building democracy.

\textbf{External states and state-building}

Several scholars have studied external actors and their role in state-building processes, and at least two important groupings within this literature have crystallized. Given the similarities of state-building and peacebuilding, their arguments are also of relevance for peacebuilding. The first focuses on the challenges faced by external actors in their efforts to enhance state capacity or statehood\textsuperscript{135}, while the other instead focuses on service delivery rather than state-building.\textsuperscript{136}

Krasner and Risse emphasize the role of external actors, particularly in relation to state-building. They clearly focus on the international dimension and define external actors in terms of the divide between state and non-state actors, in which state actors can include foreign governments and their (development) agencies, or different international organisations. Non-state actors are defined as actors which are themselves not states, such as international NGOs, churches and charities, and multinational corporations.\textsuperscript{137} Krasner and Risse argue that there are three factors determining whether or not the involvement of the external actors will have a successful outcome. These factors are legitimacy, task complexity, and institutionalization, including the provision of adequate resources.\textsuperscript{138} In addition, the various state actors’ own agendas can
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be an important factor. Furthermore, Krasner and Risse articulate a critique of the idealized notion of a consolidated state on the grounds that it is typically absent in reality and therefore misleading in debates about state-building. Instead, they centre the discussion upon different levels of statehood, also conceptualized as domestic sovereignty, which is

[...] the monopoly over the legitimate use of force and the ability to successfully make, implement and enforce rules and regulations across all policy areas within its territory.\textsuperscript{139}

Legitimacy is a dynamic concept that has relevance for both domestic and external actors. Domestic legitimacy is largely a question of political representation, while external legitimacy is often focused on being normatively appropriate in the eyes of the target populations. Moreover, legitimacy is a necessary condition for effectiveness.\textsuperscript{140} Legitimization is somewhat different from legitimacy and typically refers to the rationales used to create legitimacy for political and strategic decisions and actions. It is also a question of creating support for political leadership. Legitimization is commonly understood as the process of compliance to rules and regulations according to international law, and refers to the process by which something acquires legitimacy. Both legitimacy and primarily legitimization are related to justification. Let us focus more on how justification and legitimization are connected in Chapter Three.

Task-complexity and institutionalization are aspects of central importance also for external agency in peacebuilding. Contemporary peacebuilding is more complex than ever before, and the institutionalization of peacebuilding within the UN is both a strength and a weakness. It is a strength because of the competence and capacity building within the organisation, but it risks being a weakness once it becomes a well-functioning machinery applicable to all contexts and in danger of losing context-sensitivity.

Peacebuilding and humanitarian aid

The practice of peacebuilding also has similarities with developmental assistance and humanitarian work. These concepts both overlap and have clear differences. For instance, how is a peace initiative different
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from a development or humanitarian relief project in a post-conflict society? Again, peacebuilding is here understood as primarily relevant in a period of transition to quality peace after violent conflict. This varies from the developmental approach, which is more about poverty reduction, but it is to some extent similar to humanitarian relief. Humanitarian relief work is usually directed towards societies and contexts which have experienced extensive trauma. This approach commonly has a temporal dimension, where the early initiatives are characterized as humanitarian while the more long-term initiatives evolve into developmental aid. However, scholars have argued that there is an institutional gap between the practices in that there are fundamental differences in priorities, cultures, and mandates. Humanitarian relief work is primarily centred on providing basic needs while developmental work involves long-term poverty-reduction initiatives. Developmental work often has institutional approaches similar to state- and nation-building but focuses less on the state than on the community. To repeat in relation to peacebuilding: peacebuilding, like development work, is also understood as often having an institutional approach which emphasizes supporting the initiation of building structures, systems, and capacities by which a post-conflict society can enhance its prospects for quality peace and avoid relapsing into conflict.

Intervention or peacebuilding

Another topic of importance which needs to be raised here is whether there are any reason to believe that the ethics of intervention would differ from the ethics of peacebuilding. As briefly mentioned in Chapter One, peacebuilding and intervention are in this dissertation understood as separate but similar actions. Previous research has tended to focus on the justification of military and/or humanitarian intervention, but what this thesis aims to understand is the attempts to justify initiatives of peacebuilding. Theoretically, it makes sense to differentiate the con-
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cepts of peacebuilding and intervention, particularly since peacebuilding is more typically initiated following an invitation. Military intervention can be a matter of invitation or of a more intrusive character.\footnote{Another intriguing question is whether it is reasonable to believe that this state support continues after the conflict has ended. This question lies beyond the scope of this dissertation. However, consideration of where responsibility lies can be connected to the role of external actors. External support is likely to continue, but debate continues as to whose responsibility it is. Scholars such as Seth Lazar have argued that states that “[…] have already taken on such a heavy burden, are entitled to expect the international community to contribute to reconstruction after they have made the first and vital steps.” Lazar 2012:1 One of the main differences is that civil war often leads to a change of status quo, which is less likely in an interstate war. This can potentially affect the context for external states’ involvement.}

When it comes to the difference between intervention and peacebuilding, timing is key.\footnote{Langer and Brown (eds.) 2016:2f Additionally, in relation to peacebuilding, timing is of importance in several ways. It is a question of when it is initiated during the conflict cycle, but it is also about timing in that peacebuilding takes place in a transitional phase.} Interventions usually take place during conflict, while peacebuilding, as previously discussed, typically refers to events after the cessation of hostilities.\footnote{Robinson argues that \textit{jus post bellum}, at least as regards the potential obligation to rebuild, is an incorrect term since it does not have to be a post war situation in order to start the rebuilding or peacebuilding process. This is a matter of how peacebuilding is understood. A peacemaking process is most often initiated during the war, while peacebuilding starts with, but not always through a peace agreement. However, a treaty or accord has not always been signed. In relation to this, Last has argued that peacekeeping is generally relatively short-framed while peacebuilding most often works with more long-term perspectives. Arguably, rebuilding can be initiated before the end of the conflict, but for the most part it takes place after the violence has ended. Last 1999:3ff} As well as timing, there are also questions of sequencing and tasks being of relevance. Intervention usually refers to the task of ending atrocities and violence while peacebuilding is more focused on the prevention of renewed conflict. Peacebuilding seeks to address the root causes of conflict and is aimed at the rebuilding of institutional capacity.\footnote{Langer and Brown (eds.) 2016: 3-8, 378}

Military and humanitarian interventions differ primarily in terms of their means and principal focus. The means in military interventions is military whereas it is civil in most humanitarian missions; the main focus in military interventions is to stop the fighting. In humanitarian interventions the main focus is on providing basic needs and assistance. However, there are often instances of overlaps, and interventions can often be both civilian and military in character. Humanitarian military interventions commonly refer to interventions justified by humanitarian
means but carried out using military action. Its history is, in the words of Thomas Weiss and Cindy Collins,

[...] a history of accessing suffering civilians without the consent of the warring parties under whose political control such victims live.

Humanitarianism is commonly understood as having its origins in the restriction of warfare but has recently been combined with military means, leading to attempts to justify armed interventions as humanitarian wars. During large-scale human rights atrocities, humanitarianism is of primary importance, but this cannot be carried out without respect for international law and treaties.

Intervention in the context and aftermath of civil wars raises issues of international law and just war principles, and it primarily concerns the principles of sovereignty and of non-intervention. In addition, we know that civil wars are rarely just a matter of internal affairs and that many states frequently intervene in different ways to influence civil wars. What differs is the type of actors who become involved as well as the different types of support offered. Previous research has shown that allies, geographically proximate states, and Great Powers are more likely to intervene in both civil and interstate wars.

Regardless of whether our focus is on intervention or peacebuilding, the principle of sovereignty is of primary importance for the potential justification of the political actions of getting involved. Let us first turn to a discussion of justice after war, and thereafter continue by discussing the principle of sovereignty as well as whether peacebuilding initiatives risk turning into paternalistic practices.

Justice after war

The situation after a war is extremely difficult and questions of responsibility, reconciliation, and reconstruction add to this complexity. In the literature, these questions have been addressed from different angles, and one might simplistically divide the current thinking on justice after war into two strands. The first tends to focus on interstate wars and is
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often related to the just war tradition. The second line of research, which has developed much of the thinking of justice after civil war, is usually found within peace research. This second line of research tends to focus primarily on the domestic context, i.e. relations between the primary parties of the conflict and the civilian population.\textsuperscript{152} While the research on transitional justice here offers substantial insights, it tends to focus on the primary parties in the local context almost to the exclusion of external states.\textsuperscript{153}

The role of third parties is also a well-researched topic, and research on this topic tends to focus on trends and casual mechanisms which can explain how external states influence civil wars and peace processes. Empirical research on how different states account for their engagement in peace processes seldom focuses on the justification thereof. Research with a focus on justification of external actors is primarily conducted by just war theorists. Yet, many just war scholars tend to focus on war rather than peace and intervention rather than peacebuilding. This is where this dissertation aims making a contribution.

According to just war theorists, it is at least theoretically possible that war can be just.\textsuperscript{154} In other words, war can be just if certain criteria or conditions are met. Just war theory is therefore to be understood as a model for the justification of war and can be seen either as a way of legitimising war or, more preferably, as a way of halting war. Although the core of the just war tradition is to avoid war as long as possible, the thinkers within this tradition argue that war can be justified under certain conditions. These conditions, often referred to as the ‘just war principles’, are the subject of a general consensus, at least with regard to the formal conditions. However – and importantly – there is no consensus as to how these criteria ought to be interpreted. As presented in the introductory chapter, the just war principles are as follows: (1) just cause; (2) proportionality; (3) a reasonable chance of success; (4) legitimate

\textsuperscript{152} Importantly, while this is a very sketchy picture, for the purposes of showing general trends such simplification can be helpful.

\textsuperscript{153} In a civil war, which is the most common conflict type today, it is commonly found at least one dyad, i.e. the government versus an armed opposition group. This gives two primary parties, the government and an armed opposition group. In addition, and importantly, the civilian population is in today’s conflicts also heavily affected. This shifting role for the civilian population has largely shaped the contemporary peacebuilding discourse.

\textsuperscript{154} Frowe 2015:4
authority; (5) good intentions; (6) a last resort; and (7) a public declaration of war. These principles are commonly cited in relation to discussions of whether a war is just or not. Similar principles have been suggested for the *post bellum* debate.

A standard way of thinking about war is that it has a beginning, a middle, a termination, and a post-war phase. As was shown in the review of previous research in the introduction, an increasing number of just war theorists are now focusing on intrastate wars and revolutions as well on as post-conflict justice. They argue that there is no reason why the termination and the longer post-conflict phase that follows should not receive the same attention from a moral point of view as the two previous features. Several scholars have recently argued for taking *jus post bellum* – justice after war – more seriously so as to establish this aspect of just war theory in similar fashion as *ad bellum* and *in bello*. Due to this recent scholarly focus, *jus post bellum* is the most underdeveloped and under-theorised phase in just war theory; it is also that which has the broadest scope. However, further scholarly attention has led to a particular focus on issues such as the proliferation of war crimes tribunals and the ongoing Western presence in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Brian Orend has argued that some scholars are too hung up on the word ‘post’ in regard to post-conflict. He prefers to speak about the
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third phase of war as the ‘termination phase’ so as to capture more accurately this sense of process even amid endings.\textsuperscript{161} This terminology reduces the focus on the difficult point at which war turns into negative peace. However, Orend’s proposal that the focus tends to be on the ‘termination phase’ puts the debate in a different light since it could entail a more narrow interpretation of war. Because this specifically emphasizes the termination instead of the post-conflict phase, I would argue that it is a question of \textit{ex bello} rather than \textit{post bellum}. The time aspect and centre of attention is crucial. If research is to be done on the point at which war turns to peace, the termination phase can be a useful item of terminology. If focus should be on the phase in which weak peace develops into quality peace, post-conflict is a more useful concept.

Importantly, the shifts from war to post-conflict (or from \textit{in bello} to \textit{ex bello} to \textit{post bellum}) are often unclear. This is commonly a contested occasion and dependent on several factors. It is also a context sensitive circumstance since different environments generate and handle situations differently. This shift has been discussed by Larry May, who, together with Hilary Charlesworth, suggest that

\[\ldots\] the ‘post’ in post war discussions may refer to when serious questions of peace building occur.\textsuperscript{162}

May argues that the post-war phase commonly occurs 1) after hostilities have ceased, or 2) when there has been a truce, or a peace treaty has been signed. He also elaborates on the fact that there is not always a truce or a treaty, let alone any peacebuilding taking place, even when a war has clearly ended.\textsuperscript{163} This accord with the presentation of the conceptual development of peacebuilding earlier in this chapter, and both of May’s steps fit with the understanding of negative peace.

As mentioned earlier, Bellamy is one of several scholars who have been sceptical about giving \textit{post bellum} the same status as \textit{ad bellum} or \textit{in bello} within the just war tradition. He argues that the justice of the peace should be assessed independently of the war.\textsuperscript{164} This could be interpreted as saying that the peace and peacebuilding process should not only be designed according to the conditions of the war but should also

\textsuperscript{161} Orend 2007:573-574, also in Robinson 2013:108
\textsuperscript{162} May 2012:3
\textsuperscript{163} May 2012:3. Here he seems to refer to external peacebuilding, and a potential objection might be that domestic peacebuilding can still take place since peacebuilding does not have to be external.
\textsuperscript{164} Bellamy 2008
be forward-looking. However, the peacebuilding process is a consequence of the war and hence dependent to some extent on the features both before and during the war. In addition, peacebuilding has centred on addressing the causes of the conflict. This is similar to a point made by Seth Lazar, who argues that if an account of *jus post bellum* is needed, it should be broadened beyond its current focus on wrongdoing during war and instead located within a larger debate on the ethics of peacebuilding.\(^{165}\)

An important argument offered by Nigel Dower is the need for a clear focus on peace, not war. There is a need for a more peace-centred debate, even in *post bellum* and peacebuilding. Dower also stresses that the *ad bellum* and *in bello* conditions are heavily context-dependent. *Post bellum* is equally context-dependent, which needs to be taken into consideration when discussing the ethics of peacebuilding. There sometimes seems to exist an idea of ‘one size fits all’ when it comes to the design of peacebuilding initiatives, in particular when it comes to Truth and Reconciliation Commissions (TRC’s) and some of the UN peace missions. The South African example of a partly successful TRC has inspired several other TRC initiatives, but with diverse results.\(^{166}\) However, there is an increasing awareness about this need for context specific solutions in peacebuilding.\(^{167}\)

**Post bellum principles**

The *ad bellum* principles function as justificatory of a just war, and there are also attempts of formulating principles in a similar vein towards *post bellum* conditions. These *post bellum* principles are of importance for peacebuilding and can be of relevance for the justification of external actors in peacebuilding as well as for their justification of their engagements.

May argues for a position of contingent pacifism in which he develops a set of *jus post bellum* principles similar to those behind *jus ad bellum* and *jus in bello*. However, the *post bellum* principles are formulated differently. May’s attempt is also one of the first to formulate *post bellum* principles.
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\(^{165}\) Lazar 2012. However, since *post bellum* is concerned with avoiding relapse to conflict, it is arguably connected to *ad bellum*.

\(^{166}\) Campbell 2000

\(^{167}\) Campbell 2000
bellum principles based on an account of normative principles. He sug-
gests six different but possibly interconnected normative principles
within post bellum, which all aim at creating just and lasting peace.\textsuperscript{168}

May’s six identified principles are: 1) the principle of rebuilding; 2)
the retributive principle; 3) the restitution principle; 4) the reparation
principle; 5) the reconciliation principle; and 6) the proportionality prin-
ciple.\textsuperscript{169} He analyses and discusses each of these principles in depth and
nuances each of them. However, perhaps understandably, most of these
seem to be centred on the primary warring parties. Principle number
three, the restitution principle, which is focused on the procedures of
compensating, can be seen to exemplify this since it states that

\[ \ldots \] those who have suffered losses to receive restitution in all cases
where practically feasible, with the only possible exception being the
case where the losses are due to the loss sufferer’s own wrongdoing.\textsuperscript{170}

This focus on the primary warring parties is also evident in the discus-
sions of the principles of reparation and reconciliation. But before dis-
cussing these, it should be acknowledged that the restitution principle
and the reparation principle are connected. Restitution refers to the re-
turn of stolen goods, while reparation refers to the process of getting
things back into the same shape as before the war.\textsuperscript{171} Principles four and
five focus on reparation and reconciliation respectively, which are in
turn crucial for a return to a good or well-functioning relationship be-
tween the previously warring parties.

As I understand and interpret the suggested principles, it is mainly
number one, the principle of rebuilding, and to some extent number six,
the principle of proportionality, which can reasonably be connected to
international collective agency and responsibility in peacebuilding and
which are therefore relevant for an understanding of the justification of
external actors in jus post bellum and peacebuilding. Principle number
two may also partly be relevant in this regard since the discussion of
number two refers to the statement that

\begin{footnotes}
\item[168] May 2012:17
\item[169] May 2012:19ff
\item[170] May 2012:20
\item[171] May 2012:20
\end{footnotes}
[...] there is an obligation to engage in actions to support institutions that promote international rule of law, as long as such actions do not jeopardize basic human rights.\textsuperscript{172}

Although this could refer to a domestic process, there seems to be an underlying assumption that the international community is always involved, which is in most cases true.

The principles presented by May are relevant for justification since they provide a framework of different reasons for engaging in post-conflict contexts. These principles can be understood as ways of framing the different types of \textit{post bellum} activities that take place after war. However, as I understand them, they are in fact principles concerning distributive justice rather than justification.

Another, non-cosmopolitan account of national responsibility and global justice of \textit{post bellum} relevance is offered by David Miller. Miller has constructed a model based on six conditions for assigning remedial responsibility by duties and responsibilities in relation to international relations.\textsuperscript{173} These differ from May’s in that they have a more explicit focus on responsibility, while May’s model primary concerns justice. The six conditions which Miller proposes are: 1) moral responsibility; 2) outcome responsibility; 3) causal responsibility; 4) benefit; 5) capacity; and 6) community.\textsuperscript{174} Lonneke Peperkamp evaluates Miller’s conditions as well as theirs potential for remedial responsibility within \textit{jus post bellum}.\textsuperscript{175} She argues for a system that combines forward- and backward-looking conditions, where future-oriented capability in combination with backward-looking morals, outcomes, and role responsibility, serve as the foundation for a discussion of the distribution of the duty to reconstruct after war.\textsuperscript{176} This focus is primarily on the distribution of duties, which is important for peacebuilding and relevant to the issue of which actors get involved.

According to my interpretation, it is in relation to these suggestions that my theoretical contribution should be understood. However, these accounts address the broader task in relation to responsibility and justice, while the theory which I wish to articulate focuses primarily on

\textsuperscript{172} May 2012:19  
\textsuperscript{173} Miller 2007: 386-87  
\textsuperscript{174} Peperkamp 2016:408, 414  
\textsuperscript{175} Remedial responsibility is here referred to as opposed to outcome responsibility, where remedial responsibility refers to the agent who has a duty to rectify the bad situation while outcome responsibility refers to the agent as producing the outcome.  
\textsuperscript{176} Peperkamp 2016:428
how peacebuilding by external states ought to be understood and justi-
fied.

A crucial notion in a discussion of the justification of external actors in *jus post bellum* as well as peacebuilding is unquestionably respon-
sibility. This holds doubly true of external states. This is also a notion
that May as well as Miller continuously seem to return to, in particular
in their discussion of the principle of rebuilding and moral responsibil-
ity. However, I would argue that there is a need to develop the discus-
sion further, particularly when it comes to the justification of external
actors in peacebuilding.

**Responsibility or an obligation to protect and rebuild**

There seems to be a common view that it is an international obligation
to support peace processes and the promotion of values such as human
rights and democracy. However, this well-researched topic still needs
further scholarly attention. Hypothetically, the more widespread dam-
age and greater intensity of organized violence entailed by war bring
with them a greater duty of prevention, something that generates more
far-reaching responsibilities. This can be connected to a discussion of
the *Responsibility to Protect* (R2P), the international principle that has
been criticized as a tool by which more powerful states undermine the
sovereignty of less powerful states. At the same time, R2P is one of
the most highly praised mechanisms for addressing gross human rights
violations in cases where states cannot or will not protect their own
populations. Importantly, there are some similarities between the cri-
tique of R2P and the critique of the dominant understanding of *jus post
bellum*. Paul Robinson has argued that *jus post bellum* can be seen, not
as a moral argument, but as a vehicle for Western tactics of modern
counter-insurgency.

What is of crucial importance for the ethics of peacebuilding and the
justification of external actors is the notion of the responsibility or ob-
ligation to rebuild. As Gareth Evans clarifies, within the R2Preport as
presented by the International Commission on Intervention and State
Sovereignty (ICISS) in 2001, it is stated that R2P consists of three parts:
protect, react, and rebuild. However, most attention has been paid to
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the first part, which was also in line with the commission’s recommendation. In the report, the responsibility to rebuild is stipulated as follows:

The responsibility to rebuild: to provide, particularly after a military intervention, full assistance with recovery, reconstruction, and reconciliation, addressing the causes of the harm the intervention was designed to halt or avert.\(^{181}\)

This clarifies that full assistance should be given, but the question of how is dependent upon context-specific measures as well as capacity and political will. It has commonly been argued that R2P and peace-building should be seen as separate domains, but scholars such as Roland Paris has argued that these two domains are more closely connected than both the policy discourse and much of the academic literature would suggest.\(^{182}\) The ICISS report also stresses the particular importance of rebuilding after military intervention and the need for a post-intervention strategy. What recovery, reconstruction, and reconciliation entail are not clear but the report states that

\[
\text{[…] there should be a genuine commitment to helping to build a durable peace, and to promoting good governance and sustainable development.}^{183}\
\]

Furthermore, the report stresses the need for collaboration between local and international agents.\(^{184}\) This clearly recognizes the role of external states in the process, and the primary set up is through the UN.

With regard to where responsibility lies, most of the literature has focused on the *belligerents rebuild thesis*, which stipulates that those who have been involved in the fighting are responsible for the rebuilding process. According to James Pattison, the actors typically included in this definition are the victor, just belligerent, unjust aggressor, and the humanitarian intervener.\(^{185}\) However, his argument is that

\(^{181}\) Evans 2006:709 ICISS 2001: XI, 17
\(^{182}\) Paris 2016:509
\(^{183}\) ICISS 2001:39
\(^{184}\) ICISS 2001:39
\(^{185}\) Pattison 2013:1
[...] there is a collective, international duty to rebuild that should be assigned primarily according to the agent’s ability to rebuild – and not necessarily to the belligerents”.

This opens up the possibility of an important adjustment to the civil wars we see today, in place of the interstate focus which seem to prevail in the belligerents rebuild thesis.

Seth Lazar has identified three, what he find unconvincing positions within the post bellum-literature, the third of which is directly related to the responsibility to rebuild. The first is that there seems to be a common understanding within the literature that in the aftermath of wars, compensation should be a priority. The second position concludes that much of the literature have been focused on that the punishment of political leaders and war criminals should be prioritized, even in the absence of legitimate multilateral institutions. The third position identified is based on the fact that when states justifiably launch armed humanitarian interventions, they become responsible for reconstructing the states in which they have intervened. The common ground identified in these positions, according to Lazar, seems to be that many just war theorists use war as the grounds for post bellum duties as well as a framework for specifying the content in post bellum. He argues that this is an overly war-focused framework, where the alternative should instead be to focus more clearly on the peace ahead.

Lazar’s reply to these two first positions is that compensation should be subordinate to reconstruction, with resources going where they are most needed and can do the most good, while just punishment presupposes just multilateral institutions and a victor who cannot be trusted to mete out punishment fairly. Compensation and punishment of political leaders are covered by the principles identified by May, as discussed earlier. However, Lazar is pinpointing a key issue when he addresses the way in which war sets the conditions for the post bellum debate. Consideration of how the war was fought needs to be stressed when talking about the ethics of peacebuilding, but to base the entire discussion of this issue makes Lazar’s critique of the backward-looking orientation reasonable.

However, the argument that just interveners, who already have taken on a heavy burden by the intervention itself, are entitled to expect other

186 Pattison 2013:1
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actors within the international community to contribute to reconstruction is interesting. Especially in light of the criticism that interventions are often regarded as imperialistic tools for undermining sovereignty.\textsuperscript{189} It can also be seen as going against many of the results derived from empirically driven research on peacebuilding, which have stressed the importance of the need for context-specific knowledge about the situation, as well as trust-creating measures, for ensuring a successful peace process. Shifting actors in the middle of the process can create mistrust and threaten to undermine the whole peace process. One way of approaching this is to focus on the moral issue of how the duty to rebuild should be assigned, rather than on the political difficulties and lack of legal clarity, simply in order to create a stronger understanding about the issues at stake.\textsuperscript{190}

Pattison and Lazar offer relevant critiques and greatly develop our understanding of the responsibility which devolves upon different actors following war. In addition, these theoretical and philosophical accounts offered by Pattison and Lazar focuses primarily on moral issues. Yet, in order to develop our understanding further, it is interesting to explore how different actors understand this duty, and how they justify their involvement in peacebuilding. Since both South Africa and Russia are engaged in peacebuilding initiatives, they seem to acknowledge that they have a duty to rebuild. This needs further discussion, however, as there might be additional or other explanations for their engagement than moral duty. Let us explore how they justify their involvements in Chapters Five and Six.

International agency and peacebuilding – paternalism or proxy

External collective and institutional agency becomes significant in many contexts and in many settings, but what this study is focusing on here is how it is important in relation to peacebuilding. The actors who

\textsuperscript{189} Robinson 2013:108 It is important to remember that the type of intervention that has been discussed is mainly military and humanitarian intervention during conflict. As demonstrated in the earlier discussion in this chapter, this is not the same as peacebuilding, even though there are some relevant overlaps. A dividing line seems to be whether the peace intervention started before or after the conflict was considered terminated. In this dissertation, the focus is on initiatives that start after the violence has ended.

\textsuperscript{190} Pattison 2013:1f
are active within a peacebuilding context often consist of various different states as well as groups of states. Additionally, there is agency on different levels and this also applies within a peacebuilding context. However, given the dynamics of a fragile society that has experienced war, functional issues can undermine all types of agency within the local state. It is questionable to what extent people living in a stage between war and peace are free and independent to act driven by their own free choices, and the same applies for the institutions or state structures created during the same conditions. Does this make agency disappear, or is it relocated? In the present world system, it seems as though agency is relocated to other actors.

This relocation can be understood within the notion of proxy agency, which here is conceptualized as a notion by which actors, in this case mostly states, are able to invite other, external states to take on some of the responsibilities which normally lay within the hosting state. By accepting the invitation, the external states temporarily occupy the host state’s own room for manoeuvre, i.e. capacity to act, or its agency, and act as a proxy for the host state.

When someone acts or interferes against an agent’s will and defends this action by means of a claim that it was done with the agent’s best interest in mind and motivated by a desire to protect the agent from harm, that action is widely understood as paternalism. Within international relations, particularly peacemaking and development work, Western dominance has often been criticized for being paternalistic and having neo-colonial and imperialistic overtones. In the wake of the humanitarian catastrophes in Rwanda, Srebrenica and Kosovo, the tension between humanitarianism and autonomy versus intervention and paternalism has been a balancing act for powerful and influential states. In view of this international moral responsibility, there is an expectation that the international community acts to prevent humanitarian catastrophes, yet international politics and national interests often seem to blur those moral priorities.

Proxy agency implies an alternative perspective to the debate on international paternalism in the context of peacebuilding. The concept of

191 Proxy agency has also been presented as a type of agency by Martin Hewson (2010)
192 Dworkin 2017, Dworkin 2013:25-39
193 Here referring to the full spectrum of peacemaking, peacekeeping, peacebuilding.
194 Barnett 2012:504, 489, 519 Yet, Barnett acknowledges that paternalism seems to be a two-edged sword and that humanitarian intervention, at least from the perspective of the victims, probably is not considered paternalistic. p.495
195 Paris 2002:638, 651
international proxy agency functions, I would argue, as a fruitful way of conceptualizing the engagement of external actors within peacebuilding processes, since this goes beyond the explanations provided by paternalistic arguments. In addition, to acknowledge the necessity of external actors’ support there is a normative value in continuously questioning the rationale, role, and intentions of these actors in peacebuilding processes, based on moral as well as ethical perspectives. Peacebuilding is inherently a practice which tries to create peace and stability, but in order to prevent harm there is a need to discuss external involvement. In the literature on the ethics of intervention, a reoccurring debate concerns the question of paternalism on the one hand, and humanitarianism on the other. Within the peacebuilding literature, many regard trusteeships or international administrations as endeavours which risk being paternalistic and neo-imperialistic.196 This dissertation takes on the task of critically evaluating the justification external states offer of their engagement in peacebuilding. Most actors involved in peacebuilding know the challenging character of these undertakings. These challenges make states adopt different ways of approaching peacebuilding, but even the most sceptical states seem to accept the moral imperative that post-conflict peacebuilding should be supported. It is in relation to the debate on responsibility that the notion of proxy agency aims to contribute.197 In addition, it is also here that justification becomes important. Justification is needed to create solid and just decisions and is particularly important in the border area between law and politics.

International proxy agency is challenging the principle of sovereignty; however, it offers a way of understanding the distribution of power and responsibilities between actors. The notion connects and builds on previous research on hybrid peace198, international (neo)-trusteeship199, as well as global governance.200 International proxy agency adds to this literature by providing a more power-sensitive and morally focused approach. The notion of international proxy agency differs from existing conceptualizations of the ethics of intervention in placing

196 See for example Fearon & Laitin 2004:7, Fearon & Laitin argue that neotrustees want to withdraw as fast as possible, as in sharp contrast to classical imperialists. P.7, or Ayoob 2004:100
197 This is also related to the conceptual development of peacebuilding, since hybrid missions’ increase as a way of approaching different types of actors. In addition, another parallel is the importance of the relations between local and international communities in peacebuilding.
198 Mac Ginty 2010:391-412
more emphasis on cooperation and less on involuntary commitment from the host state’s perspective. The literature on intervention is also mainly focused on the justification of interventions, who should intervene, and what happens in a war, and far less on what happens after the cessation of hostilities, which is the focus in this study.

Previous research on collective moral agency has largely focused on corporate agents and the responsibility of business companies, but the literature on institutions and states as moral agents has been growing recently.201 This type of research is more applicable to a discussion of agency in peacebuilding. Toni Erskine (2003) argues that a crucial issue in regard to collective moral agency, in particular within international relations, is to identify who or what is meant by the ‘international community’, particularly in order to enable discussions on responsibility. By continuously using the vague term ‘international community’ without clarifying who or what that is, undermines the possibility of discussing responsibility within international relations.202 By focusing on the two cases of South Africa and Russia and their justificatory attempts of peacebuilding, this study seeks to analyse how these actors view both their agency and their international responsibility regarding peacebuilding.

Proxy agency in itself challenges the principle of sovereignty, but it is based on a mutual understanding and often an invitation by the host state. The host state, by inviting external actors, gives consent to a certain degree of proxy agency. The role of the invitation is crucial here, especially since it contrasts the notion of proxy agency with paternalism. Paternalism is instead defined by the absence of invitation or consent.203 The argument that proxy agency helps identify the importance of invitation and consent undermines the interference problems inherent in paternalism.204 Using proxy agency makes it possible instead to capture and analyse the larger room for manoeuvre which actors manage and use.
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External states in peacebuilding processes are dependent on the invitation of the host state or, in those cases where this is not applicable or available, the decision of the UN Security Council. These are the only legitimate circumstances under which external actors are able to stretch the meaning of the principle of sovereignty or choose to disregard it. Given the political game that surrounds most peacebuilding processes and most international relationships in general, actors should be understood as trying to create their international reputation as a state. This branding process is likely connected to their governments’ agency, not least because of the image which the state wish to convey to others.

To sum up, the notion of international proxy agency is a more powersensitive, consent-centred, and deliberative approach than other concepts presented in the literature such as hybrid peacebuilding and global governance, liberal peace, and liberal peacebuilding or limited statehood and (neo-) trusteeship. I argue that international proxy agency offers an additional framework for ethical analysis that can help us better understand the ethics of peacebuilding and the justification of external actors in peacebuilding processes.

But how is international proxy agency of relevance to justification of peacebuilding? Proxy agency puts more emphasis on the relational aspects and offers a way to understand how different states involved in peacebuilding recognize each other as sovereign states. This is thus a state-centric approach: the states’ own institutional and political agency occupies centre stage.

The central part here is an understanding of societal, political, and moral agency, or in other words institutionalized political agency, on an international level. This is of relevance for global equality amongst states, which is one of the reasons why this study focuses on two of the BRICS countries. The BRICS embody a desire to be taken seriously as equal partners – having equal space for agency – in issues relating peace in general as much as in international politics. Of central importance here is the principle of sovereignty, since this in many senses sets the rules of the game for external actors in peacebuilding activities. Let us
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now turn to a discussion of sovereignty and its implications for external actors’ justification of their engagement in peacebuilding.

Understanding external political agency and sovereignty

The general starting point for the notion of agency in this dissertation is that there are different types of agency which are situated on different levels. However, what is central here is international institutionalized political agency and how it is relevant in the context of external states’ involvement in peacebuilding initiatives. International institutional political agency is here defined as the way states act, behave, and take decisions with relevance for the international arena. It is international because it is of relevance to other states, it is institutional because it is concerned with and embedded in structures, and it is political because it addresses social hierarchies and how societies should be governed.

States are agents that comprise an association of several individuals. As described earlier, the common definition of a state is an organised political community under one government, which controls a recognized territory with a permanent population. In addition, this entity has the ability and capacity to interact with other states.

A state’s agency is dependent on how the state perceives itself as well as how other actors perceive the state. This relates to a nuance between assigned and self-imposed agency in peacebuilding. With regard to peacebuilding, some actors have expectations, both from the domestic constituency and the larger political leadership, of acting in particular ways. In addition, some states regard themselves as having an obligation and duty to act. The difference is that assigned agency comes from outside of the political leadership, while self-proclaimed comes from within. Sweden, for example, has a self-proclaimed role of being a humanitarian power with a feminist foreign policy. While this derives primarily from Sweden’s political leadership, the framing also has at least partial support of its domestic constituency. This understanding of self-imposed agency is also related to nation-branding, which is of importance both internationally and domestically.

How countries act on the international stage is also dependent on international power structures, prevailing political circumstances, as

---

207 Aggestam and Bergman-Rosamond 2016: 323-334
well as other agent-specific factors. Such factors can be both domestic and international in character. Institutional political agency is constructed on the basis of different factors in both domestic and international politics. A state’s agency is governed by the principle of sovereignty, and it is sovereignty that sets the limits for the states’ responsibilities. This builds on an understanding of sovereignty as international legal sovereignty. Yet, even if sovereignty distinguishes between what is domestic and what is international, it also relates the two. The principle of sovereignty to some extent enables states to have international institutionalized political agency.

The principle of sovereignty

As already stated, with regard to international agency, particularly relations between states, the obvious core concept is the principle of sovereignty. Sovereignty as a term has been understood in several different ways and scholars such as Stephen Krasner have shown the diversity of research on the role of sovereignty. Some argue that it is eroded by globalization, others that it is being sustained, given the mutual recognition and shared expectations generated by the international community. Krasner further acknowledges that sovereignty has also been used in different ways, which partly reveals that the norms and rules of any international system include being continuously subject to challenges and having limited influence. It would also include the absence of any institutional arrangement for authority as well as different incentives governing different individual rules. In addition, and of critical importance here, are the power asymmetries inherent between principal actors within the international system.

Krasner identifies four different ways in which sovereignty has been used: 1) international legal sovereignty; 2) Westphalian sovereignty; 3) domestic sovereignty; and 4) interdependence sovereignty. He explains them as follows:

*International legal sovereignty* refers to the practices associated with mutual recognition, usually between territorial entities that have formal juridical independence. *Westphalian sovereignty* refers to political organization based on the exclusion of external actors from authority structures within a given territory. *Domestic sovereignty* refers to the
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formal organization of political authority within the state and the ability of public authorities to exercise effective control within the borders of their own polity. Finally, interdependence sovereignty refers to the ability of public authorities to regulate the flow of information, ideas, goods, people, pollutants, or capital across the borders of their state.210

These are all types of sovereignty that can be related but they do not have to be. I interpret international legal sovereignty as also recognizing the importance of autonomy for states as actors. All of these kinds of sovereignty cover authority and control in different ways. While most states can have international legal sovereignty, given that they are recognized, there is a wide variety of different levels of statehood.211

Sovereignty has been the central concept in the internationalist approach as well as a core principle governing international relations.212 Given that the most common type of armed conflicts since the end of the Cold War in 1989 are intrastate, the principle of sovereignty is of crucial importance for any external actor. Yet, this shift from interstate to intrastate conflicts has led to the principle of sovereignty or the sovereign state becoming a key challenge for attempts by external states to understand, manage, control, and resolve civil wars because non-intervention is one of the cornerstones in international law and Chapter VII of the UN Charter.

Ian Atack states that the tension between sovereignty and human rights is at the heart of the UN Charter, which is at present the main embodiment of internationalist ideals.213 This tension lies at the heart of the challenges faced by interventions as well as actions in relation to the R2P, but it is also of relevance for the justification of external actors and their justification for peacebuilding.

210 Krasner 1999:3-4 (italics added)
211 Krasner & Risse 2014:1
212 This is referring to a discussion between the positions of internationalism and cosmopolitanism in thinking in IR-theory. For a discussion on these strands, see for example Doyle 1997. For an account of internationalism, the account stressing the ‘morality of states’ see for example Dower 2007. Cosmopolitanism usually sees individuals as the primary actors, while internationalism sees states. For a discussion of cosmopolitan account, developed within the notion of embedded cosmopolitanism, see Erskine 2008
213 Atack 2005:3 A discussion of sovereignty and its role often begins in interpretations of positions such as cosmopolitanism and internationalism.
International institutional political agency

The notion of agency is currently being discussed in political, moral, and philosophical debates and is to a large extent shaped by past philosophical discussions. Scholars have proposed different understandings of the concept of political agency, and it is not necessarily restricted to individuals’ participation in social movements or institutional political processes of states. However, political agency is often portrayed as either a question of government responsiveness or responsibility, or the engagement of citizens in everyday life. This seems to imply an understanding of agency as having primarily domestic implications.

The notion of agency on an individual level is often understood as the possibilities and capacities of individuals to take decisions and act on the basis of their own will. This is also related to the discussion of reason and the capacity of humans to be reasonable agents. In the Kantian tradition, moral agency is often understood to include being held accountable for one’s acts and being capable of assuming responsibilities and duties as well as having rights. In this study, I assume that there are similarities between individual and state political agency, why this brief discussion on individual agency ties in to this study.

Another way of theorizing political agency is offered by Lea Ypi who argues for what she calls activist, or avant-garde political agency. Ypi argues that political agency is about feasibility and sustainability. Feasible in that relevant political, legal and social mechanisms are functioning, and sustainable in that it has a chance to survive in regard to outcomes of political action. She offers a modification of a statist account and defends the normative relevance of state-based associative conditions for the cosmopolitan development of political institutions. Ypi makes use of the case of global justice as an example in expounding her theory of activist political theory, which she sees

[...] as a mode of theorizing interested not only in the identification of justice-based concerns but also in guiding transformative political action
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This is of interest in this study, since peacebuilding and external actors’ engagements in peacebuilding can be understood as transformative political action with justice-based concerns.

Within the scholarly tradition of international relations, states are commonly seen as agents, but not necessarily as moral agents. While groups or collectives – such as states – undoubtedly consist of several individuals, collective agency, particularly at the level of states, is somewhat different and goes beyond individual agency. This has implications for morality and law as well as politics. A basic understanding is that group or collective agency adds dynamics that are not applicable on an individual level but that play a crucial role on the group level. What I am focusing on here is international institutionalized political agency as a form of collective agency, as a notion which captures the agency of states in peacebuilding engagements most accurately.

In addition, this thesis envisions an alternative notion of agency, as international proxy agency. This is developed based on the relationship between hosting states and external states in peacebuilding processes and offers a way of understanding how agency is temporarily transferred. The nexus between the local and the external creates tensions that are often based on power dynamics and the issue of ownership. Proxy agency provides an alternative way of conceptualizing what is happening after a civil war in the nexus between local ownership and external assistance, in contrast to previous accounts which have often been criticized for paternalism. The issues addressed by proxy agency arise when external actors initiate interactions with local governing structures. This tension is also a factor in why the engagement of external states in peacebuilding practices needs to be justified.

Here, it makes sense to ask who has agency. A discussion on the relevance, conceptualization, and implications of sovereignty for state

218 Erskine (ed.) 2003:1ff
219 In his Perpetual Peace, Kant was one of the first to see states as agents. See Kant et al 2006:67-109
220 List & Pettit 2011:1-16
221 Groups are often seen as different compositions of people, as for example in demonstrations, ethnic groups, etc. Potentially, there could be different moral questions depending on whether the focus lies on groups or agents such as states. The question of whether groups should be seen as agents lies beyond the scope of this thesis.
222 Donais 2009:3ff
223 However, it is not only the government in the post-conflict society that is the interactive part vis-à-vis the external actor; civil society actors also play a crucial role, as does the civilian population at large.
agency has been initiated, but who the external state is needs further attention. The international system’s anarchic character – there is no legitimate authority above the state level – is of importance for understanding international political state agency. This also makes states the primary agents in the international system.\(^{224}\) The type of international institutional political agency that is central here stands in relation to justification of the state’s engagement in peacebuilding, and is built up in terms of five factors: identity; leadership; structure and institutions; goals; and mandate and expectations. In addition, it is political in that it governs the structures of societies, and institutional in that this is based on a bureaucratic structure.\(^{225}\)

As stated earlier, an external state actor can include a foreign government and their (development) agencies. A state can also be a part of different international organisations. Non-state actors are, for example, non-governmental organisations, such as churches and charities or multinational corporations, and thus defined as actors not being a state.\(^{226}\) States are complex bureaucratic systems, and international institutional political state agency is established by several factors. The internal focus of the state commonly distinguishes between state and society and how these interact. This is not the primary focus here. The main focus here is, rather, states as understood in the mainstream international relations literature, as outward-looking entities, and their interaction with other states. The discussion will now focus on what factors construct international institutional political agency.

State agency

A key issue when thinking about collective institutional agency is which factors can influence the dynamics of the collective or state itself. In this study, state, government, and state representatives are used interchangeably. Yet, the state is constructed by different factors and features. These factors and features are important for understanding and explaining the patterns in how an agent acts and handle situations. For example, when it comes to the actual feasibility of action the state is dependent on the individuals who are included in the state apparatus,

---

\(^{224}\) In relation to the discussion of cosmopolitanism in the introductory chapter, I adopt the position of moral but not political cosmopolitanism. In addition, the position taken by this thesis is descriptive realist in character, realizing the importance of power in international politics but rejecting the normative realist position.

\(^{225}\) Erskine (eds.) 2003:5ff, 19ff

\(^{226}\) Krasner & Risse 2014:10
and there is an important distinction between acting and taking decisions when it comes to groups, that are not present in the case of an individual.

However, collective institutional agency is also reliant on features other than the collective-individual dimension. The influential features that create and strengthen the group can be organized into separate themes. One is the state’s identity, and others include leadership, the composition of different individuals within the collective, and how it is bound by a mandate and/or the common goals. The state is also affected by internal as well as external expectations about their performance and actions or non-actions. These are all explanatory factors which contribute to our understanding of why an actor acts as it does, and it should be noted that these themes are interrelated and build on each other. However, on a theoretical level, this division provides clarity. The following sections builds upon a literature review on what state agency entail, primarily based on Krasner (1999), Krasner and Risse (2014), as well as Erskine (ed. 2003) and List and Pettit (2011). The proposed factors are at this point suggestions, and need further refinement.

**Identity and context**

While several features shape the state’s identity, one general factor is the context in which the collective is situated. The context is itself shaped by several elements, such as values, ideologies, history, and historical as well as contemporary development of the state, its institutions, and its surroundings.\(^{227}\)

However, the membership of a state is not determinate, and the states’ members - the citizens – are born, they pass away, emigrate and immigrate without affecting the identity of the state. In addition, the state is irreducible to the current government and could be described as “an apparatus of power whose existence remains independent of those who may happen to have control at any given time”.\(^{228}\)

The state’s identity is also linked to the identity of the individual members of the entity, even though it is does not rely solely upon the identity of leading individuals. It is possible for a state to establish a state culture or state identity that travels with the state and not necessarily its members. In other words, a state can have common features of

---

\(^{227}\) See for example Tsygankov 2016: xxviiff. Also see Erskine (ed.) 2003:26ff, where she makes a useful distinction between states and quasi-states, building on the reasoning of Robert Jackson.

\(^{228}\) Erskine 2003:27
identity markers across generations. A common identity marker is the creation of ‘us’ and ‘them’, and the alienation of the other.229

**Leadership and government**

International institutional political state agency is not necessarily defined by the state’s leader but by the constellation of the state itself, i.e. its leadership. In other words, it does not have to be related to a particular person. Yet, the power of presidents and prime ministers is often extensive, in particular when it comes to foreign policy. This depends on the political system as well as the structure of the state. Nevertheless, prime ministers and presidents usually have to motivate, and perhaps justify, particular decisions to the rest of the political leadership as well as society. The state’s structure is commonly referred to as the organizational form of the state. This includes for example the distribution of power among agencies, the working of these agencies, and the underlying self-perception influencing the exchange between these agencies as well as between the government and society at large.230

The distribution of power between different people in the political elite is where the institutional aspects become clearer. At least in a democracy, a leader can be changed without affecting the state apparatus as a state, independent of the history or culture of the group, for example. However, this can vary between groups and the role of the leader can be different depending on who the leader is, the political system, and also the surrounding circumstances.

When it comes to the leadership of the state, other mechanisms also become important, for example, when discussion takes place about how the leadership came to power, which in itself is connected to trust and legitimacy from the members, i.e. the constituency. Democratic elections generally generate legitimacy to the government, provided that they are free and fair. The identity of the group or the collective is related to the role of the leader, which is connected to a discussion of responsibility. It is important to note that the leadership is in focus here.

---

229 This is particularly important in a peacebuilding context, but on a level which is both individual and structural. Since there is a common pattern of expatriates staying together which increases the separation between the ‘us’ and ‘them’. The ‘us’ and ‘them’ creation can also be an in-group phenomenon, perhaps dependent on the identity marker being actualized, but can also be dependent on which question is at stake. For example, within a UN mission, different questions might unite people from the same country or the same part of the world while other issues might serve to reconcile people on the basis of age or gender.

230 Feickert 2016:234f
Not the leader him- or herself, it is the office that is the object of analysis. One important concluding remark is that leadership matters, but it is far from being the only influential factor that affects how a state performs and acts.

**Structure and institutions**

In itself a state is not necessary a fixed composition. Citizenries are perhaps largely similar, but political leaderships can be dramatically different. On the other hand, given globalization and free movement, people are moving and migrating between states, adding to the dynamic development of societies. This makes the collective a flexible and dynamic factor in this regard. However, what instead makes a state more fixed or inflexible as an actor is a question of the history and organizational culture of that particular entity. This can be governed by internal and external expectations, both perceived and real.

The structure of the state looks different dependent on different political systems. Democratic multiparty systems have the broadest representation, and they make for a much stronger state legitimacy than is the case with autocracies and dictatorships. All systems have some kind of structure as well as institutions. The state institutions have different types of responsibilities, for example, different ministries and governmental agencies.

For peacebuilding, the most important state institutions in the external state’s system are usually the Foreign Ministry and the Ministry of Defence as well as development agencies. The particular structure of agencies can vary depending on contexts but given that peacebuilding is a part of a state’s foreign policy, it is always connected to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Generally, the composition of the group can be more influential the smaller the group is, since each group member represents a larger percentage of the group. In a larger group, each group member represents a smaller portion of the total percentage of the group. The risk of fractions or splinter groups can become more visible in a larger group than a smaller, and this also depends on the leader’s levels of legitimacy as well as whether the group members agree that the group is moving in the right direction. Translated to a context of a state, this could imply that a state with a smaller population would be more straightforward to govern with consensus, though this argument needs to be refined.
**Goals and mandate**

A state is also shaped by its common goals and/or its strategies to reach these goals. In addition, it is driven by its national interest. To some extent, this is related to what constitutes its agency. The strategies can be found on different levels, for example, within the state’s guiding documents or principles, such as mandates, laws and regulations. External peacebuilding is most often multilateral but other types of constellations do occur, such as regional or bi-lateral cooperation. States express their peacebuilding engagements in different ways, and different interests, venues, and co-operations shape both engagement and the communication regarding the peacebuilding involvements.

States to varying degrees try to justify their engagements in peacebuilding. This is a part of how they shape their institutional collective political agency. By showing that you are a responsible state you are giving signals to both your domestic constituency and other states and international actors. This signalling takes the form of publishing policy papers such as guidelines and different reports and programmes. Yet, the primary purpose of these documents is to provide guidelines for how to act: signalling is probably not the primary purpose. Additionally, this is also portrayed in speeches and different types of commitments. Another example of this is the mandates which govern different United Nations missions around the globe. These mandates provide the guidelines for the missions and its members working within the mission. These are crucial in terms of tracing responsibility but also as a tool to create accountability and legitimacy.

In terms of a state, this would likely be articulated in official guidelines and policy programs. It would also include messages disseminated via different types of channels, such as political speeches in different forums. Here, it becomes clear that the state tends to be concentrated in the government and governmental bodies of a particular state. However, accountability and representation supposedly lessen the discrepancy between what citizens want and what the political leadership does.

**Expectations**

Another important aspect of influential features is expectations, which can be developed and nourished both within the state as well as outside. Depending on the state’s goals and means, these expectations can vary over time and may also relate to the different parts of the state. This intra-state dynamic is also important to take into consideration, especially since it affects a state’s room for action and decision-making.
Further, the leadership needs to take into consideration both domestic and external audiences when taking and communicating decisions.

The expectations of a domestic audience are most prominent within a democratic system whose citizens have the possibility of expressing their opinions. In states with other political systems, citizens have far less of a voice. Other external actors or states can also have expectations about how a particular state should act in a certain situation. This is shaped and governed by several cultural, historical, and contextual factors. For example, a state that has signed an agreement with other states commits to that very agreement, thereby to some extent shaping both its own and the other signatories’ expectations.

All these factors and mechanisms influence the agency of the group or collective, regardless of its structural or strategic level.

Taking the power dimensions of external agency seriously

Within peacebuilding there will most likely always be asymmetrical relations between a more powerful and a less powerful actor, state, or party, and there is a need to address these types of relationships from a normative approach of global justice. This pinpoints issues such as the state’s networks, its position of power, and the power dynamics between the different state actors. The critique of domination needs to be taken seriously. This can be done in several ways, and in this study one approach is to work with critical theory; another is to empirically address cases that are not often examined.

Another way of addressing the unequal distribution of various things across the globe has been formulated by the research tradition identified as Third World Approaches to International Law (TWAIL). This was originally formed within the anti-colonial movements and has advanced critiques which adopt a stance of reservation or scepticism towards the neglect of power relations or development approaches in the shaping of international law. TWAIL is, according to the scholars involved, to be seen as a response to decolonisation and Western hegemony. This is exemplified by scholars arguing that the regime of international law is illegitimate and solely a

 [...] predatory system that legitimizes, reproduces and sustains the plunder and subordination of the Third World by the West.231

231 Mutua 2000:31
It is further argued that the illusory universality or promise of global order and stability does not make international law a just, equitable, or legitimate code of global governance for the Third World. This provides a critical voice with direct relevance for global representation and highlights the fact that not all voices or actors are seen as equal. The principle of sovereignty is to some extent seen as an equality principle, making all states equal to international law. However, this is not always the case within world politics since aspects of national interest exert an influence on international relations. Needless to state, with power comes responsibility.

Another important point made by scholars in this critical school is that historically the Third World has seen the creation of international law as a regime and discourse of domination and subordination instead of one of resistance or liberation. Against this background, according to Makau Mutua, the scholarly debate within TWAIL has focused on three main goals:

The first is to understand, deconstruct, and unpack the uses of international law as a medium for the creation and perpetuation of a racialized hierarchy of international norms and institutions that sub ordinate non-Europeans to Europeans. Second, it seeks to construct and present an alternative normative legal edifice for international governance. Finally, TWAIL seeks through scholar ship, policy, and politics to eradicate the conditions of underdevelopment in the Third World.232

The arguments presented by TWAIL scholars are structurally similar to some of the arguments presented by the BRICS countries as well as other constellations of states originating in the global South. Both Russia and South Africa see themselves in the role of a challenger, striving for a change in the global system. However, there is also variation and the arguments are not the same or similar in all respects. Some of the arguments against domination brought forward by the BRICS will be discussed later in relation to the two case studies.

Another critique raised by Chimni concerns the threat of recolonization, which is explained as a vehicle for reconstituting the relationship between states and international law so as to undermine the autonomy of Third World states. Chimni also highlights the relocation of sovereign economic powers in international trade as well as the inability of Third World states to resist the overwhelming ideological and military

---

232 Mutua 2000:31
dominance of the First World. This interplay shows the importance of taking power, networks, and history into consideration when analysing the justification of external actors in peacebuilding processes.

Criticism has also been directed towards the risk of arbitrary use of humanitarian intervention, which is usually defined as infringement of a state’s sovereignty by external actors with the aim of stopping or preventing human rights violations. Several TWAIL scholars consider the arbitrary undermining of the principle of sovereignty, as well as the arbitrary use of humanitarian interventions, to be modern forms of domination by First World countries, and something that needs to be taken seriously, particularly within peacebuilding activities.

To conclude, this study takes seriously the power dimensions of external agency in at least two ways, theoretically and empirically. The next step is to summarize the main parts of this chapter before moving on in the next chapter to scrutinize the critical theory of justification which forms the theoretical framework of this dissertation.

Summary

This chapter has offered a conceptual discussion of peacebuilding as well as states’ international institutional political agency. In relation to this, theories and approaches of just war and just peace, and their connection to peacebuilding, have been discussed. In addition, I have proposed an account of proxy agency as a way to understand the relationship between external and local actors in peacebuilding processes. Before moving on to the theoretical discussion of justification of peacebuilding, let us summarize the main points here.

First, peacebuilding is a dynamic concept that has developed greatly over time. Both the historical and the conceptual development of the concept will be utilized in the coming case studies in relation to the understanding of the peacebuilding approaches that South Africa and Russia have developed. What has become clear is that there is a need to address all actors involved. Additionally, in accordance with what recent research trends suggest, there is a need to study actors in the periphery.

---

233 Chimni 2006:3
234 See for example Walzer 2002, Gordanić 2015:51
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Second, in the scholarly literature, thinking about war seems to be the primary focus for most philosophers and theorists. Without suggesting that these researchers are not contributing to the understanding of peace, it would seem that the ethics of peace are a secondary concern for most theorists. Several just war scholars would argue that just war requires a commitment to just peace that follows its cessation, but the main body of research nonetheless treats questions that explicitly concern different stages when initiating war or different events during war. Scholars working on just peace focus mainly on the ideal condition of societies, and how this ideal can and should be reached. This normative reasoning about how ideal peace can and should be reached could be connected to peacebuilding, but surprisingly this is not always the case. This has been done, but then it most often focuses on internal issues such as reconciliation, a mechanism commonly used in order to create justice after war. While reconciliation is crucial in order to reach just peace, several other issues need to be normatively addressed in the context of peacebuilding and post-war societies. I interpret this focus on war or peace as a partial failure to address the in-between, the peace-building phase. To some extent this is a question of definition, timing, and framing; several studies consider how societies could be more peaceful, but these are not always explicitly linked to peacebuilding or the justification of external states’ engagements. This, then, is one reason why this particular study is needed.

Third, intrastate conflicts are now the norm rather than the exception. The focus in this dissertation is primarily on the ethics of the post-conflict phase following intrastate conflicts. This is accounted for by the fact that previous research mainly has focused on wars between states. For this reason, it is interesting to study the justification of external states in peacebuilding initiatives following intrastate conflict, and the engagement of external states in another state’s domain. In order to complement existing research on peacebuilding engagements, the aim here is to focus on the external involvement after war, when the (new) local government is supposed to be in charge of the processes within its jurisdiction. This can be problematic considering that the government of a country which has recently experienced war or armed conflict is typically characterized by fragility and instability. Legally, the government should be responsible but practically this is often a challenge. This

236 Dower 2009:3
237 Philpott 2010
fragility increases the need for a justification of peacebuilding, given that it often challenges the principle of sovereignty.

Fourth, when it comes to agency, the type of agency that is central here is international institutional political agency. This is defined as the way states act, behave, and taking decisions, i.e. their room for manoeuvre. In addition, a state’s agency is influenced by how other actors perceive the state as well as how the state perceives itself. This is a question of collective institutional and political moral agency. This chapter builds on existing research on external states in relation to state-building. It has further explored how international institutional political agency could be constructed in external states. I have suggested five analytical categories for scrutinizing the agency of the state; identity, leadership, structure and institutions, goals and mandate and expectations. In relation to these, a suitable analytical approach seems to be the theory of justification, which will be discussed in the next chapter. The ethical analysis will hence be grounded and anchored in a particular understanding of agency, based in the discussion above and further developed in the chapters of the cases. The central question becomes how, and under which circumstances it is possible to scrutinize the collective, political and external agency being actualized within peacebuilding processes, and how this relates to justification. It is now time to turn to the discussion of justification.
3. Justification and Peacebuilding

Justification has been understood in different ways and studied in several disciplines using various approaches. This chapter is devoted to an exploration of the concept of justification and, in particular, its application to peacebuilding initiatives. What kind of justification is applicable to peacebuilding, and how ought peacebuilding to be understood and justified? In what follows, I articulate a conception of moral and political justification that has relevance for external actors in peacebuilding. The following discussion develops the main theoretical framework for this thesis, building on the conceptualization of peacebuilding and international agency in peacebuilding as developed in the previous chapter.

The aims of this chapter are several. The first is to explore conceptualizations and theories of justification. Within ethics, justification is often understood as the ideal status of a justificatory process, i.e. that something is justified and therefore just. The main concepts and theoretical approaches here being utilized within Kantian ethics are primarily articulated in works by John Rawls, Jürgen Habermas, and, in particular, Rainer Forst. The discussion in this chapter starts by framing the way in which these scholars have understood justification and how their positions relate to each other. The central issue here is how an adequate justification should be understood. We continue by exploring the right to justification, i.e. the theory of justice offered by Rainer Forst. Forst’s understanding of human beings is of crucial importance for his theory of justification, which warrants taking the conditions for justification as a starting point. Forst’s normative theory of justification is the core of the theoretical discussion of this dissertation, and his theory is both challenged and further developed.

The second aim is to articulate my conception of justification, which is of relevance for external agency in peacebuilding. The central question concerns the role played by morality within political justification. Here, I demonstrate how my theoretical approach is developed from
Forst’s. I also address the relationship between justification and legitimation as it relates to externality in peacebuilding. There has arguably been a tendency to mix the two concepts of justification and legitimation, which blurs our understanding of them. This chapter therefore also aims to bring conceptual clarity to the application of these concepts in relation to external actors’ engagement in peacebuilding. In addition, I develop analytical tools which can help distinguish whether morality, as well as which type of normative reasoning, is used in the process of justification of peacebuilding engagements. Here, two concepts will be suggested and discussed: attempts to justify and justification strategies.

Justification in the Kantian tradition

This study is positioned in the Kantian tradition, as should be clear from its focus on reason rather than kindness or goodness. The modern Kantian tradition in contemporary theory has been highly influenced by John Rawls and Jürgen Habermas. Their prominence is the reason for taking their work on justification as a starting point here. Therefore, justification is initially understood and developed based on the Rawlsian understanding. Rawls offers three ideas of justification. The first is the idea of public reason, the second is the method of reflective equilibrium, and the third is the idea of derivation of principles in the original position. Let us start by briefly introducing these three ideas.

Firstly, Rawls’s notion of public reason can be understood as justification. Because politics have an inherent power that is always coercive, political power is subject to more stringent demands for justification. Public reason in Rawls’s thinking can be understood in relation to a well-ordered constitutional democratic society. For Rawls, the way public reason is formed and the content which it is given form part of the democratic idea itself. Furthermore, the idea or function of public reason is often understood as deliberative democracy. Rawls states that the idea:

238 Even if these two originated from different starting points, their theories have reached a point where there are clear parallels, according to Forst. 2007:183
239 Scanlon 2002:139ff, Rawls 1999a
240 Rawls 1999a:131
This is an expression of how political relations should be understood. In addition, Rawls argues that there is a need to agree to this understanding of constitutional democracy as a way of organizing societies, because if this were not agreed upon, the idea of public reason would also be rejected. In the preceding citation, Rawls is drawing on both moral and political resources, but it is not clear what constitutes the difference between the moral and the political. He seems to understand the political as reasonable deliberation, something that is closely linked to his theory of justice as well as to the idea of democracy. Yet, Rawls appears not to place special emphasis on the differences between the political and the moral. However, his position has changed over time: the earlier Rawls tends to be more epistemological while the later tends to be a bit unclear on this topic.

Rawlsian public reason consists of five different aspects. The first aspect addresses the fundamental political question to which it applies. The second aspect addresses the persons to whom it is applied. The third aspect highlights the content of public reason as given by a reasonable political conception of justice. The fourth aspect addresses the application of the conceptions in relation to coercive norms in the form of legitimate law for a democratic people. The fifth aspect is the citizens’ control, in that they are checking that the principles derived from their conceptions of justice satisfy the criterion of reciprocity.

In addition, public reason is public in three ways. Firstly, it is the reason of free and equal citizens and therefore it is the reason of the public. Secondly, the subject of public reason is the public good. This involves questions of fundamental political justice, which fall into two
categories, constitutional essentials and matters of basic justice. Thirdly, public reason is by its very nature and matter public. It is expressed in public reasoning by means of a family of reasonable conceptions of political justice reasonably thought to satisfy the criterion of reciprocity.\textsuperscript{245}

Secondly, Rawls’s idea of the reflective equilibrium should be seen as a method which

\[
\text{[...]} \text{holds that principles are justified by their ability to explain those judgments in which we feel the highest degree of confidence.} \text{\textsuperscript{246}}
\]

The position of the reflective equilibrium has shown to be subject to differing interpretations and has additionally been the object of some controversy. With that in mind, let us go through the three stages of the idea. The first step is to identify a set of considered judgments about justice. The second step is then to try to formulate principles which would account for these judgments. The third step is to allow for revision of the principles: here one is able to decide how to respond to the divergence between these principles and one’s considered judgments. It is this reflective stage, when one is able to continue reasoning between principles and judgements, which Rawls understands as the ideal stage of a reflective equilibrium. Since this is not a stage we are either currently in or likely to reach, it should be understood as an ideal towards which we strive.\textsuperscript{247} This idea includes a dynamic approach to judgements, working back-and-forth on particular cases and decisions in order to reach an acceptable coherence between different options.\textsuperscript{248}

Thirdly, Rawls’s idea of the original position offers a third idea of justification. This position is explained as an argument of

\[
\text{[...]} \text{principles of justice as being justified if they could be derived in the right way, institutions are just if they conform to these principles, and particular distributions are just if they are the products of just institutions.} \text{\textsuperscript{249}}
\]

\textsuperscript{245} Rawls 1999a :133
\textsuperscript{246} Scanlon 2002:139
\textsuperscript{247} Scanlon 2002:140–141, Rawls 2005 :97
\textsuperscript{248} Daniels 2018
\textsuperscript{249} Scanlon 2002:139
According to Rawls, the original position is the appropriate initial status quo that ensures that the fundamental agreements are fair, which resembles his idea of justice as fairness. Rawls makes clear that the structure of the original position is itself justified by utilizing the reflective equilibrium as a way of connecting the two ideas. The idea of the original position can be understood as a revised version of the social contract, by which principles of justice are considered from a neutral position. This requires impartiality given that the parties do not know their societal position, something that, according to Rawls, provides the best platform for a discussion of justice.

Let us reflect on the insights from Rawls’s three ideas and how they can be related to the justification of external actors’ engagement in peacebuilding. First, it seems possible to interpret the idea of public reason in an international context. Rawls’s *Political Liberalism* focuses primarily on issues within a liberal society, while *The Law of Peoples* takes an international approach. International relations are very much about communication and cooperation and for this to be possible, venues for deliberation are necessary. The Rawlsian understanding of public reason seems like the most interesting idea to relate to external actors in peacebuilding. The original position is interesting as a thought experiment, but the idea requires a problematic individualistic understanding of human beings as not being sufficiently sensitive to power. We know that power influences how states act, and that peacebuilding is a highly asymmetric exercise. However, the method of reflective equilibrium may have a bearing for deliberations on the justification of engagement in peacebuilding as an ideal. As Rawls states, this is to be understood as an ideal to strive towards. However, this aspect of justification in Rawlsian thinking also seems to lack a perspective that is sensitive to the issue of power.

What seems to be an important distinction for doing that is the difference between different kinds of justification. When talking about justification, whether explicitly, in relation to peace missions, or in general, it would seem important to distinguish between *political* and *moral* justification. This dissertation understands political justification as

---
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252 What is problematic about the individualist understanding of human beings here is that this experiment assumes that the individual exists before the collective
providing pragmatic, practical reasons that have direct relevance for political action. This sometimes seems to correlate with the legitimization of political action. Moral justification is instead understood as the reasons for norms and actions that are morally approved. Chapter Three will offer a more in-depth discussion of the crucial differences between these concepts.

A note on epistemology and justification

It is important to note, as was mentioned earlier, that Rawls’s discussion is largely normative, not epistemological. However, the distinction between the epistemological and the normative has potential implications for justification in at least two ways. First, justification can be seen as a concept with potential for epistemological discussion. Second, it can be either normative or descriptive, since these two often stand in contrast to each other. This also has implications for the position of cognitivist and non-cognitivist theories in relation to justification.253 The following paragraphs aim to briefly explore how.

In relation to the potential conditions for knowledge, disagreement applies to whether justification can show that something is true or valid. This disagreement can be traced to a debate between a cognitivist and non-cognitivist position. Justification might be roughly understood as showing either validity or truth of moral judgements, and the question concerns whether moral judgements have truth value or not. Rawls and Habermas differ on this point, with Rawls sometimes tending to use truth and validity interchangeably while Habermas differentiates the concepts. Habermas and Forst are both cognitivists but they sometimes talk about validity and not truth.

There is also another option where scholars would argue that justification is a concept that cannot be grasped because both validity and truth are inaccessible in terms of morality. These are fundamentally important differences, and the choice of how to understand justification has significant implications. By opting for this last alternative, one would encounter serious challenges in studying justification from the

---

253 In brief, cognitivist theories argue that moral judgements provide knowledge about facts, and could therefore be true or false, and shown to be true or false. Non-cognitivist theories argue that arguments about the good and the right do not provide knowledge about facts, and that there is a crucial difference between moral judgements and facts. Hence, moral judgements cannot be true or false according to a non-cognitivist theory. Grenholm 2014:22-23
departure point of ethics since there is very limited room for any kind of discussion. However, by opting for justification as a form of validity, we are able to focus on the conditions that make justification valid. Opting for this alternative also opens up the possibility of including non-cognitivist theories in the project of justification. To clarify, my focus is on validity since that is acceptable to cognitivists and non-cognitivists alike.

These positions connect to meta-ethical and epistemological discussions, and the conditions for knowledge in turn affect how justification is understood. Hence, justification can be both an epistemological question, but it can also be part of a normative political process. Scholars such as Habermas can be seen as representatives for this validity-based understanding of justification. Habermas seem to see justification as something that should be able to show the validity of moral conviction, since validity is a suitable way of talking about things which have no other reference. Descriptive accounts can mirror this to a smaller or greater extent. Additionally, for Habermas, political justification connects to his idea of justification as providing validity.\(^{254}\) Habermas states that discourse ethics makes a careful distinction between the validity or justice of norms and the correctness of singular judgments that prescribe some particular action based on a valid norm.\(^ {255}\) Furthermore, and in relation to this, Habermas makes an important distinction between justification and application.\(^ {256}\) Based on this distinction, Habermas would probably view justification of peacebuilding as issues of application rather than of justification.

Besides the different epistemological positions, there are also important principal differences when it comes to various understandings and conceptualizations of justification on a more pragmatic level. Justification can be understood as a way of presenting reasons to convince others, or as implying that moral and political judgements are valid. I interpret this as being connected to different forms of justification, both political justification and moral justification. The discussion of the character of justification will continue below. However, it makes sense

\(^ {254}\) This is intriguing for the epistemological reasoning, but since I focus primarily on normative reasoning, I will not explore these epistemological aspects further.

\(^ {255}\) Habermas 1995:36. In addition, Habermas understands discourse as a form of communication that is removed from contexts of experience and actions, and whose structure ensures that bracketed validity claims are subject to discussion and that participants, themes, and contributions are not restricted. 1995:107–108

\(^ {256}\) Habermas 1995
even at this point to state that our attention here, in regards to epistemology, will be directed primarily at the kind of justification which holds and is valid.

To summarize this discussion, normativity and epistemology are located on different levels, and the focus of this study is primarily on the normative political process of justification of engagement in peacebuilding processes.

From Rawls and Habermas to Forst

The normative process of justification lies at the heart of the theoretical framework of this study. So why not settle for Rawls’s understanding of justification? First, the modern Kantian tradition has moved beyond Rawls in reasoning about justification. Habermas has further developed justification theory and has examined practical reason, particularly the pragmatic, ethical, and moral applications of practical reason. He argues for a separation between pragmatic, ethical, and moral aspects, linking this to a division between different more abstract forms of thought versus a practical discourse. He further argues that, based on the distinction between ethical and moral discourse, it lies within the framework of the moral discourse that universal moral judgments can be justified. Habermas understands ethics as a question of what is good, particularly what is good for me and my community. This understanding of the good life is often connected to different conceptions of life and different social communities. He understands morality as a duty and as the right thing to do.257 This understanding leads us to moral justification being the central notion for a conception of justification with relevance for external actors’ engagements in peacebuilding.

The theories offered by Rawls and Habermas have several similarities but also several differences. Some of the parallels are summarized by Forst as their position in the Kantian tradition and their idea of autonomous theory. A second parallel concerns their positions of a non-metaphysical and post metaphysical understanding of justice, while a third concerns the role of moral principles in a theory of justice. A fourth parallel focuses on the relationship between human rights and the sovereignty of people. Based on these and given this dissertation’s focus on the role of justification of external actors in peacebuilding, the

257 Grenholm Forthcoming
role of moral principles and the relationship between the individual and the collective are of particular interest here.

Habermas offers insights from both the epistemological and the normative level and his theory of communicative action is an example of this. Habermas agrees that we could justify a moral judgement by adopting what has been called the *moral point of view*, which is achieved by entering a practical discourse in a social context. However, he has his own interpretation of the moral point of view and manoeuvres away from the initial individual idea towards a discursive position. This discourse facilitates communication among equal persons, and the strength of the arguments govern the discourse, together with rules such as not contradicting oneself and not preventing others from expressing their views.258 The moral point of view, according to Habermas, seems to be a question about higher-level communication. In other words, he is making this about discourse ethics. He states that

> The moral point of view calls for the extension and reversibility of interpretive perspectives so that alternative viewpoints and interest structures and differences in individual self-understandings and worldviews are not effaced but are given full play in discourse.259

This can be interpreted as saying that communication takes place in the moral sphere, where differences and interests are taken into consideration. He continues by arguing that in justificatory discourses it is

> […] necessary to abstract form the contingent contextual embeddedness of a proposed norm only to ensure that the norm, assuming it withstands the generalization test, is sufficiently open to context-sensitive application.260

Yet, Habermas’s discussion of justification seems to be primarily phenomenological and derived from the philosophy of language.261 His reasoning is therefore often focused on the phenomenological analysis of human communication. Where Habermas takes a detour via the phenomenology of language, Forst goes directly from Kantian ethics to the discussion of what role morality plays within the political. Since this is

258 Grenholm Forthcoming; Habermas 1995:48f
259 Habermas 1995:58
260 Habermas 1995:58
261 Phenomenological here refers to the philosophical tradition of phenomenology.
closely related to the aim of this dissertation, Forst’s theory of justification offers the best approach for what I want to do.

However, this does not sufficiently explain why the thesis cannot settle for the theories of Rawls. The second reason for not settling for Rawls is that one of the premises of this dissertation is that there is a need to take critical theory seriously. A common view on critical theory is that it

[…] provides descriptive and normative bases for social inquiry aimed at decreasing domination and increasing freedom\(^{262}\) in every form.

Rawls’s theories offer many insights, but his theory is more clearly focused on individuals. For the purposes of this dissertation, there is a need for a theoretical approach that pays greater attention to human beings in social contexts.

A leading scholar who offers a theory of justification based on critical normative reasoning, and who is positioned in the Kantian tradition and influenced by both Rawls and Habermas, is Frankfurt professor Rainer Forst. Forst focuses in particular on the role of morality in political justification, and he is one of the most prominent scholars working on contemporary theory of justification. In my view, Forst offers the best suitable theoretical framework for a conception of justification that, with some modification, can be of relevance for external actors in peacebuilding. By building on Rawls’s conceptions of justification, which is further nuanced by the works of Habermas, Forst offers a critical theory of justification that is the most suitable starting point for a conceptual discussion of justification with relevance for peacebuilding. This, in combination with the focus on rationality and autonomy, clearly positions Forst in the Kantian tradition.\(^{263}\) In addition, his theory is in the critical tradition of the Frankfurt School and builds on its legacy of Critical Theory.

I submit that the Forstian understanding of justification as a potential duty, in combination with Forst’s theory of the right to justification, offers the most plausible understanding of justification. The reason is that his theorisation offers a context-sensitive as well as power-sensi-

\(^{262}\) Bohman 2016

\(^{263}\) This is clear from Forst’s reasoning, but also strengthened by other scholars, such as Düwell 2016:29ff
tive approach that pays attention to different political and social patterns. The mutual aspect of having a duty to justify and expecting others to offer justifications is key to the development of an understanding of justification. Our understanding of ‘justification to the other’ is not merely derived from the thinking of Forst but joins a trend developed by several scholars. This has led to an understanding that justification can be seen as a set of justificatory reasons towards persons rather than ‘justification simpliciter’, which has been portrayed as a major shift within how political philosophy understands justification. From here, the chapter continues by discussing the baseline for Forst’s theory of justification and what kind of justification is applicable to peacebuilding.

Conditions for justification – A Forstian account

There is a crucial assumption guiding this thesis when it comes to the understanding of justification. This assumption, which is crucial to the discussion that follows, addresses how we understand the nature of human beings. The characteristics of human beings – what it means to be human – has been studied and grappled with since the beginning of philosophy and theology. Hence, there are several different ways of understanding humans. One very plausible, and for justification very relevant, understanding is offered by Forst. Forst defines a human being as a combination of a social and political, autonomous, and self-legislative being endowed with reason and equipped with a capacity for language. A being that at the same time is flawed and limited.

Let us scrutinize this dense Forstian understanding of human beings and start by asking what it means to say that human beings are social and political beings. These two concepts, humans as social and political beings, are both grounded in an Aristotelian tradition. To be a social being, or an animal social, implies that humans are interactive creatures whose individual success is dependent on the overall cohesion of a
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264 Simmons 1999:759, as cited in Chambers 2010:893. The mutual aspect of having a duty to justify, and expecting others to justify, is central with regard to developing an understanding of justification. This understanding of ‘justification to the other’ or that justification can be understood as a set of justificatory reasons towards a set of persons, rather than ‘justification simpliciter’, has been portrayed as a major shift in how political philosophy understands justification.

265 Forst 2007:7, Forst 2017:21
group or society. This is connected to the understanding of human as political beings. To be a political being, a *zoon politikon*, implies that being political is a part of human nature. In Forst’s reasoning, the political in relation to human beings consists of a social context entailing norms and institutions that regulate the coexistence of human beings, the social. Furthermore, the order of justification is understood as consisting of the norms and institutions that govern both cooperation and conflictual coexistence. 266 This seems to imply that humans are social since human life is dependent on other humans, and that this interdependency becomes political once human beings start organizing themselves.

The next part in Forst’s definition of human beings is that humans are endowed with reason, as *animal rationale* or *zoon logikon*. This also resonates to an Aristotelian idea of what a human being is. An *animal rationale*, or a rational creature, has the ability to think and is therefore a reasoning being. Several philosophers consider this the main difference between humans and other animals. 267 Forst is here to be understood in the Kantian tradition of theoretical and practical reason. In relation to justification, practical reason would seem to be most relevant since this part of our ability to reason is concerned with the question of what one should do. It is in that sense practice-oriented. It is through practical reason we are able to create justifications for our moral judgments and actions. In addition, Forst recognizes human beings as *zoon logon echon*, as rational beings with the ability to master language. This communicative ability to put words to our thoughts and share them with other people through language is a prerequisite for being able to provide justifications. Furthermore, the communicative or discursive skill is of central importance for Habermas’s thinking on discursive ethics.

Forst also emphasizes other parts of what it means to be human. This rational and communicative being is at the same time flawed, finite, and limited. This can also be understood as an emphasis upon the social beings’ humans are, in that we are less flawed, finite, and limited when we work and strive together. On the other hand, the finite and limited part of being human is predetermined; we know that our life will at some point come to an end.

---
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The combination of these above-mentioned definitions or features of what it means to be human is, according to Forst, what makes human beings’ justificatory beings.

Human beings as justificatory beings

Forst argues convincingly that the combination of human beings as social, political, rational beings who are able to use language, but who at the same time are flawed and limited, makes human beings’ justificatory beings.268 This is an important assumption with normative connotations that have implications for our understanding of justification. This understanding of human beings as justificatory beings implies recognition of a human ability to justify and take responsibility for actions and beliefs by giving reasons to others. Therefore, by providing reasons we try to justify our thoughts, arguments and actions. In addition, the justificatory ability implies an ability to see justification, in certain contexts, as a duty as well as an assumption that others will do the same. This reciprocity means that I assume that I have to justify my claims, arguments, and actions towards others and that I expect others to justify their claims, arguments, and actions towards me.

Forst’s understanding of justice is central to his understanding of justification; the right to justification is his theory of justice. Central to his theory is that he understands the political as an order of justification regulated by norms and institutions. Justice is the most important concept for describing this order of justification, and this order is always a system of power.269 In addition, justice is to be understood neither as an absolute concept nor as one value amongst others.270 The concept of justice not only demands an explanation for why one or another have or does not have particular rights or goods, it asks what it is that determines whether someone can claim any particular rights or goods.271 This is crucial both for the understanding of Forst’s theory and for the understanding of justification in this dissertation. Let me elaborate a little. As I understand Forst’s conception of justice, this is the principal question dealing with normative theory as well as political orders. The conception of justice is not only interested in understanding different cases of

268 Forst 2007:7
269 Forst 2014b:10
270 Forst 2007:17
271 Forst 2007:7
injustice, but also what initially makes different cases a case of injustice. Primarily, justice is a question of power. In Forst’s account, justice is not a question of distributing goods or social values but rather a question about how these social values are produced and how this production is organised justly. It is also a question of who is in charge of the structures of the production and distribution.\textsuperscript{272} In other words, justice is structural and primarily an issue of politics and power. Justice is the polar opposite of arbitrariness, and justification is understood as a way of providing reasons instead of domination.\textsuperscript{273} Domination is important in the context of justice, particularly since it signifies the arbitrary rule of some over others.\textsuperscript{274} By focusing on principles, it is possible to address underlying structural injustices that are of crucial importance for global justice. Of similar relevance is how Forst understands peace as

\[
\text{[...]} \text{a value, while justice is a higher-order principle by means of which we judge peace - and determine what kind of peace we should strive for.} \textsuperscript{275}
\]

The most central question that Forst asks is what requirements can be placed on an adequate justification. Forst addresses this by constructing the formal criteria of reciprocity and generality. He also argues that the reasons provided should be relevant, so that they can be accepted by every moral person. The discussion will return to these formal criteria for adequate political justification shortly.

A right to justification

A Forstian account of justification is built upon an understanding of humans as justificatory beings, but no less crucial are his two formal criteria of reciprocity and generality and his understanding of power and politics. Together with Forst’s view that the right to justification constitutes his theory of justice, and his trust in the possibility of having rational deliberation and argumentation about moral judgements, they form the baseline for his understanding of justification.

\textsuperscript{272} Forst 2014c:4 Accounts focusing on distribution or goods are legitimate, but they miss central aspects of justice, according to Forst.
\textsuperscript{273} Forst 2014c:4f
\textsuperscript{274} Forst 2014a:7
\textsuperscript{275} Forst 2014b:73
Forst views ethics and morality in the same way as Habermas in that ethics is about the good and the good life, while morality concerns duties. He also seems to follow Habermas in holding that it is within the moral discourse that moral judgments can potentially be justified. Forst holds the position that politics has nothing to do with ethics but that deliberative democracy has a moral foundation, which is the right to justification. This implies that a human being should never have to obey norms in the absence of good reasons for accepting them.276

Forst makes a distinction between motives and justification, arguing that rational motives and reasonable justification provide answers to the question of what to do but lead us to different kind of answers. A rational motive for an action shows that the action is a means to achieve something seen as valuable and good. Reasonable justification in a moral context is instead about providing reasons for norms and actions, which can be accepted by all who are concerned. These reasons should be intersubjectively defendable based on certain criteria of acceptable arguments in the moral context.277

Reciprocity and generality

The primary question for Forst is what might characterize adequate political justification. As briefly mentioned earlier, his answer to this question is that the reasons provided as justification should be relevant and that they should be acceptable by every moral person. They should also be generally and reciprocally valid. Forst states and clarifies a few central aspects of his understanding of justification in the following quote. He states that:

Reciprocity in this context of justification means that one does not make any claim to certain rights or resources one denies to others, and that one does not project one’s own reasons (values, interests, needs) onto others in arguing for one’s claims.278

This quote pinpoints the importance of reciprocity and highlights a neutrality aspect of Forst’s theory of justice. It also shows what Forst means by the reciprocal aspect of justification, since the citation makes clear that justification cannot involve claiming certain rights or resources

276 Forst 2017:28
277 Grenholm Forthcoming, Forst 2014b:14
278 Forst 2004:317
which are simultaneously denied others. Furthermore, the neutrality aspect is also of importance here, since it is not permissible to project one’s own views onto others.

The second principle in Forst’s theory, generality, is to be understood as stating that all persons affected must be able to access and accept the reasons in relation to universal and fundamental norms.279 I understand this as a form of universality that is a reasonable interpretation of Kant, since it accords with Kant’s categorical imperative. Forst’s principles indicate what it means that the maxims for our actions should be possible to universalize. This is helpful in assessing justificatory arguments in a peacebuilding context. If the argument is general, and would hold in any peacebuilding situation, all else being equal, it should be seen as a convincing and strong moral argument. However, we have to bear in mind here that moral and political justification are two different but related things, as is discussed in greater depth below.

Forst argues that validity claims of a moral norm, regardless of whether it implies that people have the duty to do or refrain from doing something, indicates that no-one has good reasons for violating this norm. This also implies that both objections to and exceptions from the norm carry a high burden of justification. He argues that if one recursively asks about redeeming a validity claim, then this calls for a discursive justification procedure in which the addressee of the norm can assess its reciprocal and general validity. Therefore, the criteria for reciprocity and generality become decisive.280

According to the principle of reciprocal and general justification, moral persons have a fundamental right to justification and a corresponding unconditional duty to justify morally relevant actions.281 This builds on the Forstian understanding of human characteristics, that humans are justificatory beings. In addition, the form of reciprocal and general justification is a recursive reconstruction of the principle of practical reason. Forst argues that the two criteria answer the question of what it means to act in morally justified ways. Making use of the criteria of reciprocity and generality in the justificatory procedure, answers the question of which norms are morally justified.282 In other words, if an argument is reciprocal and general, it is morally justified.

279 Forst 2007:13
280 Forst 2014b:21
281 Forst 2014b:21
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Nevertheless, how can we know whether an argument is reciprocal and general? This requires analytical tools as well as contextual knowledge.

In order to assess justificatory attempts, it is necessary to construct analytical tools. In Forst’s theory of justification, the concepts of reciprocity as well as generality are crucial. These are used in order to distinguish acceptable from unacceptable reasons. Forst elaborates on the two concepts and argues that reasons which justify specific normative claims must be reciprocally non-rejectable, meaning that the initiator of the claims cannot demand any rights or privileges which he or she denies his or her addressee.283 This means that you cannot deny someone else a claim which you yourself are making; in other words, you cannot deny reciprocity with regard to content. It also implies that you cannot force your own values or interests upon someone else, even if you invoke true truths that not everyone agrees with. This alludes to reciprocity in regard to reasons.284

By assuming that regardless of what we think or do, we impose a demand for reasons upon ourselves as well as others, we also assume justification. This mutual demand exemplifies the quest for justification. These justificatory demands can be understood as either implicit or explicit.285 The mutual and reciprocal aspect here is therefore crucial. The reason for this is that by recognizing the need to justify your actions or arguments to others, you inherently include an expectation that others will also justify their arguments and actions to you. Importantly, Forst’s theory is not about consensus: he is very clear on this point. What is required is the fulfilment of the two criteria.

Forst’s theory of justification, which he develops as the right to justification, accords with how he understands practical reason as normative, dynamic, and vivid. Central to Forst’s theory of justification is what he calls the reflexive shift.286 This is understood as a practice which aims to avoid stalemates within political theory and philosophy. The reflexive shift opens up for potential dialogue and argumentation and sets out to consider all potential viewpoints. Also crucial for Forst is the importance of who is asking the question and who has the opportunity or capability of answering it.287 This implies that contextual as
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well as political contexts need to be taken into consideration, in particular in relation to power and justice in discursive practices.

Power and politics

Power is often considered central in international relations; this is also the case when it comes to peacebuilding initiatives. External state actors are in this context actors with stronger agency in the sense that they often have greater capacity to act in tandem with the ambition to do so. What is interesting is that different external state actors seem to have different degrees and types of power, something that also affects their agency.288 As discussed in Chapter One, power can be either soft or hard, economic or military.289 In addition, the state’s room for manoeuvre is governed by its position within the international community of states. The term international community of states has been chosen deliberately since the overall focus here is state-centric.290 In general, Frankfurt School scholars question the prevailing social order by means of immanent critique. Yet, the sovereign state is not seen as an obstacle to achieving security but rather as the referent of security.291

Forst is suggesting that it is time to recall the political point of political philosophy. What he seems to be referring to when he talks about the political is an understanding of the philosophical question of justification as a practical and radicalised question, which at the same time contextualizes the idea of justification.292 This can be seen as exhortation to take global justice seriously and as an acknowledgement of the problems with the structure of the current world order. In addition, he states that the political question of justification is always posed concretely.293 Here he seems to be referring to his view that justice is largely a question of injustice.
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288 Here agency is used in a slightly different way to how it has previously been conceptualized. Here it refers to the capacity to act which different actors possess.
289 Nye 2008:94
290 According to Eckert & Gentry, this partly deviates from the Frankfurt School’s explicitly normative commitment to the emancipation of individuals. Eckert & Gentry 2018:235f However, in my interpretation, scholars such as Forst is particularly focused on social structures and not only individuals.
291 Eckert & Gentry 2018:235f
292 Forst 2014b:2
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However, Forst’s position is globalist in that he defends moral cosmopolitanism, and, importantly, he does not defend political cosmopolitanism. In his discussions of human rights, it becomes clear that these are central to democratic processes but also that states are central given that their democratic structures facilitate non-domination. Forst’s position on power is characterized as realist in a descriptive sense. However, he rejects certain forms of normative realism, such as that offered by Bernard Williams. Yet, he is convinced that power is crucial, both for politics and for justice. Let us discuss Forst’s account of justice, since it is central to his view of power, before returning to his understanding of power.

Forst argues that recipient-oriented pictures of justice fail to address four crucial things. This understanding of justice is present in accounts of distributive justice, which focus on the allocation of social values between persons. The four aspects that these accounts fail to address are as follows. First, how different goods come into existence, i.e. that issues of production and their just organisation are often neglected in goods- and distribution-centred accounts of justice. Second, the political question about who determines the structures of production is often downplayed. A third aspect which is often neglected is that justified claims can only come into existence through discourse and deliberation; they do not simply just exist. Fourth, and perhaps most important here, is that accounts of distributive justice often neglect the question of injustice.294 This seems to place more emphasis not only on the power dynamics between actors but also on how structural aspects set the rules for the game of social interaction. The world is an unjust place, and the international community is governed by power. A descriptive realist position acknowledges that, while a normative non-realist aspires to change these dominating structures.

This dissertation adopts the understanding of justice – or injustice – articulated by Forst. This is helpful to highlight an asymmetrical relationship between agents (in this study, states). Second, external engagement in peacebuilding should be a question of justice rather than moral solidarity. Supporting a conflict-ridden society and preventing relapse into conflict is about taking global justice seriously and doing so with dignity and respect.

294 Forst 2014a:4f
For Forst, power is political, and to understand his conception of politics, it would seem advantageous to start by addressing his understanding of power. Forst’s understanding of the concept of power seems to be located on a discursive level: power is portrayed as a discursive phenomenon. This phenomenon concerns the ability to influence and set limits to the reasons that could be invoked to justify norms and actions.295 Forst clarifies that he understands power as the primary question of justice. He develops this view of power as divided between noumenal and phenomenal power, arguing that we can only understand what power is and how it is exercised once we grasp that it is essentially noumenal power.296 Such a conception of power seems abstract, even if this is not the case for Forst, who wants it to be normative and political and thus have practical implications.

A discrepancy between the philosophical and a more pragmatic understanding of power becomes visible here. Forst’s conception of power seems to be of a relational nature, in which concepts such as acceptance and recognition are central. In addition, power is about being taken seriously. Significantly, Forst’s definition of power is a modification of the classical one. The classical understanding of power typically refers to A’s capacity to get B to do something she would otherwise not have done. The definition of power which Forst is advocating seems to be based on the classical understanding of power, but it is modified in that the definition is that power is the capacity of A to motivate B to think or do something that B would otherwise not have thought or done.297 However, whether this is done for good or bad reasons is not part of that definition.298 Power is, according to Forst, a normatively neutral concept. Important to note here is that motive in Forst’s definition seems to be equivalent to justification.

Power is what goes on in the head, and what goes on is recognition of a reason to act in a certain way. Power rests on perceived and recognized, accepted justifications (from the participant’s perspective) – some good, some bad, some in-between (as seen from an observer’s perspective).299
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Forst’s account of power also places emphasis on how B receives the reasons. This is how it becomes relational and hence also political. In addition, and crucially for Forst, power is about affecting someone’s motives rather than her actual actions, since motive is here understood as justification.\textsuperscript{300} In addition, Forst argues that there is a need for criteria to distinguish between good and bad justifications. But he does not see that the general concept of power includes these criteria.\textsuperscript{301} Even if the concept of power is neutral, good justification can be distinguished using the criteria of reciprocity and generality.

However, besides stating that power is not one of those criteria, he does not mention what it is or should be.\textsuperscript{302} According to Forst’s reasoning, justification based on domination is bad while justification that fulfills the reciprocal and general criteria is good. In other words, good and bad justifications differ in whether they fulfil the criteria of generality and reciprocity.

The terminology of noumenal power seems to suggest that this is a type of power situated in the world of ideas or thoughts, but Forst argues that this is a misunderstanding. Power, he claims, is very much a social and institutional question. Like Allen and Haugaard, Forst argues that reasoning is intrinsic to political power, having both the potential to treat power as justice and as domination.\textsuperscript{303} Forst explains that the original phenomenon of power is noumenal in nature since

\[\text{[…] to have power means to be able – and this comes in different degrees – to use, influence, determine, occupy or even to seal the space of reasons for others.}\textsuperscript{304}\]

This account of power needs further explication based on examples from social and institutional instances.

Forst understands the task of critical theory as being to analyse the power of justification based on justificatory grounds and to analyse who decides how these justificatory grounds come into existence. Furthermore, he states that it is central to his approach that critical theory be seen as the venue for justification as both a theoretical and a practical
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I understand this as a possibility to see the practical aspect as being of relevance for politics and political decisions. Forst argues that the definition of power is in itself normatively neutral, but that there are both positive and negative forms of power. He states that rule, domination and violence are three different forms of power. In relation to politics, Forst argues for a model of deliberative democracy, which is his ideal form of rule. His understanding of deliberative democracy is that it is governed by reciprocity and generality. The second form of power, domination, is the primary example of negative power. The neutrality of power means that power does not necessarily have a negative connotation but that it could degenerate into domination. Violence is the third expression of power, and under these conditions there is no longer room for justification.

I interpret this as being connected to how his understanding of power operates on at least two levels. The first one is discursive, focusing on dominant and hegemonic justifications of certain forms of thoughts and actions. The second is practical in that it should be able to identify different power positions within a society. However, once power is misused it cannot be seen as neutral.

In relation to the justification of external actors’ engagement in peacebuilding, violence is not present as such. Even if the society where peacebuilding is supposed to take place has experienced systematic violence, this does not affect the need for justification of the external actors’ engagements. These practical implications are not completely clear from Forst’s reasoning, but this seems a plausible inference in view of his discussion on power and violence. He understands violence as when the other means takes over once decisions and norms are no longer justified. This noumenal version of power is arguably transferable to more practical versions of power. If power is to be understood as what happens when attempts are no longer made to provide justification, or room for justification, this can be seen as a broad definition of power.

Forst’s understanding of power can be criticized in several ways. One issue is that he seems not to consider sufficiently material factors such as access to weapons. This is reflected in his view that a violent
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society is violent due to the lack of justification. However, in light of his Frankfurt School affiliation, it is hard to believe that he is unaware of the risk of downplaying material factors. He has also been criticized for being less radical than he claims and for offering a tendentious conceptualization of power

[…] which does not satisfactorily explain the complex, material dynamics through which major structural inequalities are reproduced.  

Forst would probably reply to this by referring to his understanding of power as nominal and to the power of justification in enhancing the role of justification for a just society.

Up until now, the thesis has primarily focused on analysing how Forst’s theory of justification is constructed and understood. Let us now focus the discussion on whether, and, if so, how, Forst’s theory can be applied to the issue of states’ justification of international political action. In the following, I articulate a theoretical approach to justification in order to analyse the justificatory attempts which external states use to justify their peacebuilding engagements.

Justification and its application to peacebuilding

This section aims to discuss the ways in which Forst’s theoretical approach is applicable to the political practice of external states’ engagements in peacebuilding. In the following, I clarify how I apply and modify Forst’s ideas to a theoretical approach to the analysis of states’ political justification of their engagement in peacebuilding.

As Forst explains, in accordance with his understanding of human beings as justificatory beings, in order to understand human practices we need to understand them as bound up with justification or as justificatory practices.  

I agree with this claim and would in addition suggest that since a group such as a state consists of a large number of human beings, individual human practices and hence justificatory practices also are relevant on a group and state level. This is not a new idea and
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has been expressed by Rawls, for example, in his *Law of Peoples*.³¹² It is also discussed by Forst in relation to transnational justice. Forst argues that the criteria of reciprocity and generality are also applicable in the context of international relations.³¹³ He states that

International law and a politics of intervention have to follow a particular logic of human rights, not the converse.³¹⁴

However, he also argues that the primary perspective of human rights is from the inside. According to Forst, human rights serve to ‘ground internal legitimacy’, and the central question of human rights concerns the provision of conditions for establishing legitimate authority.³¹⁵

Here, it is possible to argue that if interpersonal practices are understood as justificatory practices, there is no inherent reason why intergroup practices should not also be considered justificatory practices. What is added in the group setting is the dimension of the intragroup dynamic in relation to the intergroup dynamic. This ties into the discussion of collective agency in the previous chapter. However, it is of crucial importance to pay attention to the differences between domestic and foreign policies. Yet, there is no inherent reason why this understanding of justificatory practices should not also be relevant at the level of nation states. This does not necessarily contradict the anarchic structure of the international system but is rather a way of understanding communication between states.

To translate justificatory practices into an example from a peace-building context, this might imply that the state of Haiti would expect the state of Brazil to provide justificatory reasons for why they are engaging in a peace mission in Haiti. There might be different expectations of the type and strength of the justification attempts, depending on whether the government of Haiti explicitly invited Brazil or not. An engagement without invitation arguably requires more justification than

³¹² Rawls 1999a:3. In Rawls’s understanding of ‘peoples’, he refers to a particular political conception of right and justice that applies to the principles and norms of international law and practice. What he is referring to seems to be a particular understanding of political liberalism. However, one of the points Rawls makes is that both liberal and illiberal peoples are included in his reasoning. For further discussion see Rawls 1999a:23-24
³¹³ Forst 2014b:54ff
³¹⁴ Forst 2014b:54
³¹⁵ Forst2014b:54
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engagement based on an invitation. In a second step, both the representatives of Brazil and the representatives of Haiti are also expecting other states and state representatives to provide justifications for their respective engagements, just as the representatives of Haiti expect justification from Brazil. The discussion will return later to what these justifications might look like. However, what characterizes them as justifications is the normative content of the arguments and, in particular, the moral reasons for action.

I suggest that recognizing that relations between states also have inherent justificatory practices built into their interstate relationships helps to facilitate the importance of justification in the relationships between states. Therefore, the same logic arguably holds for nation states as for human beings. This might then imply that a nation state should assume that it has to justify its claims, arguments, and actions and would then expect other nation states to justify their claims, arguments, and actions. In the example of Brazil and Haiti, Brazil is expected to have to justify its engagement, which is reasonable since they are providing justificatory reasons for engagement. Additionally, the representatives of both Brazil and Haiti expect other actors to present justifications for their engagements. What complicates this example is the complex nature of peace missions. There are often several actors involved, not least via the United Nations. Justificatory reasons are often provided in discussions within the UN.

The Habermasian ideal of an inclusive critical discussion, which also plays an important role in Forst’s reasoning, with participants treating each other as equals in a cooperative effort to reach an understanding on matters of common concern, is also relevant to an understanding of justification of peacebuilding initiatives. Several things become crucial here, one being the equality aspect of the participants or, in this case, states. Within international relations, there is to some extent an equality aspect in relation to the principle of sovereignty of every nation. Given this, we might understand international organisations such as the United Nations as examples of venues for inclusive critical discussion. However, and importantly, several factors complicate this. For example, the different power asymmetries between countries challenge the possibility of viewing all states as equal actors.
Forst’s theory of justification highlights structural power dimensions in the discourse. Translated into a context of international or transnational relations, particularly peacebuilding, this implies that there are venues where actors are able to articulate their justifications but also that there are opportunities to consider who is asking questions and who is providing answers and in what ways. This would imply a dynamic, reflexive and flexible approach to the justificatory attempts, but it would also provide a critical position for addressing discursive power. Empirically, it often seems to matter who is asking questions and who is providing answers. Here, descriptive realism becomes visible in that it acknowledges the implications which power has on the international arena, and that states have different positions based on both their material and their perceived power.

For several reasons reciprocity criteria seem to be advantageous to work with in assessing the attempts to justify peacebuilding initiatives. First, it is morally wrong to deny others something to which you yourself have access. Such denial undermines the relationship and potentially creates mistrust. The understanding of reciprocity implies an understanding of global justice in which all actors are treated equally. A powerful neighbour should not have precedence either in interpreting the situation or in taking action.

I argue that there is a need for analytical tools in order to assess the formal criteria of reciprocity and generality in the foreign policy of external actors. Such tools are suggestive in indicating that arguments should be transparently portrayed and easily accessible. They should also have an intersubjective character in that several actors can jointly access and accept them. This provides us with three analytical tools: transparency; accessibility; and intersubjectivity. In what way are these tools allowing for variation between different contexts? I would argue that they are to be understood as a scale on which high amounts of transparency and accessibility are crucial. When it comes to intersubjectivity there is instead a threshold; if this is not reached, the argument cannot be assessed with reasonable means.

316 Forst seems to make a point out of using the term “transnational” rather than “international”. This issue seems to be related to the legacy of the Frankfurt School, in which Critical Theory emphasized emancipatory aspects and systematically questioned the prevailing social order, institutions, and power relationships.
The descriptive realist position of this study is in line with Forst’s discussion of Phillip Pettit’s account of realism and international relations. Forst is himself a descriptive realist, but he is normatively a non-realist. A similar feature of both his and Pettit’s positions is that dominant states, multinational corporations, or international organizations do not have the same power over other states or peoples as a state does over its citizens. Hence there already exists a basic structure of domination. According to Forst, that structure must be turned into the basic structure of non-domination of a world state. The normative non-realist would not accept the domination of certain countries over others but rather try to provide serious accounts for global and international justice. This can be seen as a serious quest for equality among peoples as well as states.

However, what I interpret as a normative non-realist position is, according to Forst,

[…] convinced that there is sufficient domination at the international and translational levels that must be tracked, and that it must be overcome by establishing appropriately robust structures of justification that can curb such power asymmetries and realize basic forms of justice.

This acquires crucial importance for external engagement in peacebuilding, not only because peacebuilding initiatives should be seen as issues of justice rather than solidarity or altruism, but also because the current system includes power asymmetries and domination which need to be regulated.

Attempts to justify and justification strategies

It is perhaps reasonable to argue that the justificatory process of actions consists of different parts. In the case of external actors of peacebuilding it starts with an actor who is expected to justify a particular act which their government is planning to implement. It is also possible to create justifications subsequently; however, this often tends to be a question of legitimization rather than justification. Let us discuss the
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difference between justification and legitimization in a moment, but first focus on the process of justification.

In relation to peacebuilding, the justificatory process concerns a government which is planning to become involved in a particular peacebuilding initiative in a particular context. The justificatory process is preceded by different events leading up to a proposed action. Typically, involvement takes the form of a reply to a request of assistance from a state that has experienced armed conflict. The involvement is usually facilitated via multilateral or bilateral collaborations. This peacebuilding action is often decided upon within the framework of a foreign policy decision. Before such a foreign policy decision to engage in long-term peacebuilding initiatives can be taken, it needs to be sufficiently anchored and accounted for in addition to being seen as justifiable. Regardless of the form that the collaboration takes, there is a need for motives and justifications of the decisions leading to action. Decision-making is a process in which several reasons are portrayed as motives and justifications for a particular choice or action are presented, evaluated, and assessed. This leads to a decision by which a particular course of action is decided.

Justification, or, perhaps, an attempt to justify, is often connected to motives for following a particular path. However, there is a difference between motives and justifications. A common distinction is that normative reasons concern objectively favouring or justifying an action, while providing motives is largely a subjective enterprise in which the agent justifies her action and the principles which have guided her in acting. This is a simplification, and when motives are translated to a discussion of the justification of peacebuilding, they should be understood as the motives for an action, whether “real” realist motives such as power, interest, etc., or putative motives such as peace, humanity, etc. Justification is instead about the moral defence of an action. This latter form is instead based on normative principles which can vary, and which can include a duty and a principle of acting in certain ways, utilitarian references to benefit, a reflective equilibrium, and so on.

Forst also draws an explicit distinction between motives and justification. He states that the process leading up to a justified decision can
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explain whether the normativity of moral justifications has followed a correct course. He argues that “no nonmoral motives can motivate morality”. What follows from this is that the political and moral contexts, in Forstian terms, sometimes get blurred. A decision to get involved in peacebuilding is a political one but the justification of the action can be either political or moral. If non-moral motives cannot provide a motive for morality, moral motives might. What, then, is the difference between moral motives and moral justification? As argued earlier, the former concerns motives which could be realist or pronounced, while justification is about principles.

For the material analysed in this thesis, it is a potential challenge to get access to the real reasons or motives behind the engagement in particular peacebuilding initiatives. On the other hand, that is not the purpose. Yet, it is also challenging to get access to the real justifications since foreign policy documents do not usually invoke the language of moral principles. This makes it clear that this is a question about the most reasonable interpretation of the arguments expressed in the documents. In order to systematically address these, I suggest we focus on attempts to justify as an analytical tool to address the arguments in the foreign policy discourse on peacebuilding and interpret which kind of principles are forming them. This clearly assumes that moral principles, directly or indirectly, are present in the foreign policy discourse. This is an assumption that also is tested and challenged in this study.

Attempts to justify should here be understood as an attempt towards normative or moral justification, here understood as justification that holds and is valid, while the concept of justification strategies signals a pragmatic and/or political justification. This type of political justification is instead a question of convincing others or a kind of justification which rebuts objections.

The concepts suggested could be understood as a spectrum between justification strategies – attempts to justify – justifiable – justified, in which there appear to be important substantive and perhaps also normative nuances. Whether a political argument or decision is actually
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323 Still, the correlation between motives and actions is interesting and may imply that there is an important difference between the arguments invoked for the purpose of justification and the core motives behind a particular act or decision. While such political motives can be traced, this study is focusing on moral justifications in the arguments used in order to try to justify peace engagement.
justified, whether it is justifiable, and whether the actors involved are trying to justify a particular decision helps us to identify different parts of the justificatory process. Here, I develop theoretical instruments to distinguish between different types of justification on different levels. A justified action is closest to the ideal stage of justification. A justifiable action is an action that has the potential to be morally justified. This has to do with the character and characteristics of an action as well as the direct or indirect relation to an ethical principle. In order for it to be justified an attempt to justify is dependent on an action being seen as justifiable. This is understood as the practices of constructing justification for certain actions. Here, it is of theoretical importance that justification is discursively constructed: justification does not simply just exist.

The attempts to justify are here understood as practices related to moral principles. However, these are sometimes influenced by political and economic interests in order to justify different decisions and actions. Attempts to justify are therefore sometimes linked to justification strategies. While attempts to justify are moral aspirations towards justification, justification strategies are pragmatic and political attempts at justification. This understanding of justification strategies follows scholars such as Albert Weale (1999). Weale has paid particular attention to justifications of democracy, and defines justificatory practice as being to

[…], show either how the practice conforms to a principle or how the consequences of the practice lead to a state of affairs that can be judged good in principled terms.324

This citation shows that Weale’s definition can be understood both as deontological, in that the justificatory practice conforms to a principle, and consequentialist in that it focuses on the consequences of the practice. This pinpoints the nuanced character of reasoning in foreign policy, and that different types of normative approaches can be applicable. However, as I try to show here, the most reasonable way of assessing justificatory practice is with regard to the deontological goal of emphasizing reason over kindness or goodness.

324 Weale 1999:40
Another potential way of understanding justification strategies is to put the main emphasis on the strategical part. This would imply pragmatic, political, and tactical ambitions. Furthermore, this is often used in a calculated manner to achieve certain goals. Foreign policy decisions are often characterized by this type of strategic approach. However, this might generate confusion in relation to justification since justification strategies are not to be confused with strategies in this realist political-strategic way. As has been discussed, justification strategies are instead about political strategies with moral implications, preferable which allude to attempts to justify – i.e. are based on normative reasoning and ethical principles.

Strategies are not to be confused with policies, even if there is some overlap.\textsuperscript{325} In politics, strategies are typically understood as comprehensive programmes that set overall priorities, while policies are the guiding plans for reaching the goals of the strategies. Therefore, policies are often subordinated to a strategy. However, the conceptualization of justification strategies here is slightly different. A justification strategy is articulated in the overarching strategy but explicated and exemplified in different policies. Therefore, a justification strategy can be found both in the overarching strategy and its different policies. We are again talking about different levels here, and justification strategies are normative, discursively articulated strategies which can nonetheless be found on the political level in different political strategies, policies, and tactics.

\textsuperscript{325} Sir Lawrence Freedman argues that strategy has been developed in military circles but originates elsewhere (pp 69-70), while policy or planning is primarily derived from politics. He defines strategy as ‘the art of creating power’ (p. xii). Freedman 2013. The noun strategy is defined by the Cambridge English Dictionary as “a long-range plan for achieving something or reaching a goal, or the skill of making such plans”. However, it can also designate “the way in which a business, government, or other organization carefully plans its actions over a period of time to improve its position and achieve what it wants”. In this study it is the first of these two meanings. In the same dictionary policy is defined as “set of ideas or a plan of what to do in particular situations that has been agreed to officially by a group of people, a business organization, a government, or a political party”. A country’s foreign policy is understood as a guiding document for the foreign policy actions of that particular country. A foreign policy is a government’s approach to dealing with other countries, which often is described as a plan based on a set of coherent decisions leading towards a common goal.
Moral and political justification

Now, there is clearly a need to distinguish between the two different types of moral and political justification. Providing arguments as reasons for engagement in peacebuilding is not per se unmitigated moral justification since there are different types of justification. Sometimes it is a shallow, more pragmatic understanding of justification; occasionally it seems to be confused with political legitimacy and legitimation. Additionally, when addressed as justification, it sometimes seems to be far from the notion itself as generally understood within ethics. One example of a different conceptualization of justification seems to be the notion of political justification. However, this is mostly found in contemporary political theory and, according to White and Ypi, mostly in models of deliberative democracy. Hence, this seems to be something different from moral justification as understood here. All forms of scrutiny of justification contribute to furthering our understanding of the concept yet it is of crucial importance to clarify and streamline the different nuances.

One way to address the differences between moral and political justification is by viewing them as on different levels. Forst understands morality and politics as separate contexts and stresses that there is a difference between moral and political justification. As he sees it, a morally justified norm is not by definition politically justified. He seems to understand political justification as a legally institutionalised form of justification, i.e. justification that is constructed constitutionally. Forst relates to and sometimes build on Rawls’s theories; one such parallel is the primary focus on the domestic liberal context, which becomes clear with the reference to the constitutional. Here it seems to matter whether the justificatory attempts are national, international, or transnational. Another similarly interlinked concept of legitimate justification concerns the lack of dominance, which Forst connects to his concepts of reciprocity and generality.

The distinction between moral and political justification is important since the dimensions of the moral and the political have slightly different implications. For Forst, the ‘political’ consists of a social context where people live in an order of justification. This includes norms and institutions which regulate coexistence in a justified or justifiable way.
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He argues that the most important normative concept which describes this justificatory order is justice. In Forst’s reasoning it becomes possible to draw the conclusion that the structure governing the distribution of justice and rights is crucial, since he focuses not only on the reasons given to explain this distribution but also on the system as such. So, what does this imply for the difference between moral and political justification? As briefly presented earlier in this chapter, my definition is that moral justification concerns what ought to be done, whereas political justification is about pragmatic choices reached through democratic deliberation in different ways. This distinction is based on the different goals of the justificatory argument: a normative justificatory argument concerning morality is about how things such as peacebuilding ought to be, while justificatory arguments that are political are pragmatic. This is not always an either-or situation, and several arguments can be moral as well as political, given that morality has a role to play in politics.

On the other hand, as previously mentioned, Forst separates the contexts of morality and politics. Yet, he acknowledges that morality provides formal criteria for a just political rule. Therefore, morality – here understood as the right to justification – constitutes the foundation for deliberative democracy. My account is to some extent a modification of his in that I emphasize the critical role of ethics. This chimes with the different understanding of ethics and morality, whereby I adhere to those accounts which view ethics as a tool for critiquing morality, as developed by Carl-Henric Grenholm and others. Therefore, in my account, ethics is used as a critical tool for discussing morality. For Forst, his right to justification and his formal criteria provide grounds for critiquing the political rule. His normative and political assumptions provide guidelines for critical scrutiny.

Justification, as has been demonstrated, can be understood and conceptualized differently, depending on perspective, procedure, and purpose. This takes us to the question of what justification means in the context of peacebuilding initiatives by external actors. The question of justification of peacebuilding is primarily a question of ethics of peacebuilding. As introduced in Chapter One, there are several positions
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within international politics on the role of ethics and morality in politics. This disagreement concerns both the actual role of ethics and morality and the role they *should* play. It is in relation to this debate that this dissertation makes an original contribution by emphasizing the role of ethics as a critical tool.

The discussion between realists and moralists in political science and philosophy has developed somewhat differently in political philosophy, where many scholars claim to be realists. This should be understood as a way of distancing oneself from idealist theory. However, as Forst states “anyone who aspires to study politics in a scientific way should observe the imperative of realism.” A classical view of realism puts its main emphasis on power, while moralism does the opposite. Moralism tend to overestimate the power of morality in believing that politics conforms to morality. It also allows for moral judgement in politics as well as in scientific studies. This polemical picture is problematic in several ways, particularly in how it depicts power and norms as a false either-or choice. Forst puts this nicely:

> If we do not understand how norms and interests intermesh to generate and reproduce power, we are condemned to failure in political science.

This shows that some kind of realism is necessary in order to understand politics and is therefore also relevant for an understanding of the politics of peacebuilding. Yet, the aim in this study is not to understand politics in a general sense but to explore how justification theory can enhance our understanding of the ethics of peacebuilding and how external actors try to justify their involvement in peacebuilding efforts as well as to develop critical tools for scrutinizing these justificatory attempts.

**Justification of peacebuilding**

As I set out to ask what justification means in the particular context of external state agency in peacebuilding initiatives, several aspects need
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to be addressed. For example, the self-perceived role those different external states see themselves in, in the context of justice and equality as regards engagement in peacebuilding, is important for their agency as well as for their attempts to justify engagement in peacebuilding. As already alluded to, power plays a role both between the external state and the host state and between the different actors involved in peacebuilding. This gives us three aspects and analytical tools that need to be taken into consideration when analysing external state agency in peacebuilding: justice, equality, and power.

Furthermore, it is essential to assume that actors involved in peacebuilding initiatives provide justificatory reasons for their engagement, that they make attempts to justify their actions. When it comes to states as external actors, we know that the majority of states offer different kinds of reasons for their engagements in peacebuilding. Such provision of reasons is part of what is here conceptualized as attempts to justify, or justification strategies, depending on their moral or political content. Justification strategies connect attempts to justify, i.e. the normative aspects, with the political pragmatism that are often evoked in explanations as to why certain states become involved in particular peacebuilding initiatives. The attempts to justify are understood to have inherently political aspects in that they are often used in a strategic way. For example, some attempts to justify might be framed as a way of signalling an assumption of responsibility in world affairs. This prompts us to conduct an analytical assessment of whether and how particular actors try to justify their engagement in peacebuilding contexts.

In the previous literature on peacebuilding alone, several different varieties of justifications have been suggested. These can be put into at least five formal categories: improving lives; strengthening human rights; respecting international law; protection of civilians; and a mismatch between the discrepancy about intentions and outcomes. These forms are not mutually exclusive and some of them may overlap. However, they are distinct enough to be seen as separate types of argument.

The first form of argument adduced is that peacebuilding is justified as a way of improving the lives of the local population. While this is the core idea behind peacebuilding, peacebuilding practices have been criticized for being paternalistic in that it is mainly external actors who set the terms for how local populations should organize their society and live their lives. Peacebuilding is here justified by the argument that
peacebuilding is better than its alternative, no peacebuilding.\footnote{Barnett 2016:33} This could be categorized as a consequence-focused type of argument based on reducing potential harm. Furthermore, this first type is largely governed by a consequentialist approach which distinguishes a morally justified action based on its consequences. This is problematic given the focus on consequences, and the initiator of the action does not have any control of its justification since the consequences can be affected by other factors.

The second form of argument used to justify peacebuilding initiatives in existing peacebuilding literature has addressed the aim of strengthening respect for human rights or human security.\footnote{Chandler 2001:698, Sending 2009:19, Schwarz 2005:436} The reference to strengthening human rights can to some extent also be seen as paternalistic in relation to the universalist/cultural relativist debate in that it usually tends to be the asymmetrically stronger outsider who initiates the strengthening measures. This external initiation of human rights is challenging for all actors involved since meaningful respect for human rights needs to be anchored locally. However, several studies have shown that a lack of respect for human rights increases the likelihood for armed conflict or a return to violence.\footnote{Thoms & Ron 2007, Caprioli 2005} A setback of this kind stands in complete opposition to the general goal of a peace process, which provides further arguments for the connection between human rights and peace. Respect for human rights increases the likelihood of peace.

The third approach to justifying peacebuilding has been to refer to legal frameworks such as the UN Charter, particularly Chapters VI and VII.\footnote{Although the UN Chapter does not provide an explicit basis for peacekeeping, such action is often associated with Chapter 6 and Chapter 7 (and occasionally Chapter 8). More recent peacekeeping missions due to their complex nature would be authorised as “peace enforcement” under Chapter 7. Source: UN Peacekeeping, Mandates and the legal basis for peacekeeping accessed 2018-10-02} For example, this is evident in the United Nations report on peacekeeping operations, known as the Capstone Doctrine.\footnote{Lee & Özerdem 2015:23} Here, it seems that the legal aspects and arguments tend to speak both to justification and to the legitimacy of a peacebuilding initiative. However, it becomes clear here that the postcolonial critique of international law and international organisations needs to be taken seriously, in particular
the issue of which voices are being heard and listened to.\textsuperscript{338} This fits well into Forst’s emphasis on the power structures of justification, and the need to pay attention to who is being listened to and who is not.\textsuperscript{339} Even if international law is an established framework of regulating the relationships between states, and the UN Charter is one of the main documents in international law, there seem to be differences which stem from who is claiming legality. Here, aspects such as status and power come into play since a more powerful state often gets more attention than a less powerful state when addressing illegitimate, irresponsible, or illegal behaviour.

In addition, a fourth way of justifying peace missions is to stress the protection of civilians.\textsuperscript{340} However, this kind of argument is more frequently used in relation to peacekeeping, i.e. when military aspects are a factor. This type of argument has become more common in recent years, partly due to a shift in priorities. The previously state-centred focus in international relations has now shifted towards an individual-centred focus, and the concept of human security is challenging the traditional norm of state security. The protection-of-civilians argument has paved the way for new norms such as the Responsibility to Protect (R2P), which challenges the traditionalist understanding of sovereignty.

Besides these four forms, a fifth approach to justification addressed in previous studies of the motives behind and justification for peacebuilding (in particular liberal peacebuilding) has noted the disconnection between the intentions and the consequences of peacebuilding initiatives.\textsuperscript{341} This is perhaps not a category of motives in itself but rather a critique of the peacebuilding project at large. This last kind of argument shows the need for careful consideration of the initiation of peacebuilding initiatives, and it combines the motives and the consequences in a critical examination. This is different from the first kind, which focuses primarily on the outcomes.

The above examples of justifying peacebuilding engagements exemplify different approaches and can be categorized as pragmatic, political, normative or moral. There is not always a clear line between them.

\textsuperscript{338} The question of which conception of peacebuilding would be consistent with post-colonial theory has been asked by for example Lidén. He states that the theoretical framework of peacebuilding fails to take the war-torn societies own terms into account. Lidén 2014:37, 30
\textsuperscript{339} Forst 2014c:251f
\textsuperscript{340} Slim 2003
\textsuperscript{341} Lidén, Mac Ginty & Richmond 2009:595
The overlaps add complexity to the assessment of justification, and the forms and types of justification can be understood as situated on different levels. In this dissertation, the focus is primarily on moral justification of political actions and the potential for ethics to assess the different attempts of justification. The tools to assess these attempts to justify are Forst’s criteria for reciprocity and generality. Within the context of peacebuilding initiatives by external actors, attempts to justify are understood as a discursive practice by which political action is addressed.

The main question here concerns how justification can be understood from the perspective of peacebuilding. This is complex in that moral justification is mainly situated on a normative level, while peacebuilding actions are mainly located on a political and pragmatic level. As clarified earlier, the focus here is on the normative level of justification. By working with the conceptualizing of attempts to justify as a bridge between the normative and the pragmatic-political levels, it is here argued that it is possible to address them both. An attempt to justify, as we saw above, aspires to moral justification and is here operationalized as discursive strategies which aim to morally justify certain political actions.

In a peacebuilding context involving the engagement of external state actors, it seems helpful to make use of reciprocity when assessing the justificatory arguments provided. Would you, as a representative of a country, allow external state actors to help and assist your recovery process if you had not invited them to help? Based on the principle of sovereignty, you could argue that no, you do not have to allow assistance if you have not invited it yourself. This implies some kind of consent. South Africa would not willingly allow Lesotho to involve itself in an issue relating to water resources on South African soil if it had not explicitly asked Lesotho for assistance. However, South Africa and Botswana did intervene in Lesotho in 1998. They sought to justify this on the grounds that they were trying to provide support against an alleged coup attempt. However, the intervention seems in fact to have...
been prompted by the issue of water supplies and lacked an explicit invitation from representatives of Lesotho. It has also been tried to be justified on the basis of a SADC mandate. Based on the principle of reciprocity and the additional criteria of consent, we could therefore argue that South African activities in Lesotho were not justified. In this case, South Africa would seem to have been exercising its power over a small neighbouring country. It is alleged that the arguments given as justificatory attempts were presented afterwards, at which point the issue was framed as a regional SADC issue.

Justification, legitimacy and legitimization

In the field of peacebuilding, justification is often either portrayed as what I call a thin understanding of justification or reduced to the political notion of legitimacy. A thin understanding of justification addresses the need for justificatory arguments but without necessarily taking the normative aspects into serious consideration. Thin justification is thus often a question of political justification. Here, the terminology of and distinction between moral and political justification is important, particularly since political justification sometimes seem to be understood in terms of legitimization.

Legitimization and legitimacy are interrelated concepts; however, so are legitimization and justification. The traditional Lockean view is guided by an understanding of justification as

\[\ldots\] an essentially philosophical or epistemic enterprise seeking to get it right while legitimacy is a political concept seeking to secure allegiance.\[346\]

This citation illustrates moral justification as an epistemic enterprise aiming towards ‘getting things right’, while legitimacy is seen as political measure. A possible interpretation is that justification and legitimacy are situated on different levels, whether political or moral. That would mean that justification is about epistemic enterprises and legitimacy is about political enterprises. However, this explanation seems too simple. How, for example, should moral legitimacy and political
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justification be understood? And are the concepts interlinked in some way? One way of reasoning here is to understand the different notions as originally coming from different traditions. Additionally, justification does not have to be epistemological; it could also be a normative, political, or pragmatic enterprise. Justification is in this dissertation understood as a normative and political process but also as an epistemological question, which is why some conceptual work is needed to separate the different layers from each other.

The dictionary definition of legitimacy is derived from the Latin word ‘legis’, which has the meaning of being ‘in accord with a rule’. Yet, a broader understanding of the concept is perhaps preferable, if not because of a need for legitimate rules. Legitimacy is here understood as dependent on consent and beneficial consequences as well as public reason and civic approval. In this dissertation, whose main focus is on the justificatory attempts of external actors’ governments when engaging in peacebuilding initiatives, both objective and subjective legitimacy are of importance. Here justification refers primarily to moral justification, while legitimization concerns either political-strategic motives or rules and regulations according to international law. Moreover, legitimization is about creating support for political leadership and its actions. This often resonates with contractual theory, which in the domestic situation concerns the contract between the state and its citizens. In the international and transnational context of the justification of external states in peacebuilding, it seems more relevant to think about legitimacy in terms of international legitimacy and international law.

347 A subjective definition of legitimacy as based on the point of view of the actor is offered by Morris Zelditch. This subjective legitimacy entails that “[…] something is legitimate if it is in accord with the norms, values, beliefs, practices and procedures accepted by a group.” (p.33). This definition is widely used in empirical studies since it is useful if one’s aim is to predict or explain empirical behaviour. Another definition offered is objective legitimacy, a sense which presupposes an objective observer. This would instead be defined as legitimacy if a principle or rule is in accordance with certain normative criteria which have been postulated by an observer, and if the observer concludes that these criteria are met. This latter definition is more common and perhaps better suited to a combination of normative and descriptive purposes, while subjective legitimacy primarily addresses descriptive empirical purposes.

348 Legitimacy is a concept that scholars worry may turn into a concept with so many meanings that it becomes analytically useless. Ramsbotham & Wennman (2014), for example, discuss legitimacy as local and domestic; organically-grounded: process and performance; international; constitutional; and legitimacy of fundamental grievances. For further discussion, see Mitchell in Hancock & Mitchell 2018 or Ramsbotham & Wennman 2014
This resonates with the previous definition of legitimacy as ‘according with a rule’.

In addition, both vertical and horizontal legitimacy are taken into consideration in the conceptualization of the notion of legitimacy. This is done in relation to legitimacy of a state and, in particular, in relation to the analysis of different audiences. Vertical legitimacy is understood as dealing with authority, consent, and loyalty to the ideas of the state and its institutions, and therefore refers to the existence of an agreement upon the principles on which the 'right to rule' is based. Horizontal legitimacy is instead understood as dealing with the definition and political role of a particular community. In other words, it entails a consensus about the definition of the community over which rule is to be exercised.\textsuperscript{349} This is understood to be transferable from a domestic context to the international and transnational.

Some scholars are associating legitimacy with the justification of coercive power and the creation of political authority, while others relate it to the justification, or at least sanctioning, of existing political authority. This focus on legitimacy is principally connected to internal politics and democratic processes, often with connotations to the liberal tradition, and sometimes seems to be confused as political justification.

A critique has been made of contemporary theorists and their tendency to merge the two concepts of justification and legitimacy together.\textsuperscript{350} By treating the concepts as two different but interconnected notions, both the similarities and different nuances can be addressed. The interconnectedness can be exemplified by the fact that an action has to be legitimate if it is to be regarded as justified. However, an action can also be legitimate without being justified. Justification is a thicker concept than legitimacy in that it is normative while legitimacy is primarily political.

Both Rawls and Habermas have written about legitimacy and, as Jørgen Pedersen argues, both are developing different freestanding conceptions of political legitimacy. Furthermore, Pedersen argues that Rawls and Habermas diverge when it comes to how political legitimacy can be justified. The main difference is that Habermas is looking for a deeper justification than Rawls allows for, and Pedersen argues that this is explained by their differing conceptions of political legitimacy.\textsuperscript{351}

\textsuperscript{349} Holsti 1996:80-87
\textsuperscript{350} Chambers 2010:893
\textsuperscript{351} Pedersen 2012:399
Another way of understanding the relationship between justification and legitimacy is offered by A. John Simmons, who addresses the tension between the justification of the state and state legitimacy. Simmons argues that showing that a state is justified and showing that it is legitimate are typically taken to require the very same arguments and that this is a misunderstanding. He contends that the way we evaluate states morally is blurred by confusing the notions of justification and legitimacy. 352

In the more social-science-oriented research on peace missions, legitimacy has been understood as comprising three interlinked and mutually reinforcing elements: political consensus, legality, and moral authority. In general, a peace mission’s legitimacy is widely seen as determined by political consensus and international legality. 353 This understanding sometimes tends to add to the confusion.

When it comes to the practices of justification of peace engagements in foreign policy, there is seldom a clear line between the different normative schools. The practices are more often a mixture of different normative traditions, as seems often to be the case with political practices. As the dissertation move on to the empirical chapters, the discussion will return to the ways in which these normative traditions are presented and used in these cases. However, as outlined in the literature review in the introductory chapter, much research on the ethics of peacebuilding tends to be consequentialist.

Summary and conclusions
One of the most central points raised in this chapter is the difference between justification, attempts to justify and justification strategies. Justification is the ideal, while justificatory attempts are normative, and justification strategies are pragmatic ways to address the ideal within the framework of political action. This allows us to understand attempts to justify as political actions with normative content. In addition, another crucial point here is that political ideas and actions need justification as much as moral ideas and actions do.

I have demonstrated that the theoretical framework I discuss builds to a large extent on the work of Rainer Forst, even though this chapter

352 Simmons 1999
353 Wiharta 2009:96
results in a development of Forst’s theory. I have also demonstrated that both Jürgen Habermas and his conversations with John Rawls have influenced Forst. Therefore, a selection of their work has also been influential, both for Forst and for this dissertation. However, it should be clarified that this theoretical framework, which also provides analytical instruments, is a modification of Forst’s theories. Forst’s reasoning primarily concerns individuals, but he also covers the contexts of justification, which are of relevance here. Additionally, Forst focuses primarily on domestic liberal contexts. In the following chapters, I will show how this is transferable to an international or transnational context.

The discussion in this chapter has resulted in a number of proposed analytical concepts or aspects that can guide the analyses of the case studies. First, state representatives’ understanding of justice and equality with regard to peacebuilding seems to concern both their relationship towards the host state and their perception of their own role in the international community. This is evident in how external actors present arguments that are accessible and intersubjectively testable. Second, when analysing different cases, it is necessary to take into consideration various aspects of how external states understand their own position of power within the international system. This highlights what they perceive as their own space for agency. Third, the understanding of justification governing this dissertation is particularly influenced by Forst’s conceptualizations of human characteristics as well as by the criteria of reflexivity and generality. Reciprocity and generality are important concepts for analysing international institutional political agency and how external states tries to justify their peacebuilding involvements. These aspects also need to be taken into consideration when beginning to articulate a theory of justified peacebuilding.
4. Method and Material

The aim of this chapter is to present a rationale for and critically discuss the choices that have been made throughout the research process regarding methodology. The selection of strategies for collecting and generating material is discussed, as are the limits imposed on methods and material. The chapter is also presenting how the typologies in the case studies have been constructed. The discussions are closely connected to the overall purpose of this study, which is to identify and critically examine the types of arguments being used as justification strategies by emerging or re-emerging countries when they engage in peacebuilding missions abroad.

This is a study of justification, particularly of external states use of justification in relation to their engagement in peacebuilding initiatives abroad. It is based on two case studies, as this is an established way of allowing for theoretical development. It also seems fruitful for addressing in-depth clarifications of a particular social behaviour, as well as exploration and understanding of complex issues.\textsuperscript{354}

This study relies on a reflexive and critical approach to information generation and analysis, creating room for understanding the meaning-making process of justification strategies by state representatives in relation to their states’ peacebuilding efforts. What is central in this study are the ways engagement in peacebuilding is justified or how such justification is sought for. This locates the focus in the arguments provided. These are understood to be constructed in relation to several other political areas and are a part of general foreign policy discourse. The aim of the case studies is not necessarily to make a comparative analysis but to explore the possibility of discovering patterns of justificatory attempts within the two selected cases.\textsuperscript{355} While there are also comparative elements, it is the case studies as such which generate the main

\textsuperscript{354} George & Bennett 2005, Harrison et al. 2017:1

\textsuperscript{355} It is common, but not necessary, to select cases based on a comparison. In this dissertation, I make use of two separate case studies, in that I understand them as two
findings. Let us continue by discussing the choice of methods and how it relates to the overarching aim of this dissertation.

Choice of methods

The choice of methods is primarily driven and guided by this study’s research questions as well as the aims of the study. It is also affected by the availability of material. As presented in the introduction, the main research question of this dissertation addresses how peacebuilding can be justified. By taking this as a starting point, this is explored by means of three sub-questions. The first of these addresses in what ways external states justify their engagements in post-conflict societies. The second question addresses how these justificatory attempts are to be assessed. The third and final question addresses what the criteria are for justified peace building. These are both descriptive, explorative, and normative as well as critical in character. This is reflected in the choice of methods.

The methods used in this study are characterized by two main concerns. The first correlates to the aim of understanding what external states do when they make justificatory attempts with regard to engagement in peacebuilding. This is achieved by means of a critical analysis of what external states do in terms of justification strategies, and by an assessment of what these justificatory attempts are about. This requires a conceptual discussion of peacebuilding and agency, which is given in Chapter Two. This fills the purpose of clarifying what peacebuilding is and how it has been developed. Further, Chapter Two provides the background and context of the concepts that are helpful in the analysis of the cases and their justificatory attempts at peacebuilding. Yet, this also requires a critical theoretical analysis of how justification of peacebuilding should be understood.

This first part of the methods section focuses on connecting the theoretical discussion of normative reasoning to the empirical case studies, which are the second methodological aspect. This second aspect relates to how external states are justifying their involvement in peacebuilding activities. This is addressed in the two empirical chapters on South Africa and Russia.

individual cases. This does not imply that I will not discuss the cases in relation to each other, as they offer analytically interesting variation.
Theory is to some extent both tested and developed through this study, and the first part of the methods section focuses on developing theory, while the second part challenge it and modifies it. Chapter Three addresses normative reasoning, to some extent based on Rawls and Habermas, but primarily based on a reconstruction of Forst. The baseline for Forst’s theory is explicated and discussed, and Chapter Five and Chapter Six test how well Forst’s theory of justification performs when analysing the attempts of external states to justify their engagement in peacebuilding. The construction of the theoretical approach includes identifying and evaluating the thesis and purpose of the reasoning, in this case, Forst’s. This is discussed and presented in Chapter Three, which also provides this study’s theoretical framework.

Another important part of the methods section comprises the empirical analyses of South Africa and Russia’s foreign policy discourses. This demands a combination of several methods. The main method used to analyse the material is an interpretivist content analysis. This is helpful for identifying the normative arguments and the justification strategies constructed within the foreign policy documents and the interview material. The second method used is semi-structured expert interviews.

Case studies
As mentioned, this study makes use of two case studies. Their purpose is to test the theoretical framework in contextual situations. The case selection is briefly presented and discussed in Chapter One, but further clarification of the role of the cases in this study is needed. The analysis of cases is needed to further develop theoretical tools for understanding justificatory attempts at peacebuilding, which are closely connected to the political action of getting involved in peacebuilding. To make sure that the theoretical discussion is relevant for the political action of justification, the cases have a crucial function. They function as a platform for contextualisation of the theoretical discussion. The cases therefore fill an important role in developing theory. It is therefore crucial that this study could not achieve its aims without the cases.

356 The approach I have used is similar to the Value-critical policy analysis as presented by Schmidt 2014:322-337. My approach is less focused on protagonists but follows the other steps, 1) identifying the issue 2) describing the context, 3) describing and deconstructing the arguments and core values, 4) value-critical analysis of the arguments, 5) drawing conclusions
The attempt to justify engagement in peacebuilding efforts could be assessed by means of other cases, but South Africa and Russia are particularly interesting. Firstly, these two states are currently in an identity-building phase in their foreign policy. Secondly, they are not satisfied with how the world is structured today, and each holds a position which advocates for change in the international system. This represents a similarity between the cases and explicitly connects them to critical theory, which questions the structure of the current world much as Russia and South Africa do. This enables comparison on two analytical levels. The third reason for choosing South Africa and Russia is that by working with these two specific cases, we see a variation in their opportunities for action given their different positions of power. Yet another reason for the choice of these states is that they have not yet been analysed from this perspective in previous research and might therefore offer new insights.

There are potential objections related to the cases. One such is the number of cases, namely whether two cases are enough for testing and developing a theory. This is a reasonable objection which is met by counter-arguments relating to feasibility and manageability as well as analytical depth. More cases would potentially imply that the analysis of each case would be shallower. Fewer cases offer a possibility for analysis in depth, which generates a more nuanced assessment. Yet, there are also potential objections to these particular states as case studies, since they are not among the mainstream of states engaged in peacebuilding. A reply to this potential critique is that a theory of justification of peacebuilding should be broad enough to cover all actors, for which reason this objection should not matter. In addition, as Chapter Five and Chapter Six will show, both South Africa and Russia offer interesting insights by virtue of how they seek to justify their peacebuilding engagements. Also, since there is a connection between the cases and critical theory in their critique of world structure, this strengthens the rationale for the choice of these states as case studies.

The information in the two case studies is generated by a multi-methods approach that combines an intertextual approach for generation of

---

357 This follows from Tsygankov’s (2016) approach to constructivism foreign policy. It is also, in the Russian case, strengthened by scholars such as Trenin 2009:64
358 This is strengthened by their collaboration within BRICS
359 See a discussion on different types of power in for example Nye 2008
textual information, such as official policy documents, with expert interviews with key participants. This gives the study three main methods, one in relation to the reconstruction of the theoretical framework, and two in relation to the empirical case studies. The reason for using a multi-methods approach is to allow for triangulation but also to allow for cross-validation and thereby increase the study’s validity. Questions of validity, reliability, documentation, source criticism, and triangulation are of great importance throughout the whole research process, and special attention is required when constructing, de-constructing, and analysing the collected and constructed information. In this study, the intertextual approach allows for a clearer structure for selecting documents. This is based on the logic of one document being referred to in others, leading the researcher forward. This is a way of strengthening the relevance of the selected documents. These issues are addressed as a way of improving the quality of the information and the study at large.

The use of different approaches towards information analysis creates opportunities for recovering different pieces of the puzzle, thereby producing a more nuanced understanding of how the representatives of external actors justify their engagements in peacebuilding missions abroad. The different types of material further allow the identification and categorizing of types of strategies that aim to justify peace engagements. It also helps to triangulate the data that has been generated. The combination of the different approaches further clarifies the justificatory patterns in the two cases, offering one set of justification strategies used by South Africa and another set of justification strategies used by Russia. Let us now focus on the case studies and the methods and questions used in relation to them.

---

360 A multi-method approach allows for more flexibility regarding selection of methods, than for example a mixed-methods approach. This requires some clarification since some understand the concepts as synonymous while others draw a clear distinction. Anguera et al. 2018:1f Multi-methods, for example, involve combining any different methods while mixed-methods more specifically focuses on combining qualitative and quantitative methods. Hunter & Brewer 2016:200

361 Triangulation is here used as a way of verifying information from the different types of sources, but, this also adds nuances to the analysis. The concept is, in its original conception, used to counter to the limitations in survey material, but has commonly been applied also on interview studies. The use of triangulation could be either purely corroborative, or both additive as well as corroborative. Davies 2001:75 In this dissertation it is used as both additive and corroborative.
Analytical questions

Besides the research questions, this study makes use of analytical questions governing the analysis of the cases. The analytical questions guide the case studies in the analysis of the documents as well as in designing the interview guide. These questions address how actors representing the states of South Africa and Russia justify their engagements in peacebuilding processes abroad. These are posed to grasp and sketch the larger picture of how prioritizations have been made and justificatory attempts articulated.

The first question is how the engagement for peacebuilding has changed over time. This is followed by the second, which address to what extent peacebuilding is a prioritized area in South Africa/Russian foreign policy discourse. The third analytical question addresses how South Africa/Russia are trying to justify peacebuilding engagements, while the fourth addresses which discursive strategies they use in order to try to justify peacebuilding engagements. A fifth question addresses which audiences are of importance for South African/Russian attempts to justify their engagement in peacebuilding. A sixth question is whether there are any themes in the justificatory attempts and how these might be linked. Finally, the seventh and final question addresses whether the justificatory attempts are moral or political, or both.

The first two questions are mainly descriptive and help address larger trends in peacebuilding engagements in the two cases. They address how engagement in peacebuilding has developed over time and how peacebuilding initiatives are prioritized in foreign policy discourse. The first question helps us sketching the picture of South Africa’s and Russia’s involvement in peacebuilding for the period of study. The analytical questions also address the discursive strategies used by the state-representatives and the audiences they address, as becomes clear in question three, four and five. Question number two to five, have been instrumental in designing the interview guide, while question six and seven is directed towards the analytical work on the material generated.

Question six addresses the search for themes in the data on attempts to justify peacebuilding, which results in the typologies of justificatory strategies in the two cases. Question seven addresses the level at which

362 The interview guide could be found in Appendix 1, and a table with the official documents in Appendix 2.
attempts to justify are placed and whether they are political or moral, or both. These questions help systematize the different justificatory attempts in terms both of how they are communicated as well as to whom they are primarily directed.

These analytical questions are constructed based on the literature review of previous research as well as on the theoretical framework. They have governed both the critical analysis of the documents and the interview guides and analysis of the interview materials. During the interviews there has also been room for follow-up questions, such as questions about the motives of engagements in specific contexts or whether certain justificatory attempts could be understood as overarching themes. The interviews have also allowed for queries about how national interest is understood in the different cases. Importantly, the different materials are to be separated in terms of the methods by which they have been constructed. This study consists of two case studies: Russia and South Africa. The chapter will continue with a discussion of the rationale for the case selection.

Empirical focus and case selection

A large part of this study includes more empirically oriented case studies. This is crucial for two reasons. Firstly, it provides access to context-specific knowledge and increases contextual understanding while also enhancing the analytical comparability between cases. Second, fieldwork in both cases allows for an information-gathering process that generates information which would not otherwise have been available.

As stated earlier, the empirical part of this dissertation focuses on Russia and South Africa as two of the BRICS countries (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa). This has several purposes. First, the BRICS countries offer an alternative position and therefore challenge the current hegemony within international relations. Second, existing research on the role of ethics in foreign policy or ethics in peacebuilding tends to focus on more traditional (Western) actors, which allows this dissertation to make an empirical contribution to the study of BRICS countries. Third, the BRICS often focus on the principle of sovereignty, one potential hypothesis being that they put greater emphasis on the need to justify peacebuilding engagements, which often challenge that
very principle. Lastly, there is a growing literature on the role of BRICS in world politics, to which this study contributes.

The BRICS are not yet on the same level of industrialization as most of the traditional donor countries; however, they have started to make significant investments as well as becoming more engaged in peace and development initiatives. Among the BRICS countries, India has long contributed personnel and funding to UN peace missions, as has Brazil. China has recently taken a leading role in cooperation with developing countries and is a major source of foreign direct investment in many developing countries around the world, especially on the African continent. The BRICS-countries are still struggling with persistent inequality and poverty domestically, but they are committed to allocating support to developing countries, mainly via significant investments and foreign assistance funds.

I make use of several criteria for the case selection process. A first step is that there must be some relevant interaction between the country and post-conflict societies, either bilaterally or multilaterally. A second step is to select cases which offer some variation in their peacebuilding profile. For example, this might be the constellations through which they prioritize their peacebuilding engagements (regional, international, etc.). In order to access relevant material, the conflicts where countries have been engaged in peacebuilding should not have ended too long ago: peacebuilding initiatives mostly start during or shortly after the termination phase. So as to maintain the ontological approach and avoid focusing on consequentialist reasoning, the types of justification that are central for this dissertation are those given prior to the initiation of an engagement. This makes South Africa and Russia interesting cases because of their different roles within the international system. For example, the established collaboration between India, Brazil, and South Africa (IBSA) is an element within the BRICS that has been most positive towards long-term peacebuilding engagements, whereas Russia and China (RC) have been more sceptical, typically invoking the sovereignty principle and the need to stay out of other states’ internal affairs. Since the main focus is on the external actor, most information is accessed from the country itself, i.e. South Africa and Russia.

In order to gain an overview of the case studies a structural assessment is made based on the above-mentioned criteria. Both South Africa and Russia have also finalized ongoing engagements which could be
classified as peacebuilding. While Russia is more sceptical about peacebuilding, South Africa is more enthusiastic, which allows for an interesting variation in this study. In addition, they each represent one part of the division within the BRICS, South Africa coming from IBSA and Russia from RC. In addition, I make use of analytical questions which I bring to the material from the cases. These are introduced with greater nuance in Chapter Four, which is devoted to an in-depth discussion of research design and methods.

For example, Russia has repeatedly been involved in peace cooperation, as here described by their Ministry of Defence:

[…] the Russian Armed Forces along with the other members of the international community have repeatedly participated in prevention or elimination of internecine and inter-ethnic conflicts in the territories of both the former USSR Republics and in the foreign far-abroad countries.

Here it becomes clear that the two cases might have different definitions of peacebuilding, since this could also be interpreted as early prevention or counter-insurgent efforts with partners. This difference does not affect the feasibility of the study for two reasons. First, since it two separate case studies variation between them is favourable. Second, both states still talk about peacebuilding in their foreign policy discourse, and disagreement or conceptual confusion contributes to nuance the theoretical development.

Other cases in which Russian interests have been mentioned are South Ossetia, Abkhazia, Transnistria, Tajikistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo and Metohija, Chad, and Sierra Leone as well as, most recently, Sudan. This last example is primarily in relation to the UN-led mission UNMIS, United Nations Mission in Sudan.

South Africa’s role as a partner with other developing countries has grown in recent years. In 2008, over half of its total aid budget was

---

363 IBSA is an established platform which has been quiet in recent years. RC is not an established term in the same sense, but Russia and China have more features in common with each other than with the other countries, one example being their role on the UNSC.

364 Russia’s Participation in Peacekeeping Operations (n.d)

365 Russia’s Participation in Peacekeeping Operations (n.d)
earmarked for defence and security efforts, and in 2011 this prioritization of war further emphasized.\textsuperscript{366} South Africa is the most recent member of the BRICS, having been invited to the partnership in 2010 and formally becoming a member in 2011.\textsuperscript{367} South Africa’s engagement is primarily Afrocentric and the country has stated that it will take a leading role in questions related to conflict prevention, peacekeeping, peacebuilding, and post-conflict reconstruction in Africa.\textsuperscript{368} In South Africa the agency responsible for foreign policy, including development assistance is the Department of International Relations and Cooperation (DIRCO). DIRCO has stated that South Africa has made commitments to support the DRC, Sudan, Comoros, Zimbabwe, Madagascar, and the Great Lakes region. South Africa is channelling parts of its support through the Southern African Development Community (SADC) and the African Union (AU) to facilitate peace efforts.\textsuperscript{369} For example, South Africa played an important role during the conflicts in Cote d’Ivoire, in which former President Thabo Mbeki acted as mediator.\textsuperscript{370}

Let us now turn to a discussion of how the documents have been selected and approached, before continuing to discuss field studies and interviews.

Text selection strategy and access

The text selection strategy used for policy documents follows an intertextual path from primary documents to related ones.\textsuperscript{371} Intertextuality provides support to map the textual information that is most relevant to the actors and actions which this study is focusing on assessing. The procedure has followed Lene Hansen’s intertextual research models on official discourse, i.e. what representatives for the state and documents have produced, as well as on marginal political discourse, i.e. academics.\textsuperscript{372} In this study, the foreign policy documents are all understood as

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{366} Morazán et al. 2012:15f
  \item \textsuperscript{367} Asuelime 2018:130
  \item \textsuperscript{368} Morazán et al. 2012:15
  \item \textsuperscript{369} Morazán et al. 2012:15f
  \item \textsuperscript{370} Thabo Mbeki begins Ivory Coast mediation mission: 5 December 2010, Abatan & Spies 2016:24
  \item \textsuperscript{371} Schwartz-Shea & Yanow 2012:70
  \item \textsuperscript{372} Hansen 2006
\end{itemize}
located in the official discourse. In addition, the majority of the inter-
view participants are both part of the official and the academic dis-
course. This is the case since many of them functions as advisors to
politicians and policy makers. However, not all have this advisory func-
tion, but the ones in the academic discourse are seen as authorities and
experts in their fields.

Given that it was difficult to know beforehand what textual sources
were available, this strategy helped to show and increase the reliability
of selected textual information and material.

It is crucial to gain access to key texts relating to South Africa and
Russia, which in this case is exemplified by contemporary white papers
on engagement in peace missions abroad or, in their absence, more gen-
eral foreign policy documents that also cover peacebuilding activities.
Although these documents are supposed to be publicly available, it can
sometimes be challenging to get access. One strategy of getting access
to the documents is to make use of expert interviews. These conver-
sations help provide access to textual information and give information
on the significance and relevance of the different documents.

Field studies
Collecting or constructing information and data through field research
is a challenging task. Generally, good information is the baseline for a
solid analysis and the essential striving for accuracy, veracity, and reli-
ability of the information. In relation to the potential sensitivity of the
questions, access to informants often creates a key concern when it
comes to field research.373 For the purpose of generating information for
this dissertation, two research trips were carried out, to South Africa in
2015 and Russia in 2017. The trip to South Africa extended over three
weeks and included meetings and interviews in four different cities:
Cape Town, Durban, Johannesburg, and the capital, Pretoria. The trip
to Russia was scheduled for two weeks and all interviews were con-
ducted in Moscow. The decision to focus on these locations was pri-
arily governed by the fact that the people with insights relevant to this
study were located there. In addition, the governmental agencies and
offices of each country are located in these cities.

373 Höglund & Öberg 2011:4
Interview design

Access is of crucial importance when working in the field, and during both research trips, I had the opportunity to benefit from networks beyond my own. By getting the invaluable help from senior scholars to establish initial contacts, the snowball approach, in combination with a careful selection strategy, functioned as a way of getting in touch with experts on this topic. The choice of working with a careful selection strategy in combination with the snowball approach was determined by the opportunity of gaining access to key participants. This strategy was informed by previous research as well as contextual knowledge.

A potential challenge that arises early on in relation to the initial presentation of a research project is how to frame the study in a trust-building way. This initial presentation needs context specific consideration.\(^{374}\) Due to the networks that were possible to utilize, a trust-building mechanism was enforced from the start insofar as the initial contacts helped me to get in touch with further contacts.

Informed consent is an important aspect of the information-generation process through interviews. This is one of the cornerstones in research ethics when it comes to the interview process. Informed consent can be secured either orally or in writing, but it needs to take place prior to the collection of information so that both interviewer and informant are on the same page.\(^{375}\) In this case, oral consent was secured. In addition, confidentiality has been guaranteed, which means that the identity of participants will not be disclosed in this study unless they explicitly have given their permission.

In relation to discussions of informed consent and confidentiality, it makes sense to raise the question about the use of recording devices and/or taking notes. As presented above, while notes have been taken during all of the interviews for this study, not all interviews were recorded. The reason is either that some interviewees were uncomfortable being recorded or that the interview set-up did not allow for recording. Another explanation is that the participant expressed hesitance towards recording our conversation. However, given the notes and the character of this study, this is not considered a problem. However, extra measures towards triangulation have been taken to address the potential validity issue of the absence of recordings in some of the interviews.

\(^{374}\) Cammett 2006:16

\(^{375}\) Höglund & Öberg 2011:139, 174, 196; Morris MacLean 2006:13
Another important aspect that ties into both research-ethical and practical challenges in relation to interviews is the set-up for the information-generation process. This can be discussed in relation to geographical location or time of the day, etc. The interviews for this study took place either at the experts’ offices or in public cafés or restaurants. The location and time were selected by the interviewee. The type or quality of the information generated from the interview seems not to have differed in relation to the interview location.

Compensation is another issue that can potentially generate both research-ethical and practical challenges. This partly depends on where you are doing your research and the customs and traditions in the particular context. It could also depend on the type of power relationship between researcher and informants. In relation to this study, the asymmetry was reversed, as is common when interviewing experts. This contributed to downplaying the need for any type of compensation beyond the courtesy of showing great appreciation for the interviewees’ time.

Interviewing experts

The definition of an expert is very much dependent on the context of a study, but in most cases, people are regarded as experts due to their special knowledge. The experts here are a source of information since they are people with special knowledge and experience due to the actions, obligations, and responsibilities which they have had in a specific process. In the case of this dissertation, the key participants are policy advisors and analysts, diplomats and ambassadors, and scholars who in different ways and capacities have been involved in creating the policy documents on South Africa’s and Russia’s respective engagement in peace missions. The experts were sometimes also researchers specializing in foreign policy but frequently appointed as expert advisors.

The type of knowledge that commonly makes experts interesting to interview can be understood as technical knowledge, process-related knowledge, and interpretative-evaluative knowledge running from expertise to implicit and tacit knowledge.376 The people interviewed have had a wide range of knowledge, covering these areas. Yet, theory-generating interviews, as conceptualised by Meuser and Nagel,

376 Littig & Pöchhacker 2014:1088ff
[...] seek to elicit the specialized knowledge gained through the expert’s professional activities as well as the tacit interpretive knowledge that shapes professional practices.\footnote{Littig & Pöchhacker 2014:1088-1089, Meuser and Nagel 2009}

An expert interview is often a one-off event because experts are usually busy people with a limited amount of time. The purpose of an expert interview is usually to access expert knowledge, gather in-depth information on views, attitudes, experience and perceptions, to gain understanding of a particular phenomenon, and to reconstruct latent meaning and develop explanations.\footnote{Littig & Pöchhacker 2014:1088ff} The aim in the interviews in this study has been to better understand the justification and motives for getting involved in peace missions and to add nuance to the analysis of the official documents.

For this study, I conducted three different types of expert interviews. First, exploratory interviews were used to provide orientation and gain an overview of the countries’ peacebuilding engagements and their justification thereof. Second, an approach of systematizing interviews has been applied, enabling the systematic retrieval of information and reconstruction of the special knowledge about South Africa’s and Russia’s engagement in peacebuilding initiatives. Third, this study has to some extent also made use of theory-generating interviews. The purpose of this has been to reconstruct social interpretative patterns and subjective action-orientation criteria. The aim in this type of interview is to target not only the expert’s explicit knowledge but also her tacit specific background knowledge obtained through her professional practice.\footnote{Littig and Pöchhacker 2014:1088ff} The types of interviews are distributed evenly across the number of participants and are not dependent on the participants’ current occupation.

Types of questions and structure of interviews
Preparation an interview is challenging and often since it can indeed does differ according to who is being interviewed. For example, the most challenging interview was conducted in three parts, initially by phone,
then in a car, and finally at a restaurant. By following a semi-structured approach and interview guide, I have been able to allow for flexibility regarding the path of the interview, while probing follow-up questions have helped prepare for a flexible approach in the interview situation itself.

The interview technique has been conversational and has been guided by a semi-flexible topic guide, allowing for an in-depth dialogue further generated through probing questions. One of the strengths of using interviews is that this type of conversation can generate information that is not accessible through text analysis since it invites reflexivity and situated knowledge. This is particularly clear in the Russian case, where the documents were more often general than specific. The interviews have thus proven to be more important for identifying arguments and justification strategies in the Russian case.

An interview situation is to some extent always artificial and consists of self-reported data, but by using a semi-structured approach it is possible to generate a more in-depth understanding. The conversational semi-structured interview approach also allows for more probing follow-up questions, which help generate more nuanced data during the conversation. Before discussing how the typology is constructed, it is time to present and discuss the materials.

Material

The primary material of this study is, in consequence of its multi-method approach, divided in two parts. The first part consists of official foreign policy documents and white papers on foreign policy from South Africa and Russia. The second part consists of notes and transcripts from the interviews. By using these types of material, I have been able to triangulate by cross-referencing information constructed though the interviews with the written documents. Triangulation has also been made with scholarly works as secondary material.

The different types of textual data are dominated by official documents, such as white papers and policy guidelines, making them primary data, while parliamentary debates constitute secondary data. This is warranted by the more specified focus in the documents, since there
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380 Even if this interview was an exception in its unusually flexible structure, expert interviews on the phone are considered difficult. Christmann 2009:159ff
are more specified documents on peacebuilding in the South African context than in the Russian. *Vice versa* parliamentary debates that particularly focus on peacebuilding abroad are not very frequent in the South African context; however, they exist to a larger but still limited extent in the Russian context. This infrequency justifies their status as secondary information.

**Official foreign policy documents**

The main material analysed within this study consists of official policy documents. Depending on for the purpose for which the documents are produced, they are sometimes aimed for different audiences and sometimes situated on different levels. Some documents, for example, are aimed at a wider international audience, while others are more directed and delimited in their intended reach.

Since the material consists of official policy documents written to represent the state of the Republic of South Africa and the Russian Federation, they are directed at a domestic constituency as well as at regional and international audiences, and the analysis aims to shed light on the nuances in the argumentation used. As presented above, the material consists of the general policy guidelines and concept notes on international development assistance, national security, and foreign policy as well as more long-term security strategy. These general foreign policy documents are drafted for the purpose of creating an image, and branding is a central component of foreign policy discourse.

I have formulated three selection criteria for application to the foreign policy documents so as to allow for a systematic analysis of them. The first is a criterion of relevance, which helps distinguish the relevance of the documents in relation to peacebuilding. This is supported by the interviews, in which key individuals have directed me towards particular documents. In addition, previous research and contextual information helped to establish relevance and assisted me in making an informed decision about which documents to include.

The second is a criterion of accessibility, which addresses the possibility of gaining access to the relevant documents. Some of the documents are available online, others are not. The field studies made more documents accessible and available, making the research trips of deci-
sive importance. Furthermore, the interviews helped situate the documents as well as providing information on the potential for updating them.

The third is a criterion of language. This means availability in English. In the South African case this is not an issue since English is one of the official languages and all documents are available in English. However, this criterion presented a challenge in the Russian case. Several of the official documents are also available in English in the Russian case, but translation adds potential complications in regard to terminology. The translations I have used have been made available by official channels, i.e. the government or ministries websites etc., and are made public albeit with a certain degree of reservation.

The policy documents are in both cases triangulated and nuanced by means of the information generated from the interviews as well as by other types of materials, such as policy-oriented reports and output from different think tanks.

The documents can be put on a scale ranging from directly to indirectly related to Russian and South African peacebuilding. For example, issues connected to national security do indeed influence the levels and prioritizations of engagement in peace missions, which warrants the inclusion of the concept documents on national security even though it does not address peace missions extensively. Analysing documents of a slightly different character allows for a more holistic understanding of the framework of South African and Russian engagement in peace missions abroad and provides, in combination with a review of the scholarly literature as well as interviews, a broader understanding of the context.

A potential objection to the selected documents is that they were mainly written as foreign policy documents, not specific strategy documents for particular countries. The country strategy documents could have been an excellent resource, but these have not been possible to access since they are classified as in the national interest. On the other hand, what I am interested in is the discourse on engagement in peacebuilding. As a discourse here is understood as “a particular way of talking about and understanding the world (or an aspect of the world)”381, the overarching documents seems most relevant to analyse general patterns. Another potential objection could be that these documents pri-
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381 Jørgensen & Philips 2002:1
arily focus on military intervention; in the case of the military doctrines this is true. However, an analysis without these documents would not provide the full context of peacebuilding engagements.

The documents are to some extent limited in that they cover the available foreign policy material. They offer general guidelines and not country-specific guidelines and are often understood as rhetoric. This does not allow for any analysis of country-specific justificatory attempts, although the interviews do make this possible to a greater extent. That the documents consist of rhetoric is not necessarily problematic since the aim of this study is to examine how external states try to justify their engagement in peacebuilding and to identify the kinds of arguments which are being deployed to this end. The study will continue with a discussion and contextualization of the documents in each case, before turning to a discussion of the interviews.

**South African documents**

The South African case study is based on reviews of the state’s foreign policy documents with relevance for peace missions abroad. These consist of four documents. The first is the *White Paper on South African Participation in International Peace Missions* from 1998/1999, which represents a deliberative process involving representatives and advisors primarily from the Department of Foreign Affairs and the Department of Defence. The guidelines in the document was not only written with the purpose

\[
[...\] to equip the government with a greater degree of rationality and coherence in dealing with requests for participation, but that it would also bestow on government a higher level of legitimacy for its actions.\]

In addition, according to the document, representatives from other state departments and the intelligence community also took part. In addition, interested parties from the South African parliament and civil society were also consulted and/or participated in the process of compilation. This White Paper is extensive and covers several different aspect of South Africa’s peace engagements. The aim of the paper is to address:
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382 The White Paper was published in 1998 and approved by South Africa’s parliament in 1999
383 Williams 2000:87
· The nature and scope of contemporary peace missions;
· The international mandate for conducting peace missions;
· South African philosophy on participation in peace missions;
· South Africa’s potential contributions to peace missions, including
  the concept of standby arrangements and a readiness system;
· Principles governing South African participation in peace missions;
· Procedures for the deployment of South African personnel.384

This shows the wide approach taken by South Africa towards its peace
engagements and also highlights the fact that each mission is unique in
character.385 In addition, it gives a rich account of South Africa’s under-
standing of both and peacebuilding. Given the clear focus on peace mis-
sions, this document is the main source for justificatory attempts of
peacebuilding.

The second document in the case of South Africa is Building a Better
World: The Diplomacy of Ubuntu, which is the white paper on foreign
policy published in 2011. This document is the first consolidat
attempt to develop an official and formal policy providing a vision for
foreign policy in post-apartheid South Africa.386 This document pro-
vides the overarching framework for South Africa’s foreign policy, and
peacebuilding is discussed together with other peace measures, such as
peacekeeping, conflict prevention, and post-conflict reconstruction.387

The third document is the South African Defence Review 1998 and
the fourth its updated version from 2014.388 This is the defence policy
of the Republic of South Africa. The second version of this document,
from 2014, presents the final product from a policy review process car-
rried out primarily by experts and retired politicians. This was largely
conducted as a critique of how the first version was put together. The
Defence Review of 1998 mentions peacebuilding as an activity and dis-
tinguishes it from other types of peace measures, but it is not further
discussed. This is not surprising since there is a separate document with
that task. The 2014 Defence Review discusses peacebuilding more ex-
tensively than the previous version, and clearly states that it is not a
practice with solely military benefits. It is stressed that

386 Le Pere 2017:94
387 Government of the Republic of South Africa (2011) p.20
388 There are later versions of the Defence Review available, but since this study is
limited to the years 1994-2015, these are the versions that will be studied here.
South Africa envisages that, as a major power in Africa, it will play a leading role in conflict prevention, peacebuilding, and post-conflict reconstruction.389

This shows both the moral and political vision of South Africa’s role in peacebuilding and its role on the African continent. The 2014 Defence Review emphasizes the need for including developmental, economic, and governance aspects for effectively achieving lasting stability and conditions of human security.390

These four documents are the main policy guidelines governing peace missions in the period of this study, 1994-2015. On the scale between directly and indirectly related to South African peacebuilding, the White Paper is the most directly related document. This document consists of statements about the nature and scope of contemporary peace missions, discussions of the international mandate for peace missions, as well as the South African philosophy for participation in peace missions. In addition, it presents South Africa’s potential contributions as well as its principles and procedures for participation. This is the richest document of South Africa’s approach to peace missions. The Defence Review of 1998 and the white paper on foreign policy are documents only indirectly related to peacebuilding and largely provide a framework for foreign policy and defence at large. However, the defence policy of 2014 lies somewhere between directly and indirectly related to peacebuilding since it provides important insights and framing, even though the most in-depth discussions are clearly offered in the white paper on peace missions.

Although the most important policy document for South Africa’s engagement in peacebuilding is the white paper on peace missions, the defence policy of 2014 also provides important insights. Even though it largely reflects what is stated in the white paper on peace missions, it sometimes offers nuances. This study considers all the documents to have been written by the South African state, which is why the arguments within them are understood as having been articulated by the state. Drafting these kinds of documents is a political process and several branches of the South African government and its agencies were involved. However, since they are official documents, it is reasonable to treat them as the stance of the South African state.

390 Government of the Republic of South Africa (2014) p.78
Russian documents

The case study on Russia is based on close readings and critical analysis of Russia’s main foreign policy documents with relevance for peace missions abroad. This material consists of five core documents. These are, firstly, the National Security Concept from 2000. These documents offer an overview of the foreign policy goals and visions but are primarily a way of portraying national interests.

The second document is the National Security Strategy to 2020 from 2009, which offers both long-term visions and an account of the strategic goals in Russia’s foreign policy. This document is devoted to an account of perceived threats to national security in the ten-year period between 2010 and 2020. The third document is the Concept of the Foreign Policy from 2013 and the fourth its updated version Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation from 2016. These documents provide a systemic vision of the basic principles, priority areas, goals, and objectives of the foreign policy of the Russian Federation.

The fifth document is the Concept on International Development Assistance from 2007 and the sixth its updated version Concept of the Russian Federation’s State Policy in the area of International Development Assistance from 2014. These are relevant because, following their preamble, they address socioeconomic development as well as issues and crises caused by conflicts. This signals that the Russian Federation tends to define peacebuilding as part of development assistance. Yet, peacebuilding is not commonly used in these documents.

The seventh document is the Military Doctrine from 2014. This document has been revised numerous times during the post-Soviet era, and the relevance criteria have assisted in selecting only the most recent version. This document functions primarily as a policy guideline on defence issues.

It is important to note that there is no white paper on peace missions in the Russian policy document portfolio. However, the policy for international assistance offers something that seems at least to overlaps with issues defined as peacebuilding. The documents have been selected on basis of their relevance in framing the official foreign policy discourse of the Russian Federation. As the main foreign policy documents in the period of study, 1992-2017, they provide an almost complete selection. These documents also provide the framework for Russian engagements in peace missions’ abroad. All documents, accessed
in their official English version, have been read closely and their justification strategies identified on the basis of the aspirational goals and values expressed in the texts. They are, as in the South African case, viewed as the official stance of the Russian state.

Getting access to documents in the Russian case have been more challenging. This has to do with language as well as the kind of documents that are accessible. Moreover, there is no specific white paper on peace missions in the Russian context, which limits the material available in this case. For this reason, the interviews in the Russian case play a greater role in generating information.

Language presents a challenge in the Russian case. However, the documents collected and analysed here are the official English versions. The fact that they are the official versions is deemed as making them sufficiently trustworthy to include in this study. Yet, it also increases the importance of the interviews. As previously mentioned, the interviews have been helpful in helping to identify the most important documents and justification strategies and to triangulate information. The methodological discussion continues by focusing on the interviews and interviewees, and how the information has been generated.

Interviews and interviewees

For the fieldwork, 28 interviews were conducted: 16 experts on Russian and 12 experts on South African foreign policy and peace engagements participated in this study.\(^{391}\) This provides a potential limitation in the material. However, the material is deemed to be sufficient to address this study’s research questions. A common objection towards interview studies is the limited ability to generalise the results.\(^{392}\) Importantly, the aims of this study are not to generate generalizable results, but rather to develop theory.

Since this study focuses on the official foreign policy discourse, interviewees were typically foreign policy advisors and analysts, diplomats and ambassadors, and senior scholars. The common denominator
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\(^{391}\) There does not seem to be a right or wrong when it comes to number of interviews, what helps setting a satisfactory amount is directly related to what kind of study it is and what kind of research questions are addressed. A guide line presented by Kvale and Brinkmann suggests that you should interview as many people as needed to find out what you need to know. They also draw the general conclusion that most studies have about 15 interviews, but it varies between 5-25 participants. 2009:129f

\(^{392}\) Kvale & Brinkmann 2009:280
was that the interviewees had actively worked with foreign policy and peace engagements. The people interviewed included, for example, professionals who had served as advisors to the South African or Russian governments as well as professionals who had served different United Nations peace missions or in other UN capacities such as international judges, diplomats, and representatives. Additionally, interviews were conducted with ambassadors and diplomats who had served their country abroad. The participants were selected on the basis of a careful selection strategy and, having been guaranteed confidentiality, and will not be mentioned by name.

**Interviews in Cape Town, Durban, Johannesburg and Pretoria, South Africa**

The interviews conducted in South Africa were, as with the Russian case, primarily made up by participants from academia. In this context scholars often work as advisors to the government.

In the South African case, the interviewees are active at the Institute for Justice and Reconciliation (one person) and the Centre for Conflict Resolution (two persons) in Cape Town. One participant is active at the South African Institute for International Affairs in Johannesburg, two are based at the African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes (ACCORD) in Durban. Two participants are based at the University of KwaZulu Natal in Durban, and two at Wits School of Governance (WSG), at the University of Witwatersrand in Johannesburg. One participant is based at the University in Johannesburg, while one is based at the University of South Africa (UNISA) in Pretoria and one at the University of Pretoria. Most of these people have double affiliations and are connected to several institutions; here, their primary affiliation is listed.

While this offers a diverse set of participants in the case study on South Africa, they are primarily participants with academic positions. On the other hand, several of them are both diplomats and scholars. Their position is classified according to their current occupation, even if their previous experience is also taken into consideration. This also shows that most of the participants are part of the marginal political discourse, rather than the official discourse, in Hansen’s terminology. However, the participants who are connected to both the marginal political discourse and the official discourse have been the most informative and useful.
Interviews in Moscow, Russia

In the Russian case, interviews were conducted with individuals from different institutions. Three participants are active at the Moscow State Institute of International Relations (Московский государственный институт международных отношений, MGIMO), an academic institution run by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Two participants are active at the Institute of World Economy and International Relations (Институт мировой экономики и международных отношений, IMEMO), an independent research institute. Three participants are active at the Russian Academy of Sciences at departments such as the Institute for African Studies. These include two scholars and one ambassador. One participant is also active at the Gorchakov Foundation, which facilitated further contacts with a diplomat and other scholars. Additionally, one participant from the Russian International Affairs Council (Российский совет по международным делам) and one from the BRICS Research Centre (Национальный комитет по исследованию БРИКС) took part of the study, as did three participants from the Diplomatic Academy and one from the PIR Centre.

As in the South African case, this offers a diverse set of people with different competencies, even if most of them are senior academics. In this case, too, the participants are connected to the marginal political discourse, the official discourse, or both.

Structuring information from interviews

The interviewees have different positions, which affects the extent to which they can be regarded as representative of the states of South Africa and Russia. Some are closer to the government than others, while some are former ambassadors and ministers with close ties to the government. Others are scholars who have worked as advisors to the governments. This means that the interview material includes people who should be seen as part of the official discourse, i.e. representatives for the state, while others are parts of the marginal political discourse, i.e. academics. A feature of the interview material is that the interviews I conducted with people still active in academia offered a more nuanced and rich account than those with current and previous state representatives. These also were interviews classified as theory, since they have
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made the greatest contribution to identifying justification strategies. Most interviewees have an academic degree but are here categorised as official or marginal political discourse, depending on their position and role.

The textual information generated from interviews consists of interview notes as well as recordings and transcripts of the recordings. As noted earlier, not all interviews could be recorded, which made the notes an increasingly important part of the information. The interviews that were recorded clearly confer greater validity on the material. However, note-taking offers an alternative way of working systematically with the information being collected albeit with less validity than recordings. Interviews generating textual information through note taking have a greater potential for misunderstanding and misinterpretation, making the material potentially fragile. This was addressed by systematically triangulating the information received.

The textual information generated from the interviews allows for a mapping of the different themes and topics constructed through the interviews. This exercise builds on the analysis of the foreign policy documents. This is beneficial in order not only to find differences and similarities in the differing information but also to enhance intertextuality, in line with given goal of bringing together different pieces of text. The following step is to analyse the differing textual information by using interpretivist content analysis to identify the justification strategies constructed in the data. This combines the analyses of the documents and the interviews and is summarised in one typology for each case.

Secondary material

The secondary material consists of policy reports and publications from various think tanks on the engagement of South Africa and Russia in different peacebuilding contexts. In addition, research on Russian and South African foreign policy is discussed within the respective chapters on the case studies. However, the main empirical material consists of Russia’s and South Africa’s foreign policy documents and guidelines for engagements in peacebuilding processes as well as textual data generated from expert interviews. These different textual sources were initially reviewed and systematically mapped in terms of where peacebuilding activities (ongoing or recently concluded) involving South Africa and Russia had taken place as well as their justificatory arguments.
This resulted in two different outcomes, one concerning the engagements each country had been involved in within the selected period. The second mapping led to the construction of a typology for each case based on the types of arguments the representatives were using to justify each country’s peacebuilding engagement. Let us now turn to a discussion of how these typologies have been constructed.

**Constructing typologies**

The typologies constructed in the two cases are presented as a summary of the results from the analyses in Chapters Five and Six; these are also understood as an organized system of types of justification strategies. These have been constructed on the basis of critical readings of the documents in addition to being guided by answers given in interviews. For reasons of intersubjectivity and clarity, attention should be paid to how these typologies have been constructed. The presentation will start with the more general parts of a typology and then examine how the typologies in the cases have been constructed.

A typology commonly consists of an overarching concept, in this case justification strategies. It also consists of several types, which here are different kinds of justification strategies. These justificatory strategies have different labels, as, for example, the continuous invoking of multilateralism as a justification strategy by both South Africa and Russia. The types are generally organized in some way, either on a hierarchical scale or on the basis of equal weighting. There are several different ways to organize the types, but since both typologies in this study are built on equally strong types, this discussion is not of primary importance.\(^{394}\)

The types are constructed on the basis of themes found in the material. These themes have been grouped together according to whether they offer similar or different arguments as justification of engagement in peacebuilding. The analysis shows three groups of justification strategies in each case, which I consider as three types of strategies within
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\(^{394}\) Collier, Laporte & Seawright (2008) offers a distinction between nominal scale, partially-ordered scale, and ordinal scale as ways to organise the types in a typology. The nominal scale includes types which are mutually exhaustive and mutually exclusive, but not ordered. A partially ordered scale is ordered on the basis of only two categories or types, while the ordinal scale offers an ordering based on low to high, weak to strong, or equivalent. Collier, Laporte & Seawright 2008: 156f
my typology. Hence, a typology is the result of a systematic grouping process.395

The guiding rule for constructing a typology is that the characteristics within a type should be as similar as possible, while the characteristics between types should strive to be as different as possible. They should be connected by the overarching concept but remain clearly separable. When reading the material, the analysis is governed by the search for justificatory arguments in relation to peacebuilding. What is found is grouped into different themes and categorised into types. The two typologies developed in the cases are closely developed on the basis of the material. In addition, in the final chapter, a more general typology is suggested. Here, the typologies reveal both divisions and overlaps in the moral and political justification strategies and the attempts to justify.

Combining empirical research and ethical analysis

As outlined briefly in the introductory chapter, this study is situated within the emerging field of empirical ethics. At the same time, it is also a study positioned in critical theory. In some branches of what is known as applied ethics, scholars have proposed developing the terminology further into empirical ethics, as a logical consequence of the increasing combination of insights from ethics and the social sciences. The fields in which these discussions have been most prominent are medical ethics, business ethics, and some areas of political philosophy.396

There are several crucial distinctions between ethical analysis and analysis within social sciences. The first is the moral focus within ethics and the social focus within social sciences. However, this is less clear-cut as might first appear: researchers within social ethics, for example, are often keen for their research to have implications for real world phenomena rather than merely being relevant on a theoretical level.

It is crucial to remember that there is a difference between ethics as a scientific discipline and morality as a social institution. As Carl-Henric Grenholm explains, the scientific study of ethics consists of a critical thinking about morality, which can be conducted on three different levels: descriptive: normative; and applied.397 Descriptive ethics aims to

395 Kluge 2000:1
396 Musschenga 2005:467
397 Grenholm 2014:18ff
describe and clarify different strands of morality. On this level, it is crucial to elucidate the different arguments for and against different positions. On the level of normative ethics, the role of the researcher is instead to develop suggestions for more plausible moral models. This inherits a constructive task and by definition involves a critical perspective. In other words, social ethics emphasizes the normative dimension of ethics in combination with descriptive ethics, rather than merely focusing on descriptive, applied, or analytical ethics.\textsuperscript{398} This study taps into descriptive ethics as well as normative ethics. It both addresses how morality plays a role in justifying engagement in peacebuilding and suggests a model for what justified peacebuilding is.

Summary

In order to address the research questions credibly, the approach to information analysis in this study has been to start with a critical analysis of the different textual data. The analyses were initiated by an interpretivist content analysis of the foreign policy documents. By continuing with an interpretivist content analysis of the interview transcripts and notes, it has enabled patterns to emerge from the materials. This allows an analysis of the generated information from different angles since the different types of evidence and analytical approaches connect with different dimensions of the roles and justifications of external actors and their initiatives in peacebuilding processes. The analysis of documents, in tandem with the interview material, makes up the core of the empirical material in each case. A combination of the analyses of the different types of material has resulted in the typologies, as discussed above.

The next step is to apply critical tools from justification theory to the state practice of trying to justify engagement in peacebuilding, with the aim of showing that ethics has a valuable contribution to make. This explicitly addresses the goal of connecting the ethical level with the applied, political level. The discussion will now continue in the empirical chapters on South Africa and Russia.

\textsuperscript{398} Grenholm 2014:19f
5. The Republic of South Africa

How do actors representing the state of South Africa justify their engagements in peacebuilding processes abroad? Which justificatory strategies do they use and why these particular strategies? In addition, it seems reasonable to ask in what way South Africa understands peacebuilding and justification thereof, based on their foreign policy discourse. It is also of interest to address what priorities have been made in South African peacebuilding initiatives and how have these been justified. Moreover, which audiences do the justificatory attempts address? These are the guiding questions that this chapter highlights and analyses.

South Africa is an interesting case with respect to justifying peacebuilding for several reasons. As stated in the introduction, South Africa is in an identity-building phase, particularly with regard to its foreign relations.\(^399\) It is also a state that is dissatisfied with the current structure of world affairs. South Africa has on many occasions called for African states to have a greater voice in international relations and has often taken a leading position. It is also interesting since it has been regarded as a moral authority,\(^400\) but is this translated into the use of moral reasoning in foreign policy and peacebuilding?

This chapter analyses the case study of South Africa and starts with a general overview of historical aspects of South African foreign relations. This is followed by a discussion of its engagement with different peace issues, with a particular focus on peacebuilding. This offers a picture of trends and developments within South Africa’s peace engagements. Furthermore, this shows which type of collaborations are generally preferred and which organizations are most important for South Africa’s peacebuilding engagements. South Africa’s foreign policy and engagements are well researched, but not in light of a normative ap-
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\(^399\) Le Pere 2017:94
\(^400\) van Nieuwkerk 2009:71f, 76
proach that connects the discussion to normative theory and justification. The aim of this chapter is to analyse how the political leadership of the state of South Africa seeks to justify its engagements in peacebuilding initiatives. The results are presented as a tripartite typology consisting of themes that have been organized into groups based on the analysis. Before discussing the results, let us begin with a sketch of the historical developments that have influenced South Africa’s role as an actor in peacebuilding initiatives.

**Historical aspects of South African foreign relations**

White settlement in South Africa was begun by the Dutch East India Company in 1652, and by 1910, after two Anglo-Boer-wars, the British took control over the area now known as South Africa. The country was domestically organised according to the British model, including the adoption of policy of ethnic separation. Foreign affairs were largely dominated by the country’s relationship with the United Kingdom. The 1948 South African election, for whites only, marked an increased intensity in racial policies. This election was won by the Afrikaner elite who enforced racial laws based on white domination. The Republic of South Africa was established in 1961, replacing its Afrikaner incarnation as Republiek van Suid-Afrika.

South Africa’s fraught history is a crucial factor in explaining the developments in the country in general and also the country’s foreign policy. During the apartheid period in South Africa, the country was regarded as a pariah by most of the international community, and South African foreign policy termed the “diplomacy of isolation”. This was primarily characterized as a reactive foreign policy focusing mainly on dealing with the international measures intended to force Pretoria to abandon apartheid racial laws. Apartheid was widely opposed internationally and, in particular, regionally, with neighbouring countries
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401 In addition, the ethics of intervention and ethics of foreign policy are also well-researched areas, though without a particular focus on peacebuilding initiatives but rather military and humanitarian interventions leading to or during war, as demonstrated in Chapter One.

402 van Nieuwkerk 2006:38f; Vandenbosch 1970:3–28

403 Pfister 2006:23

404 Pfister 2006:23
such as Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Mozambique, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia, and Zimbabwe all actively campaigning to isolate the apartheid state. These campaigns led to repeated cross-border incursions by the South African security forces, which created continual mistrust and insecurity in the region.\textsuperscript{405} The struggle against apartheid was also supported by other African countries as well as countries outside the continent. For example, the Soviet Union provided training and support for ANC freedom fighters against the apartheid government.\textsuperscript{406} Another example is Sweden’s financial support of the freedom struggle, combined with active opposition to the apartheid regime through consumer boycotts and awareness campaigns.\textsuperscript{407}

In Chapter Three it was argued that there is a difference between being justified and attempting to justify in the case of peacebuilding initiatives. The reason is that being justified implies that an ideal stage of justification has been reached, whereas an attempt to justify should be understood as an attempt at normative or moral justification. This distinction is also applicable in other areas. For example, this is exemplified by the statement that apartheid can never be justified because of its inhumane basis in a continual violation of human dignity. However, there have been several attempts to justify the race laws upon which apartheid was built. Attempts to justify the ideas used by the South African government during the apartheid period rested on the idea of white superiority. This was the core value that guided both the national and the international discourse, leading to an aggressive foreign policy and very limited economic cooperation.\textsuperscript{408} This is an instance in which attempts to justify were inadequate, when that which was being argued for was unjustifiable and fell far short of potential justification.

A crucial development that took place in parallel with the evolution of foreign relations in the South African apartheid regime was the development of the African National Congress’s (ANC) foreign relations. The ANC was the main opponent to the Afrikaner party, the National Party (NP), and during its struggle against apartheid the ANC developed its own foreign relations.\textsuperscript{409} This was very much a strategic as well as survivalist approach, given that the ANC was dependent on support from abroad both to survive and to carry on the struggle for freedom. In

\textsuperscript{405} The Republic of South Africa 2014:148
\textsuperscript{406} Arkhangelskaya & Shubin 2013:21
\textsuperscript{407} Sellström 2003:137ff
\textsuperscript{408} The Republic of South Africa 2014:148
\textsuperscript{409} van Nieuwkerk 2006:39
contemporary South Africa, the democratic political system is dominated by the ANC, which won 62.15% of the votes in the national elections in 2014, an election which resulted in 13 political parties getting seats in parliament.410

South Africa’s international isolation shifted tremendously during the transition period between 1990 and 1994, and in particular with the formal end of apartheid upon the first free elections in April 1994.411 The new constitution of 1996 stipulated values such as equality, non-racialism, non-discrimination, liberty, peace and democracy, which since 1994 have been seen as central to the country’s national identity and as guiding principles of foreign policy. This dual focus, both domestic and international, is a consequence of South Africa’s need to prove itself a responsible actor both internally and externally.412 This need is both self-proclaimed and externally expected and relates to the restoration of the reputation of the state. This is a challenging task which the South African leadership has approached with care. South Africa’s transition from apartheid to democracy has shown many soft power attributes, both with regard to the attraction and power of the democratization process. This has led to South Africa acquiring a certain moral authority and prestige, which has resulted in it playing an influential role in conflict resolution and mediation through peacekeeping operations.413 Moreover, discussions of responsibility have heavily influenced South African foreign policy as well as the country’s engagement in peace missions.

Shifts and nuances in South Africa’s foreign policy

Until the transition period which began in 1990, many of the successive governments of South Africa had followed a western-colonial approach, mainly consisting of a status-quo-preserving unilateralism based on white domination. This non-transparent and closed process gradually became more open during the transition period of 1990-1994, which signalled the first important shift in the development of South
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African foreign policy. During this period, the challenges facing the integration process also became visible in the policy-making processes.414

A second important shift in South African foreign policy took place in the period following the first democratic election in 1994, when Nelson Mandela was elected President and the ANC came to power.415 In the literature, 1994 is portrayed as the main turning point in South African foreign policy, including as regards peacemaking issues. Since the crucial domestic developments in 1994, when the Republic of South Africa held its first free and inclusive elections, domestic and international expectations about the role of South Africa as a responsible and respected member of the international community have grown steadily, above all in regard to the expectation that it should take a leading role in international peace missions.416 These international expectations have played a substantial role in South Africa’s engagements in peace missions abroad and, together with the country’s self-image, have pushed the development of South Africa’s engagement in peacebuilding. With regard to national self-image and international expectations, the image of Nelson Mandela has been of crucial importance.417

However, as early as 1993, Nelson Mandela published an article in *Foreign Affairs* stating that the future South African foreign policy was to be guided by six pillars. The pillars he identified were: 1) human rights; 2) democracy; 3) just relations between states and the rule of international law; 4) peaceful resolution of disputes; 5) the centrality of Africa; and 6) greater regional and international cooperation.418 These pillars have influenced both the constitution and the foreign policy of South Africa.

As a consequence of the 1994 election, a well-written and ambitious constitution was drafted that would regulate both domestic and international relations of the Republic of South Africa. Foreign policy developed in this time was inspired by the philosophy of *Ubuntu*, a word that though translation could be interpreted as humanity. This notion emphasizes that ‘a person is a person through other people’ as well as the social dimensions of humanity. *Ubuntu* has been identified by the South
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African Government as the inspiration for a foreign policy characterized by cooperation, collaboration, and the forging of international partnerships.\(^{419}\) One direct consequence of the shift in 1994 with more immediate relevance for peace missions is exemplified by the mediation efforts of President Mandela\(^ {420}\) after he took over from the late Tanzanian president Julius Nyerere in the Burundi peace process in 1999.\(^ {421}\) This was one of the earliest mediation missions in which South Africa participated as an external actor. The first mission was supposedly an SADC mission in Lesotho in 1998, an initiative for which South Africa has received criticism given the uncertainty regarding its legitimacy and mandate. The first South African UN deployment took place within MONUC in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) in 1999. Yet, the first large-scale deployment took place through an AU mission where the seconded personnel were ‘re-hatted’ to create the UN Operation in Burundi (ONUB) in 2004. Up to 2015, South Africa seconded personnel to 14 international peace operations, including seven UN peacekeeping missions (Darfur, DRC, Burundi, Ethiopia/Eritrea, Liberia, and Côte d’Ivoire).\(^ {422}\)

A third shift took place in 1999 following the second post-apartheid election as a renewed development of official foreign policy started to take place. Anthoni van Nieuwkerk has identified two driving forces behind the shift in 1999, the first being the invitation of Jackie Selebi, the newly appointed Director-General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, to reformulate the Ministry’s mission statement. The second driving force was Thabo Mbeki’s articulation of a strong commitment towards the ‘African renaissance’, and his parallel promotion of the role of developing countries via a South African leadership role in various multilateral institutions.\(^ {423}\) Additionally, it was in 1998/1999 that South Africa’s first, and hitherto only, white paper, the *White Paper on South African Participation in International Peace Missions*, was published.\(^ {424}\) This was important for putting peace issues on the agenda in an institutionalized manner. I interpret this document as being of crucial importance for South Africa’s involvement in different types of peace initiatives, from mediation to peacekeeping and peacebuilding. It offers
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a detailed account of South Africa’s conditions for engagement in peace issues.

In continuation of the foreign relations initiated and nurtured by President Mandela, his successor Thabo Mbeki, President of South Africa 1999 – 2008, maintained and strengthened Mandela’s principles. However, Mbeki also developed them, and the Mbeki government’s foreign policy has been marked by both continuity and change compared to Mandela’s. In 2001, Mbeki formulated five foreign policy goals which have strongly influenced the subsequent development of the foreign policy of South Africa. These were: 1) a crucial restructure of regional organizations such as the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) and Southern African Development Community (SADC); 2) a reform of international organizations such as the United Nations (UN), the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the World Bank; 3) South African hosting international conferences; 4) promotion of peace and security on the continent and in the Middle East; 5) and fostering ties with the G8 countries as a strategy of the Global South. Under the presidency of Mbeki, the elements of cooperation, multilateralism, and, in particular, the centrality of Africa via the notion of African Renaissance were further emphasized. In all these goals, the overarching theme seems to be more equal participation in international multilateral organizations and the promotion of the voice of developing countries. South Africa’s two rounds as a non-permanent member of the UN Security Council, in 2008-2009 and 2011-2012, exemplify how these goals have been operationalized in international politics. In addition, scholars such as Chris Landsberg have argued that Mbeki’s foreign policy vision was more internationalist and strategic than Mandela’s, which also become clear from a survey of Mbeki’s principles.

At the third democratic shift of presidency in 2009, almost a year after Thabo Mbeki’s resignation which was followed by Kgalema Mottlanthe seven months as president, Jacob Zuma began his presidency. Zuma signalled before the election that foreign policy priorities would not change and emphasised continuity. Although stated policy as articulated on paper gestured towards continuity, government practice revealed deviations from it. The Zuma government has also articulated

---

425 Landsberg 2012
426 Interview Johannesburg 2015-11-30, Interview Johannesburg 2015-12-01
427 Landsberg 2012:2
428 Landsberg 2012:14
pillars of prioritization within foreign policy: 1) African advancement; 2) strengthening South–South relations; 3) engaging the North; and 4) actively participating in the global system of governance.429

President Zuma’s foreign policy has built on the goals identified by both Mandela and Mbeki, but he has more clearly promoted a leading role for South Africa in the SADC, the AU, and the UN. Zuma has also put more emphasis on foreign investments in South Africa as a foreign policy strategy, under the label ‘South Africa as the gateway to Africa’. This focus on South Africa as the leader of the continent has prompted an ongoing discussion in several aspects. The South African economy is one of the largest on the continent, which brings with it certain unavoidable expectations and roles. Zuma’s presidency has sparked much debate domestically, regarding both domestic and foreign policy. This shows that the foreign policy of South Africa has been characterized by both continuity and change. Landsberg has studied the potential change and continuity in the foreign policies of the Mandela, Mbeki, and Zuma governments and argues that it is primarily continuity that has influenced the foreign policy making in post-apartheid South Africa, and most clearly so between the governments of Mbeki and Zuma.430

The three shifts sketched above are all connected to leadership. Change and continuity in foreign policy is customarily explained by several factors, such as the dynamics of institutions, environment, and personalities.431 South Africa’s foreign policy should be seen not as bits and pieces connected to each presidency or government, but as a continuously progressing process.432 In this process, all presidencies have developed the foreign policy further, a natural element in a young country’s formation. Initially, Nelson Mandela faced high expectations about his performance as a president and a leader, expectations that came from an internal as well as international audience and that were imposed on domestic and foreign politics alike. This is connected to the key factor that South Africa has to perform a balancing act between its self-proclaimed and its externally expected roles. This is expressed in South African foreign policy, which defines the role of the Republic as
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a responsible actor engaged in regional cooperation, peace, and stability but, crucially, on equal grounds. It is also expressed by the fact that individual countries or national organizations often turn to South Africa, either through bilateral collaboration between the countries or through national organizations, to ask for assistance on issues related to peace, security, and post-conflict reconstruction. Additionally, from the South African perspective, there are also international expectations that South Africa should take care of its neighbourhood, especially if the country is to be seen as a regionally important actor.

Besides the South African context, the shifts in the foreign policy discourse can also be connected to more general global trends. For example, a greater emphasis on regional actors in peace processes has led to the African Union having a more established role as a peacemaking actor, which also affects South Africa in different ways. The point I would like to stress here is that developments in the South African foreign policy context can be both internal and external. However, the emphasis in this chapter lies on the self-image South Africa constructs through its foreign policy discourse.

South African involvement in peace missions

South African involvement in peacekeeping operations was increasingly debated in the domestic discourse in the mid-90s, within both government departments and academic institutions. The new government adopted a clear strategy of developing South Africa’s potential as a peacemaking actor, both regionally and internationally. At this time, the debate changed from whether South Africa would participate, to by when and how. This debate has continued, following the parallel developments of international peace missions as they move from a militaristic to a more holistic approach, including issues of peacebuilding and post-conflict reconstruction.
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Broadening the scope; geographically and conceptually

In the mid-1990s, South Africa had relatively narrow scope and ambitions in regard to peace missions and directed its rhetoric towards regional matters. This initial stance had shifted by the later part of the 90s, and South Africa declared in the *White Paper on South African Participation in International Peace Missions* that the country had an important role, regionally as well as internationally.\(^{437}\) This statement clearly implied a perceived responsibility to participate in the fostering of peace and security across the continent. As explicitly stated in the Executive Summary of the document:

> Since the advent of democracy in 1994, domestic and international expectations have steadily grown regarding South Africa’s role as a responsible and respected member of the international community. These expectations have included a hope that South Africa will play a leading role in international peace missions.\(^{438}\)

However, in the later part of the 1990s, South Africa still seemed inclined to prefer the deployment of support in the neighbourhood and the region rather than elsewhere.\(^{439}\) The argument used as attempts to justify this was the South African National Defence Force’s (SANDF) intimate knowledge of African conditions as well as the urgent need for specialized expertise in Africa.\(^{440}\) This claim can be questioned and problematized in view of the size and diversity across the continent, and it is not obvious that South African forces would be better deployed in the systems in Northern Africa than, say, those of countries in the Middle East. In addition, criticism has been directed at South Africa on this particular point.\(^{441}\) On the other hand, foreign policy and peacebuilding engagements are, as previously argued, primarily questions of national interest. Importantly, the phrase “African solutions to African problems” is a powerful factor for legitimizing regional engagement in domestic as well as international discourses. While this regional focus can be interpreted as a step away from national interest, it should in fact be understood as a secondary prioritization. In addition, the African continent has been a clear foreign policy focus across the Mandela, Mbeki, and
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Zuma governments. This Afrocentrism should be seen in the context of South Africa distancing itself from European colonialism and imperialism.

There has been a development in the stances adopted in the mid-90s (around 1994-5) after the transition period, and the late 1990s (1999) in South African foreign policy when it comes to involvement in peace missions. This can be summarized in terms of issues centred on scope, capacities, and ambitions. The development can be explained as a natural evolvement of a young nation, adjusting its foreign policy step by step and building up its identity in global affairs. The stances in the mid-90s were coloured by the liberation process and the development of democracy and were perhaps most heavily focused on domestic developments. The stances taken in 1999 are instead more focused on international collaboration, and the development of South African foreign policy has evolved with a clearer external focus.

South African participation in peace support operations was and is ultimately regarded as a political decision.\textsuperscript{442} In the mid-1990s, the Departments of Foreign Affairs and Defence declared that the current SANDF was under the influence of the old regime and did not reflect the reformed SANDF which was in the process of being created at that point. The departments also raised a pressing concern, that deployment of troops outside of the South African borders would have to be justified in relation to domestic security and socio-economic and development priorities. In the earlier debate, it was seen as unlikely that South Africa would commit itself to United Nations missions in the near future, a position that was largely explained by the absence of capacity in handling domestic and international developments at the same time. However, and most importantly, the ambition and political will were not lacking.\textsuperscript{443}

Studies have shown that Mbeki had a great influence on South Africa’s peace engagements, and during his presidency he personally defined the peace efforts of South Africa. Even if practices on the ground have sometimes found it difficult to keep up with the political documents and to some extent the political will, the terminology has been developed successfully. South Africa’s peace engagements are governed by terms such as accountability, democracy, human rights, gender equality, fiscal responsibility, and peer and civil society. In addition,
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the principle of sovereignty is no longer inviolable. South Africa’s role has largely been influenced by its own process, and ‘The South African Model’ has served as an approach to mediation which South African politicians have drawn on when serving as mediators, for example, in Zimbabwe. This has received criticism, however, for being an oversimplification that is insufficiently adapted to other contexts.444

The main engagements of South African peace missions have been its efforts in Democratic Republic of the Congo, Burundi, Sudan, and the Côte d’Ivoire. These have been characterized by different types of peace missions, and the majority have been mediation efforts. South Africa has also contributed military personnel as well as experts and advisors.445 However, its engagement when it comes to peacebuilding would appear slight.

One important remark in regard to the conceptual development and understanding of peace missions in South African foreign policy concerns the definition of peacebuilding. In the South African foreign policy discourse, both peacebuilding and post-conflict reconstruction cover the definition of peacebuilding as conceptualized in this dissertation. However, post-conflict reconstruction seems to be the dominant term in South Africa’s wider foreign policy discourse, and this is also often related to development work. However, in the White Paper on Peace Missions, peacebuilding is the most commonly used term. The White Paper defines peacebuilding as follows:

“Peace building” may occur at any stage in the conflict cycle, but it is critical in the aftermath of a conflict. “Peace building” includes activities such as the identification and support of measures and structures that will promote peace and build trust, and the facilitation of interaction among former enemies in order to prevent a relapse into conflict. In essence, “peace building” is mainly a diplomatic/developmental process. Although the military might be requested to support this process, “peace building” does not constitute a military operation in the true sense of the word. It is important that the military involved in “peace missions” will have knowledge of the role of the different role players within the “peace building” process, but as in the case of “preventive diplomacy” and “peace making”, “peace building” is not primarily a military responsibility.446
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In this part of the White Paper, the definitions of related concepts, such as peace mission, peace support operation, preventive diplomacy, peacemaking, peacekeeping operation, peace enforcement, humanitarian assistance and humanitarian intervention, are also clarified. This shows an awareness of the importance of the content of the concepts as well as the importance of keeping them apart.

South African foreign policy discourse on peacebuilding consistently refers to peace missions, not peace operations. This can be explained as a desire to reduce the militaristic connotation of the word: by using ‘mission’ the connotations lean more towards collaboration, which is also in line with the overarching theme of South African foreign policy. The White Paper initially clarifies that

> If South Africa is to formulate a meaningful policy for participation in peace operations, a clear understanding of the exact meaning of key terms and definitions is of utmost importance as a clear point of reference. Of particular concern in this regard is the current practice of interchangeable use of the term “mission” and “operation”, as well as the scope and use of the term “peace support operation”.447

This is then followed by a definition of different concepts with relevance for South African peace involvement. The clarification between missions and operations is as follows:

**Peace Mission.** Although there is general consensus today that all measures aimed at conflict prevention, management and resolution are in essence political and diplomatic activities (of which the military is but one, subordinate player), the term peace “operation” immediately creates the perception of military dominance. The term “mission”, on the other hand, suggests a broader series of political and diplomatic activities. As all current UN activities to prevent or settle international disputes are, in essence, political and diplomatic activities, the term “peace mission” constitutes an appropriate generic term to include “preventive diplomacy”, “peacemaking”, “peacekeeping”, “peace enforcement”, and “peacebuilding”.

**Peace Support Operations.** The term “peace support operations” is widely used to cover “peacekeeping” and “peace enforcement” operations. The UN has also accepted the meaning as such. The term “peace support operations” should therefore be used to refer to all military activities in support of a peace mission. This includes military activities
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in support of predominantly political activities, such as “preventive diplomacy”, “peacemaking” and “peace building”.448

This shows that there is a deliberate choice to use the term “missions” rather than “operations”. In addition, it shows that there are some differences in how peacebuilding is understood, namely whether it forms part of a peace mission or a peace operation. However, if we look at the definition of peacebuilding again, it seems reasonable to interpret peacebuilding as primarily a constituent of peace missions.

Domestic procedures and trends

The procedure for South African engagement in peace missions abroad is essentially prepared in the presidential office and then decided upon in parliament. The practice of taking the decision through parliament is a way of creating legitimacy and broader support for the mission, but the procedure is flawed by the fact that it is not always implemented. Public debate on involvement in peace missions abroad seems to be limited by only moderate interest but also by a lack of transparency of the political process. This feature is not specific to the case of South Africa; studies of public opinion in the United States show a similar trend. There are several similarities between South African and American public opinion on foreign affairs: the public’s view that too much is spent on foreign aid; a desire to focus on domestic, rather than international, issues; support for shifting away from military intervention and toward humanitarian aid; and strong support for multilateral organizations such as the UN.449 Additionally, public awareness of peace missions seems to grow as soon as something goes wrong. This is exemplified by the increase in South African public interest in the country’s peace engagements abroad in 2013 when 13 South African soldiers were killed in the Central African Republic.450 This offers an interesting intersection between domestic and foreign policy.

Prior to any South African engagement in a peace mission, the white paper on peace missions states that
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[...] an extensive media campaign should be launched prior to the deployment of a national military contingent for service in international peace support operations to ensure that requisite levels of popular and political support are sustained for the operation. This campaign should be spearheaded by the Office of the President in consultation with relevant parties.\textsuperscript{451}

This shows that the public should be involved before military deployment, but it is not clear whether this applies also for civilian deployment in peacebuilding.\textsuperscript{452}

The structure for peace missions is primarily found within the office of the president and the South African Foreign Ministry. An important signifier for South Africa’s foreign relations being governed by the baseline idea of cooperation is the Foreign Ministry’s change of name from Department of Foreign Affairs (DFA) to Department of International Relations and Cooperation (DIRCO).\textsuperscript{453} This name change was implemented in 2009 with the rationale that it was

[...] in line with international trends and is informed by the need to give greater clarity on the mandate of the department.\textsuperscript{454}

But also, as being

[...] an advancement of our domestic priorities at an international level ... South Africa recognizes that its destiny is inextricably linked to that of the developing world in general and in particular the African continent ... Consequently as South Africa seeks to attain its foreign policy objectives it should simultaneously pursue a developmental agenda both in the continent and the developing world.\textsuperscript{455}

These quotations could be interpreted as saying that clarity and cooperation were the main motives behind this change of name. In addition,
this is a signal towards domestic as well as regional and international audiences about how South Africa sets priorities in international affairs. The name change is a deliberate move to avoid the alienating connotations of ‘foreign affairs’ and instead emphasize the inclusiveness of ‘co-operation’. The strategic move of changing name could also be seen as a way of softening the foreign policy discourse, which is often dominated by a close connection to defence issues.

Engagement through international and regional structures

In December 2015, South Africa ranked as the 16th largest troop-contributing country in the UN. This measurement covers UN personnel seconded as police, military experts, or troops, and South Africa was at this time contributing 17 military experts and 2,114 troops. Since 2003, the number of South African personnel on UN missions has been consistently between 1500-2500 people per year. To put this in context, the top five countries at the end of 2015 were Bangladesh (total personnel 8,496), Ethiopia (8,296), India (7,798), Pakistan (7,643) and Rwanda (6,077). Of the 16 ongoing missions in December 2015, nine of which were located on the African continent, South Africa contributed personnel to the UN missions in the DRC and in the Republic of South Sudan. Within the AU context, South Africa was at this time involved in the joint UN-AU Mission in Darfur (UNAMID) by seconding military personnel. South Africa’s contribution to UN missions in DRC, Sudan, and South Sudan accords with its diplomatic engagements as mediator. Alongside Burundi and Côte d’Ivoire, these are among the prioritized countries in South Africa’s peace engagement.

During the 2015-2016 turmoil in Burundi, the AU discussed whether to deploy a peace mission, to be based in the capital Bujumbura. However, largely because of Burundi’s refusal to accept a mission, and fol-
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lowing a voting procedure, the AU decided not to proceed with the deployment. As a member of the AU and following its foreign policy objectives, South Africa has been involved in the discussions. Furthermore, South Africa’s role in the region and on the continent, as well as its history of engagement and support in Burundi, provides an important context here. Its role can also be seen as more indirect given that Ms. Nkosazana Dlamini-Zuma, a South African diplomat who is the head of the AU, has been involved in the crisis in various capacities. Seconding through the UN is a way of creating legitimacy for engagements, both for domestic as well as international audiences. It is also a way of showing that South Africa is a state to count on when it comes to peacebuilding engagements.

Within the UN structures, South Africa has during recent years climbed in the ranking of troop contributing countries. In August 2018, South Africa was the 11th largest contributor, with a total of 1242 personnel, as compared to 16th in 2015. Besides the structures of the UN and the AU, South Africa is also involved with issues of peace and security in and through regional organizations. The main forum in this category is the Southern African Development Community (SADC) but South Africa has also historically been involved in conflict resolution activities though collaboration with the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), specifically in relation to the conflicts in Liberia and Côte d’Ivoire. In Liberia, for example, ECOWAS sought support from South Africa in terms of troops, and Thabo Mbeki was appointed mediator by the AU in the Ivorian crisis in 2004. The SADC countries are active though the UN and the AU peace operations, deployed as military or police personnel and also on an individually recruited basis. In 2008, the SADC Brigade was established as a regional component of the AU Standby Force, a quick-deployment force ready to act when needed.

In addition, The Southern African Defence and Security Management
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(SADSEM), which started as a South African project but quickly turned into a regional network with the aim of promoting peace and security in southern Africa, offers support and research as well as a platform for discussing regional security.\textsuperscript{471}

Current trends in peace engagement

South Africa has emerged to establish itself as a peace actor for the most part during the 21st century, and Walter Lotze, Cedric de Coning and Theo Neethling have identified three trends in South African agency in relation to peace missions, including peacebuilding. This largely correlates with Mbeki’s presidency, even if much of the baseline was established already under Mandela.

The first trend is the strategic geographical focus on the African continent. This is exemplified by the deployments to Burundi and the DRC, both of which were influenced by Pretoria’s leading role as a facilitator and mediator. In addition, the “deployment to Darfur paved the way for South Africa to play a leading role in conflict resolution in the Sudan(s)”\textsuperscript{472}

The second trend identified by Lotze, de Coning, and Neethling is the strategy of deploying within UN-led operations, even though this often is done through regional or sub-regional organizations, or bilateral arrangements. However, they add that South Africa seems not to prefer UN operations to other types of peace missions and that on occasion Pretoria has sent the same amount of personnel through the UN as in bilateral (DRC and the Central African Republic) or regional arrangements (in Lesotho, Burundi, Ethiopia/Eritrea, the Comoros, Darfur).\textsuperscript{473}

This implies a pragmatic attitude but also an awareness of different arenas and different actors facilitating the different venues for peace. For example, a bilateral solution is sometimes more efficient than a large UN-mandated operation or mission. Regardless of the form of collaboration, the decisions should be well-anchored and deliberated and follow upon justificatory attempts.

The third trend to be highlighted by Lotze, de Coning and Neethling is connected to the South African self-image as an increasingly important middle power and as an African power in the international
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arena. This indicates that South Africa sees peace missions as foreign policy tools and/or mechanisms which can support its ambition to play a leading role in multilateral forums.\textsuperscript{474} This can also be interpreted as having a larger moral and political responsibility to act in peacebuilding, both because it is possible and expected. Importantly, possibilities and expectations are not always in tune, and the capacity to live up to expectations may in fact be lacking.

South Africa is a valued partner in many African peace processes. As Kwesi Aning has argued,

> South Africa’s relative power, wealth and human resources are increasingly making it the ‘preferred’ choice for mediation in African conflicts.\textsuperscript{475}

However, critics of South African foreign policy argue that a discrepancy between rhetoric and practice, between policy and strategy in peace processes, and between highly qualified and renowned negotiators and facilitators, together with a lack of capacity at the middle level of implementation, offers a challenge to the image of South Africa as exemplary peacemaker.\textsuperscript{476} Nonetheless, while there may sometimes be a vast gap between rhetoric and achievement, several parties, such as the LRA in Uganda and both the opposition party MDC and the government of Zimbabwe, have expressed a desire for South African leaders to conduct negotiations.\textsuperscript{477} While not of direct relevance to peacebuilding, this is related to South Africa’s perceived and self-proclaimed identity as peacemaker.

### Justification strategies of South African peacebuilding

In the following section, the findings from the analysis of the South African foreign policy documents and the interview material are discussed and presented. The five guiding principles as well as the typology of justification strategies which I present are the result of analysis
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of the material. As previously mentioned, I have clustered the themes found in the material into different types of justification strategies, among which the notion of *Ubuntu* seems to have an overarching function in the South African case. My critical analysis of the South African foreign policy discourse of engagement in peace missions abroad shows that several ethically grounded premises are influential as justification strategies for external peace engagements. The typology of justification strategies is the result of the clusters of arguments identified in the analysis. The discussion will now focus on the overarching notion that seems to be influential in all justification strategies, the notion of *Ubuntu*, and then turn to the guiding principles.

**Ubuntu** – overarching principle and/or concept provider

The notion of *Ubuntu* is, as previously mentioned, a regional term for a philosophical approach which is centred on societal aspects of humanism and the importance of other humans realizing themselves. The notion is usually translated into English as ‘*A person is a person through other people*’ or ‘*I am because we are*’. Nelson Mandela has explained the meaning of *Ubuntu* as follows:

- A traveller through a country would stop at a village and he didn't have to ask for food or for water. Once he stops, the people give him food, entertain him. That is one aspect of Ubuntu, but it will have various aspects. Ubuntu does not mean that people should not enrich themselves. The question therefore is: Are you going to do so in order to enable the community around you to be able to improve?478

According to Isaias Ezequiel Chachine, *Ubuntu* should be understood as an ideal of human dignity with a basis in African culture. He also states that even though the notion has its roots in the Xhosa context in South Africa, it has wide implications across different cultural traditions of the people of the African continent, together with contextual nuances. The notion as such corresponds to the ability to define persons in terms of sociality and their ability to respond or contribute to the common good without suspending their individual uniqueness.479 In other words, the notion represents an understanding of the balancing act
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constituted by the mutual relationship between individuals and communities. One person can hardly exist without others. As Chachine discusses the notion, one’s humanity has the propensity to transcend its cultural limits in order to embrace the other.480

This societal aspect of humans realizing their humanity in relation to others seems to function as a way of showing that we have responsibility for each other. The notion of Ubuntu is of great importance for the framing of South African foreign policy, which also is set out in formal documents. A concrete example is that South Africa’s white paper on foreign policy from 2011 is titled Building a Better World: The Diplomacy of Ubuntu, and the document refers continuously to Ubuntu as a notion that has been influential in creating the South Africa of today. As stated in the first paragraph of the preamble of the white paper:

South Africa is a multifaceted, multicultural and multiracial country that embraces the concept of Ubuntu as a way of defining who we are and how we relate to others. The philosophy of Ubuntu means ‘humanity’ and is reflected in the idea that we affirm our humanity when we affirm the humanity of others. It has played a major role in the forging of a South African national consciousness and in the process of its democratic transformation and nation-building.481

This citation shows something crucial, that the phrase affirming our humanity when we affirm the humanity of others can be interpreted as a kind of reciprocity. This is perhaps not the same kind of reciprocity as Forst advocates, since he is focusing on arguments, but arguably the first step is to see each other in a reciprocal way.

Within the foreign policy discourse, Ubuntu has been translated into a natural focus on multilateralism and cooperation. It can also be interpreted as an account of moral cosmopolitanism. In addition, Ubuntu contains an understanding of equality, which is translated into the focus on the African agenda and South-South solidarity. This is exemplified as follows:

South Africa’s unique approach to global issues has found expression in the concept of Ubuntu. These concepts inform our particular approach to diplomacy and shape our vision of a better world for all.
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This philosophy translates into an approach to international relations that respects all nations, peoples, and cultures. It recognises that it is in our national interest to promote and support the positive development of others. Similarly, national security would therefore depend on the centrality of human security as a universal goal.482

These paragraphs from the preamble of the white paper on foreign policy are to some extent open to interpretation. One point of importance to stress is the reference to human security, a paradigm that has mostly individualistic connotations. This shows the dialectical relationship between the individual and the collective focus on South African foreign policy. It is not the aim here to spell out the intentions behind this use of every specific word, but in referring to human security, the writers of this official document can be understood as speaking to different agendas simultaneously. Another interpretation is that this is in line with global developments, since human security is a general trend in peace issues that has gained importance during the last decades.

This white paper shows that Ubuntu is used as a philosophical as well as an instrumental principle. A more cynical account might suggest that Ubuntu is used merely to show good will and good intentions but plays no substantial role in foreign policy. The analysis indicates that the notion of Ubuntu works both as an overarching principle that has been present in the development of foreign policy as well as a more instrumental concept provider. Ubuntu is literally used as the concept providing the framework for foreign policy in South Africa. Whether this is merely a strategic approach or something that goes to the heart of the nation of South Africa will not be answered here. However, this seems to be used as a moral and political argument to try to justify the African-centred focus in relation to peacebuilding. On the other hand, if Ubuntu is to be taken literally, it should govern relations between all humans globally. While this may have been the intention, the foreign policy documents make clear that South African peace initiatives will primarily be on the continent. This, too, can be explained in terms of factors such as capacity to act was well as more revealing details such as the fact that most civil wars take place on the African continent. Several reasons are interlinked, but if the analytical focus lies on the foreign policy discourse, Ubuntu has been given a substantive role, at least in

482 The Government of the Republic of South Africa 2011:4
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the guiding document for foreign policy. In the white paper on peace missions, Ubuntu is not mentioned at all.

South Africa’s emphasis on the individual and the collective seems to have the potential for contextualizing the account of reciprocity which is found in Forst’s reasoning. This is relevant to his moral cosmopolitanism, in which all humans are of equal value and deserve equality, as well as to his internationalist or transnationalist approach to global justice. For Forst, states are necessary to uphold the system, and sovereignty is a central part of this. South Africa’s view of sovereignty seems to be pragmatic in that its foreign policy white paper addresses sovereignty and non-interference as crucial principles, while also stating that:

The historical concepts of sovereignty and non-interference in domestic affairs are coming under legal scrutiny in the search for suitable responses for intervention.483

I interpret this as an open, if cautious understanding of sovereignty and non-interference which is aware of current challenges. However, the white paper on peace missions does not discuss sovereignty and non-interference in depth, and the discussion in the foreign policy white paper is not extensive. What is important, however, is that sovereignty is seen as a way of creating equality amongst states.484

Five guiding principles for South African peacebuilding

The White Paper on peace missions from 1998/1999 is one of the most important documents in the South African context. However, the White Paper on foreign policy as well as the Defence Review also offer important insights. The following typology builds on analysis of the four of these, together with the material from interviews. Based on the analysis of the material, five guiding principles are identified.

The first principle is Ubuntu, briefly introduced above and further discussed below. This is primarily visible in the white paper on foreign policy, which I interpret as one of the framework documents for South Africa’s engagement in peacebuilding.

483 The Government of the Republic of South Africa 2011:16
A second, more instrumental principle which is clear in the white paper on peace missions is that the South African National Defence Force (SANDF) should regard international peace missions as having a function secondary to the protection of national peace and security and national interests. The prioritization of national interest is connected to the very nature of foreign policy objectives, and sometimes connected to the democratic electorate, as is shown in the following citation:

South Africa will not participate in any mission that is inconsistent with South African values, or that cannot be justified to the South African public. Parliament must be responsive to the opinions of the broad electorate, which are not always easy to gauge with respect to specific elements of South African foreign policy, such as participation in peace missions. In this regard, the results of a nation-wide opinion survey conducted in 1997 on public attitudes towards South African participation in peace missions revealed that the overwhelming majority of South Africans – nearly two-thirds - are indeed in favour of such participation.485

This is a classical understanding and order of prioritization, and not specific to South Africa as such. It is expected that peacebuilding engagements should not overrule national interests and security. The Defence Review explicitly states four strategic defence goals and 13 strategic tasks. The goals are: first, to defend and protect South Africa; second, to safeguard South Africa; third, to promote peace and security; and fourth, developmental and other ordered tasks. Each of these goals has specific tasks; defend and protect South Africa should be done by task one (deterring and preventing conflict); two, protect national interests; and three, defend South Africa. The second goal, safeguarding South Africa, should be done by task four (safeguarding borders); task five, safeguarding critical infrastructure; task six, cooperating within the police service; and seven, ensuring information security. Goal three, promoting peace and security, is supported by task number eight, the promotion of strategic influence, and task number nine, contribution to peace and stability. Developmental and other ordered tasks mean task number ten, execute relevant treaty obligations; eleven, ordering presidential tasks; twelve, assisting civil authority as ordered; and, finally

thirteen, contributing to the development of South Africa and its people. These are easily identified as military goals in how they are expressed, but contributing to peace and stability is explicitly stated. This is important for peacebuilding and signals that South Africa sees the promotion of peace and security as one of its four defence goals. In addition, the document emphasizes at several points that all goals and tasks are of equal priority.

A third principle which seems crucial in regard to South Africa’s involvement in peace missions is a reliance on proximity, which here means that involvement in a peace mission should depend on proximity to national interests and type of demands. This is exemplified in the following citation:

\[
[...] the level and size of South African contribution to any particular peace mission will depend on how closely the mission relates to national interests and the type of demand that exists for the type of contributions [...]\]

The track record of South African engagement does not show particular support for geographical proximity, and the engagements have been across the continent. To some extent, the African focus could also be seen as having close proximity to South Africa, speaking geographically. It has been argued that South Africa’s engagement in Zimbabwe, which is a neighbouring state, as well as the DRC and Burundi, is linked to national interests on the grounds of there being large numbers of migrants and refugees. In regard to national interests and type of demands, two criteria are spelled out for South African engagement. First, there is a need for a clear international as well as domestic mandate. Second, that there are sufficient collective means for the particular mission.

Fourthly, it is emphasized that South Africa’s engagement as an external actor in peacebuilding other peace processes abroad also relies on a principle of volunteerism, which means that the people deployed or seconded have the option of returning home whenever they wish. This applies for all peace missions but has been explicitly stated in relation to mediation efforts. These should be voluntary, collaborative, and fully inclusive, building on the South African model.
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A fifth principle visible in the material is the principle of keeping national pride intact. This is formulated in more instrumental terms by being translated into the need for clear entry and exit strategies which correspond to South Africa’s current capacity in the specific mission. I interpret this as a reverse formulation of not ‘loosing face’: this is largely a matter of keeping national self-confidence intact. Let us now turn to the notion of Ubuntu, and a discussion of whether it is an overarching principle or a concept provider for South African foreign policy at large.

A typology of South African justification strategies

The analysis of this case study shows that the justification strategies can be explained by historical and social/relational, political and economic ties and networks as well as by cultural and geographical explanations in each case where they are being used. This is exemplified by the historical factors and personal traits which explain why the AU selected Mbeki to mediate in the Ivorian peace process. Yet, there are also negative aspects to these factors. In the Ivorian case, South Africa has been accused of siding with the stronger side as well as of becoming increasingly involved in the Ivorian economy. In addition, there are suspicions that South Africa sold weapons to Cote d’Ivoire despite the embargo on arms sales to the Gbagbo government.

However, external states’ engagement is also a question of timing and resources. For example, when Mandela was willing to engage rapidly in Burundi and with all possible means (political, financial, and even military), this moved the process further and showed South Africa as more dedicated than any other actor. This also influences their justification of their actions.

Based on the analysis of the case of South Africa, I have identified what in the theoretical chapter I conceptualize as justification strategies. Justification strategies are policy measures, derived from ethical principles as well as influenced by political and economic interests, for the purpose of creating legitimacy and as attempts to justify different decisions and actions. The justification strategies used by the South African
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government have been identified through a critical analysis of the foreign policy discourse as well as being triangulated with supplementary interviews. The strategies have partly been developed inductively, driven by the research question ‘how and under which circumstances is South Africa justifying its presence in peacebuilding missions abroad’. Based on the analysis, several ways of justifying peace initiatives have appeared, and I have clustered the strategies into three themes which together make up the typology. These are: 1) multilateralism, human rights, and democracy; 2) an African Agenda; and 3) South-South cooperation and solidarity driven by anti-imperialist ideology. The following sections explore these further.

A. Multilateralism, human rights and democracy

The first part of the typology is centred on three broad but frequently interconnected models and concepts. The aim here is not to explore the different definitions nor the intended meanings of these concepts, but rather to understand how and why they are the dominant concepts being used as justification strategies of peacebuilding in the foreign policy discourse of South Africa.

**Multilateralism**

First and perhaps most influential is the importance of multilateralism in South African foreign policy discourse on peacebuilding, as becomes clear in relation to peace missions in general and thence also to peacebuilding. However, the continuous referencing of human rights and democracy is also a key strategy in South Africa’s post-apartheid foreign policy. As has been seen, South Africa is involved in several organizations on several different levels. The country’s broad involvement in organizations and collaborations such as the UN, BRICS, AU, SADC, NEPAD and SADSEM, to name just a few, also shows the extent of South Africa’s ambition in its foreign relations. In addition, South Africa has also established a Bi-national Commission (BNC) with several countries, a forum that meets regularly in order to guide and coordinate bilateral relations.493

Multilateralism is to a large extent a strategy used to create political legitimacy for the decision to get involved in peace missions and peace-
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building. This kind of legitimacy applies to domestic as well as to re-
gional and international audiences. This strategy has several dimen-
sions to it, one being that multilateralism per se is a way of showing
that South Africa is no longer the pariah it once was: active participation
in different collaborations is a continuous reminder of this change. An-
other dimension of multilateralism as a justification strategy is that add-
ing more actors into the decision-making procedure it, at least in moral
terms, creates a shared responsibility for the outcome of the action.
When actors join together to create institutions, they also create a form
of authority, and when a recognized authority takes decisions with the
support of its members it creates legitimate decisions. This shows that
legitimacy is contextually created and is dependent on the members’
acceptance of the authority. In addition, documents which the actors
have agreed upon can be seen as a type of authority created by the ac-
tors. An example of this is the UN Charter, which functions as an au-
thority for the organization’s member states, and a Security Council de-
cision needs support in the Charter to be legitimate.

Multilateralism is also used as a strategy to show the importance of
valuing responsibility and accountability. This is crucial for being able
to show that you are a serious agent who takes responsibility for your
actions and that you have the capacity for showing accountability to-
wards the other actors in the organization. As South Africa’s white pa-
per on foreign policy states:

South Africa has embraced multilateralism as an approach to solve
challenges confronting the international community. In this regard, it
took up a leading role in various multilateral fora, including SADC, the
AU, NAM, G77+China, the Commonwealth, and the United Nations,
championing the cause of developing countries and Africa in particu-
lar.494

This is not explicitly related to peacebuilding but is rather an example
of how multilateralism frames all of South Africa’s foreign policy en-
deavours, which also makes it relevant for peacebuilding.

Concepts such as responsibility, accountability, and legitimacy are
often related to multilateralism. These are important for the fellow
members of the different organizations as well as for a state’s crucial
domestic population. The above passage from the white paper shows
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that South Africa has the ambition of assuming a leading role in championing the cause of developing countries in different multilateral forums. Additionally, the white paper on foreign policy has an entire section devoted to multilateralism, which also indicates the importance of the approach. The opening paragraph of this section states that unilateralism is no longer an option to address the challenges the world is facing, and that

Multilateral cooperation is more relevant than ever before in seeking equitable multilateral solutions to global problems. … South Africa’s foreign policy will continue to recognise the importance of multilateralism and a rules-based international system that is governed by international law.495

This approach governs South Africa’s peacebuilding engagements. In addition, South Africa seems to be convinced that multilateralism is the best way of handling inequality, and that the same principle which underlies democratic elections should also govern international relations, namely one person, one vote – or in this context, one country, one vote. The equality between countries is emphasized by international law and by the UN Charter. Even so, South Africa articulates a need to address globalization and justice between the world’s countries. This, together with Africa’s role in the global economy, is exemplified in the following quotes:

South Africa is a strong proponent of multilateralism as a necessary intergovernmental response to managing globalization and the deepening interdependence of national economies.496

Structural changes in the global economy are opening up opportunities to position Africa as a significant player in the global economy.497

An interesting finding from the analysis of the white paper on peace missions is that it uses the term *multinational* and/or *multifunctional* in place of *multilateral*. This could potentially be a way of detaching the approaches outlined in the policy paper from the dominant transnational organizations such as the UN. However, there are continual references
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to multinational peace missions, and very close referencing of UN missions throughout the whole text. This is exemplified by the following:

Whilst South Africa has, as a member of bodies such as the United Nations (UN) and the Organisation of African Unity (OAU), begun to play an active role in diplomatic conflict resolution initiatives, the country is also expected to contribute to wider multinational “peace missions”.498

**Human rights**

Human rights have had a prominent role in all of the foreign policy documents analysed for this study, and the role of human rights has also been emphasized in the interviews. The South African understanding of human rights states that they do not prioritize between civil and political rights or social, economic, or cultural rights.499 South Africa is committed to the international systems of global governance for the promotion and protection of all human rights.500

One quote from the white paper on foreign policy clearly shows how history is tainting the strategies that are supposed to structure the work ahead. This quote raises several of the issues within all three justification strategies in this first cluster, and pinpoints the role that South Africa has embraced in response to external expectations:

Since 1994, the international community has looked to South Africa to play a leading role in championing values of human rights, democracy, reconciliation and the eradication of poverty and underdevelopment. South Africa has risen to the challenge and plays a meaningful role in the region, on the continent and globally.501

South Africa seems to refer to human rights in two separate ways in its foreign policy discourse. In the first, it is a domestic reference, as in the following quotation where it functions as a way to define national interest as based mainly on citizenship:

The national interest is thus informed by a people-driven perspective that prioritizes protecting and promoting the human rights of its citizens
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The second approach is instead connected to protecting the values of human rights abroad (a), or as a way of justifying intervention based on gross human rights violations (b):

a) Defence partnerships will also be pursued with like-minded states beyond SADC that are committed to the common values of democracy, human rights, peace and stability, and civil control of the armed forces.502

b) …an intervention in the case of grave circumstances or human rights violations, to establish or re-establish the international rule of law, or to separate belligerents in a conflict.503

This quotation is general in its scope and relates to South African foreign policy in a broad sense. Importantly, there are also several instances where respect for human rights is described as an important element of and reason for peacebuilding. One example is found in the following passing in the white paper on peace missions:

Peace building involves the inculcation of respect for human rights and political pluralism; the accommodation of diversity; building the capacity of state and civil institutions; and promoting economic growth and equity. These measures are the most effective means of preventing crises, and are therefore as much pre-crisis as post-crisis priorities. In all cases, peace missions should aim at the empowerment of peoples and be based on local traditions and experiences, rather than the imposition of foreign modes of conflict management and governance.504

The continual referencing of human rights can also be interpreted as a strategy for creating legitimacy and showing responsibility as an actor. There seems to be a general trend in foreign policy of focusing on the promotion of human rights abroad. Many countries do not ensure that their domestic human rights situation is at a reasonable level before setting out foreign policy goals in which the promotion of human rights is an obvious feature. South Africa highlights both dimensions of human rights promotions in its foreign policy discourse, but the records show that its own domestic human rights situation has a long way to go. This pinpoints an important discussion of the meaning of human rights in
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foreign policy, which lies in the nexus between empty strategy and influential notion. Since human rights are being promoted in foreign policy globally, it is highly likely that the meaning of the concept varies widely depending on who is making the reference. In the case of South Africa, in addition to taking responsibility, it may be a way of reaching out to other liberal democracies.

Surprisingly, peacebuilding and human rights are not always a perfect match in post-conflict reconstruction, and most challenges arise when trying to implement the sometimes slightly different agendas in diverse post-conflict communities. While peacebuilding and human rights promotion have a given place in UN missions, they are sometimes parallel processes. 505 This matter is not restricted to the case of South Africa but has far wider application. What is interesting, however, is that South Africa’s foreign policy on peacebuilding issues connects peacebuilding and human rights in a straightforward way.

Democracy
The third approach within this first type of justification strategies is focused on promoting democracy within the framework of peacebuilding abroad. The promotion of democracy and human rights often come together, especially since political and civil rights, as substantial components of human rights, also are fundamental components of democracy. According to this logic, the reason for South Africa’s use of democracy as a justification strategy is a combination of showing its ability to take responsibility. Yet, it is also a way of showing that the public should have the opportunity to influence politics. The promotion of democracy is therefore in line with South Africa’s democratic values in which the slogan ‘one person, one vote’ has been crucial, which also is a way of distancing the current state from the apartheid regime:

Furthermore, security and development go hand in hand; the two are inter-linked and intertwined; and both are the continent’s biggest challenges. South Africa, in partnership with likeminded African states, has a vested interest in contributing to the rooting of democracy, the promotion of economic advancement and the pursuit of peace, stability and development on the African continent. 506
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This quotation shows that South Africa has a vested interest in contributing to democracy and democratization, but it also offers an example of the Afrocentric approach of South Africa’s foreign policy. Another example shows that South Africa sees democracy as the way forward for international peace and stability:

South Africa believes that security is underpinned by the inter-related factors of peace and stability, development, democracy and good governance.507

In addition, it is clear that South Africa sees its own role in this work as having great importance and influence. The foreign policy white paper states that it is

[…] important to assist the continent consolidate democracy and meet universally accepted standards of participatory democracy.508

In conclusion, all three justification strategies play an important role within a strategy for repositioning South Africa on the global stage, showing that South Africa is a responsible actor ready to be accountable for its actions. Participating in peacebuilding is one part of showing this responsibility, but it is also a part of the ideology governing South Africa’s foreign relations. The three dimensions of this first type of justification strategies are all part of a larger approach, which is the reason why they have been combined.


The core of the second type of justification strategies is the referencing to the African agenda or the African Renaissance and can be summarized in the slogan ‘African solutions to African problems’. This accords with both the first and the third types of justification strategies but is still considered a separate strategy by virtue of its prominent role in South African foreign policy in general and peacebuilding in particular.

508 The Government of the Republic of South Africa 2011:21
In the documents and also as regards implementation, the African Agenda is a prominent element and a commonly used argument in attempts to justify peace engagements. However, South Africa’s peace engagement is not restricted to the African continent in the documents, as is also clear from the next element of the typology: South-South cooperation. Even so, several of the interviewees stress that, after national interest, Africa is a clear priority.509

Neighbourly solidarity has influenced this second set of justification strategies and is also a way of distancing current politics from colonial and imperial history. This can be seen as intertwined with national interest, yet its prominent role in the material makes the continuous references to the African Agenda an almost equally important priority:

South Africa recognises itself as an integral part of the African continent and therefore understands its national interest as being intrinsically linked to Africa’s stability, unity, and prosperity. Likewise, the 1955 Bandung Conference shapes our understanding of South-South cooperation and opposition to colonialism as a natural extension of our national interest.510

This states clearly that both the African Agenda and South-South cooperation are closely connected to South Africa’s own national interest.

This second type is set up around a strategic focus whose goal is to put Africa on the global agenda, but it is also a way of trying to justify the geographical focus which most peace operations have had on the continent. The guiding principles of the African Agenda are set out on different levels. One approach is connected to the obvious strategic goal of creating space for an African voice on the international agenda. This is both a strategy of creating a distance to colonialism and imperialism, but it is also a strategy of establishing the rightful place of African countries in the world. In some sense this renaissance is about empowerment and about being taken seriously. Another approach is centred on solidarity with African sisters and brothers in the continent, and the slogan ‘African solutions to African problems’ offers an example of how African agency is being created.

In the 2014 Defence Review, several passages explicitly refer to the African Agenda in relation to peacemaking. The following quote needs to be put in context, or at least it needs to be clarified that the growing
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peacekeeping commitment is about an expansion from internal to external, and not about a geographical shift *per se*:

South Africa’s growing peacekeeping commitment on the African continent has compelled the need to re-examine and reprioritize defense roles and functions accordingly in pursuit of the “African Agenda”.  

This citation explicitly refers to peacekeeping and says nothing about peacebuilding, which in this context can be explained by the character of the document: this citation is from the Defence Review. It shows how South Africa has begun to take on the role of continental power, and that national security has to some extent been expanded to include regional and continental security. Another quotation which also clearly states the geographical priorities of South African foreign policy, particularly with regard to peace missions, is the following:

Africa is at the centre of South Africa’s foreign policy. South Africa must therefore continue to support regional and continental processes to respond to and resolve crises, strengthen regional integration, significantly increase intra-African trade and champion sustainable development and opportunities in Africa. Peace, stability and security are essential preconditions for development. South Africa must consequently continue to play a leading role in conflict prevention, peace-enforcement, peacekeeping, peacebuilding, and post-conflict reconstruction.

This quotation also shows a normative dimension in stating that South Africa *must* play a leading role. This is further emphasized by the following quotation, which, though slightly more modest, remains normative in its use of the phrase “*will* play a leading role”:

South Africa envisages that, as a major power in Africa, it will play a leading role in conflict prevention, peacebuilding, and post-conflict reconstruction.

This shows that South Africa sees itself as called upon to take a leading role.
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C. South-South cooperation and solidarity

As shown in previous citations, the African Agenda is linked to the idea of South-South cooperation, yet these are here understood as two separate types of justification strategies given the different scope. Let us continue by exploring how South-South cooperation and solidarity have been used as a justification strategy.

The rhetoric of the third part of the typology is directed towards collaborations between countries and actors in a general sense but with the common denominator being that they are located in the global South. This type of collaboration is exemplified by the regional or continental organizations of the AU and the SADC as well as by strategic collaboration between counties such as Brazil, Russia, India, China, and (since 2010) South Africa (BRICS), and India, Brazil and South Africa (IBSA).

In relation to the focus on multilateralism and as a strategy to show solidarity, South-South cooperation is seen as a viable justification as well as legitimization strategy:

In terms of South Africa’s liberation history, its evolving international engagement is based on two central tenets, namely: Pan-Africanism and South-South solidarity.514

This is a guiding principle for all international engagement, for which reason it is not restricted to peacebuilding but instead offers a general approach. Other formulations strengthening South African prioritization as South-South cooperation can be found in the following:

An emerging trend is for like-minded countries to form groupings outside the formal multilateral structures in order to address specific issues affecting the international community. Groups such as the G20, Major Economies Forum, BASIC, IBSA and BRICS have grown in prominence and are focused on global issues related to political, security, environment and economic matters. South Africa supports the use of such groupings as an important mechanism for consensus building, whilst recognising the centrality of the UN and ensuring that these groupings should strengthen the primacy of the UN. South Africa’s multilateral relations with the South will continue to find expression particularly through the African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States (ACP), the Commonwealth, the NAM, and the G77.515
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This passage shows that South Africa does not restrict cooperation to South-South, but it shows the centrality of these forms of networks. It also shows that the UN is the primary venue, but it recognises South-South cooperation as equally important.

South-South cooperation is further exemplified in the intensified discussions within the BRICS collaboration on joint engagements in peace missions and peace operations. Here, rising powers seem to understand conflict resolution and prevention that differs from many Western countries. For emerging powers, social and economic development are seen as the driving factors in sustainable social change and peace.516

As regards peacebuilding, the clear African focus of South Africa’s engagement is supplemented by its willingness to provide active support in other contexts, for example Haiti and Palestine.517 While this strategy is clearly stated in the documents, it ceases to be self-evident when it comes to implementation. On the other hand, the arguments offered as attempts to justify peacebuilding are the object of enquiry here; implementation must remain the purview of another study.

Summary of the typology

In the analysis of the role of peacebuilding in South African foreign policy, and how peacebuilding engagements are justified, I have identified three overarching approaches that are frequently used as attempts to provide moral and political justification as well as to create political legitimacy for peacebuilding missions. These are summarized as follows.

The first type of justification strategy I have identified in South African foreign policy, regarding engagement in peace missions, is the continuous reference to liberal values such as human rights, democracy, and multilateralism. This is partly a strategy used to distance contemporary South Africa from the previous apartheid regime and, as such, can be seen as a legacy of Nelson Mandela’s presidency.518 It is also a way of showing the world that South Africa is a responsible actor and a country to be reckoned with in international relations and organizations. This indirect focus on responsibility is again a way of distancings the contemporary government from the apartheid regime. In addition,
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this is connected to the South African conception of durable peace and therefore also to peacebuilding.

A second type of justification strategy is the referencing of the African Agenda and/or the African Renaissance, which is used to justify the primary focus on the African continent. This strategy is also connected to the enforcement of the axiom ‘African solutions to African problems’. South Africa has mainly been engaged in peace missions on the African continent, with only a few, more humanitarian-oriented, exceptions. This strategy has been enforced through the different presidencies after the first free elections in 1994, but particularly during the presidency of Thabo Mbeki. In relation to this, there is an ongoing discussion as to whether South Africa is a regional hegemon or a ‘big brother on the block’. In meeting these expectations, South Africa here walks a thin line between taking care of situations in its neighbourhood and dominating the region.

The third type of justification strategy is the referencing of South-South cooperation. This is explained as a way of distance itself from colonialism and imperialism and is based on the importance of showing solidarity with the south. South Africa has styled itself as the voice of the African continent, for example in the United Nations, and has also lobbied for reform of the UN Security Council on a more equal basis. South Africa has also been a strong voice within the African Union (AU) and its predecessor the Organisation of African Unity OAU as well as the Southern African Development Community (SADC).

Dimensions of justification

Something happened in South Africa’s foreign policy discourse after the fall of apartheid. This marked an important shift for the country in many ways and also for the role of moral arguments in foreign policy. This study has shown that justificatory attempts are used in the foreign policy discourse on peacebuilding in South Africa. This supports the assumption that states also provides justificatory reasons to each other.

In the three justification strategies presented above, it is possible to interpret different kinds of justification. These offer both moral, political, and pragmatic justification, and there are several normative formulations in the material. Given the political character of the discourse, all justificatory attempts are political but not all are moral. Yet, there are
several examples where moral justifications are used. For example, the continual references to human rights can be understood as moral justification. This builds on the moral reasoning of human dignity and equality.

When it comes to the African Agenda and South-South cooperation, these justification strategies are established on the basis of solidarity and a moral conviction of mutual beneficence. This is governed by political aspects and political justification, such as national interest and security. However, as has been shown, the African Agenda is a prominent prioritization within South African foreign policy on peace missions and peacebuilding, indeed, is almost as important as national interest. I argue that these two justificatory strategies are both political and moral and that morality is particularly clear in relation to solidarity.

Another type of attempt to justify peacebuilding engagements in the South African context has been to refer to mandate. This is political in that it sets the limit for the engagement; it is normative but not necessarily moral. The referencing of mandates is, rather, a matter of legitimizing engagement such that it can be deemed to accord with international laws and regulations.

Much of the basis for South Africa’s engagement in peacebuilding rests on a normative framework. For example, a common formulation is that South Africa should, or must, take responsibility for peace and stability. This is warranted by the need for peace and prosperity on the continent as well as globally, and the attempt to justify this by referring to democratization and human rights can be understood as both a moral and political justification.

**Reciprocity and generality**

Whether justificatory attempts in a foreign policy discourse are a question of rhetoric or real intention ties into a larger discussion of the relevance of ethics in international relations. I argue in support of the view that ethics has a role to play in international affairs in that moral references are used in foreign policy. In this chapter, I have identified the stands and arguments, tested them, and shown that politicians and decision-makers make use of moral arguments in their political discourses. I have also shown that justificatory attempts are to be found in foreign policy discourses on peacebuilding. However, these are attempts to justify; the question is whether they can be seen as adequately
and reasonable justified. In the South African case, it is clear that something happened in the political discourse after the fall of apartheid. I argue that I can, based on my material, show that there are serious attempts to justify engagement in peacebuilding. I find further support for a moral dimension in South Africa’s attempts to justify engagement in peacebuilding.

In order to be a question of justification, the arguments must fulfil the criteria of reciprocity and generality. Reciprocity means that South Africa, as the initiator of the claims, may not demand any rights or privileges that it denies its addressee.\textsuperscript{519} Some of South Africa’s attempts to justify its peacebuilding engagements could be seen as reciprocal in that they also reflect its own priorities. Multilateralism, human rights, and democratization are notions and models which South Africa also strives towards, as can be seen from the domestic context. Therefore, this kind of argument can be seen as reciprocal: the approach is something that is also prioritized at home. However, since reciprocity is not about projecting one’s own reasons onto others, it is no longer clear whether this first type of justification strategy can be seen as reciprocal.

The African Agenda is of importance for South Africa in establishing its role as the voice of the continent, yet this statement is not uncontroversial. This kind of justification strategy can be seen as reciprocal if South Africa turns to fellow African countries when it needs support. This is probably sometimes the case, and sometimes not, which makes it difficult to argue for reciprocity in a general sense since it seems to rather be a matter of deciding on a case-by-case basis. On the other hand, the mutual aspect of reciprocity becomes clearer here. Even so, it remains difficult to establish whether these types of arguments are reciprocal. Since reciprocity would mean that South Africa could not deny someone else a claim that their own state is making, and that the African Agenda to some extent puts South Africa in a dominant position amongst its fellow African states due to its capacity to act, this should mean that South Africa is open to any other African country also taking on this role. While this could well be the case, but, there are also several interests at stake, and South Africa is likely encountering challenges and opportunities alike in taking on a leading role.

South-South collaboration is a win-win situation for South Africa since the national economy and society at large also benefit from this. Although that might suggest that this type of justification strategy is a
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reciprocal argument, it can entail different levels of solidarity and as in all other issues, national interests are also at play, which could affect the moral strength in the justificatory attempts. Even so, it seems that this type of justification strategy provides arguments that are reciprocally non-rejectable insofar as South-South solidarity is generally a win-win proposition.

Because generality should be understood as holding that all persons affected must be able to access and accept the reasoning in relation to universal and fundamental norms, it could be argued that all three justification strategies are potentially general: South Africa is a democratic state with public forums for discussion. On the other hand, the opposite could also be argued, since these public forums are not necessarily accessible to everyone. They only target also the domestic audience and not those affected in the contexts where South Africa is engaged in peacebuilding.

In the theoretical chapter, concepts such as justice and equality in peacebuilding, transparent, accessible, and intersubjective arguments were suggested, together with reciprocity and generality.

**South Africa’s position of power**

When it comes to engagement in peacebuilding, South Africa is seen as a moral authority, as is clear from the arguments presented in the documents and also stated explicitly in several of my interviews. This is largely explained by the successful transition to democracy, and the South African model has been praised both domestically and internationally. Of course, there are also critical voices, and neither the model nor its implementation has been flawless. Yet, this authority has put South Africa a position of power with regard to peace processes, particularly on the African continent.

South Africa has been a marginal actor in global economic terms, but very powerful in symbolic terms, a fact that has underpinned the prominence of morality in the development of South African state agency. During the last decades, South Africa has deliberately sought to extend its power – politically, economically, and discursively. This is mirrored in the development of the foreign policy discourse and is visible in its peacebuilding initiatives.

It seems difficult to apply the understanding of noumenal power proposed by Forst to a context that is largely driven by an understanding
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of power as the exercise of national security. On the other hand, in the South African context power is not only connected to national interest but there is also a quest for global justice embedded in the foreign policy. Also, since attempts are being made to expand in terms of discursive power also, this can be connected to the ability to motivate, i.e. rationalize to a recipient why it should something it would otherwise not have done. When the study make use of Forst’s theoretical instruments, then, it would seem possible to apply the formal criteria of reciprocity and generality. Yet, they seem to be lacking the contextual applicability needed for a satisfactory analysis of the attempts to justify peacebuilding offered in the case studies.

An understanding of peace and peacebuilding

South Africa’s understanding of peace seems to be governed by a holistic approach which approximates to how the scholarly debate understand the concept of quality peace. In the South African documents, this is portrayed as functioning social and political representative systems which respect all human rights and enhance political pluralism; it also accommodates diversity and involves capacity in state and civil institutions as well as economic growth and equity.\(^{521}\) This is a rich and nuanced understanding of peace, which has evolved from militarily oriented to a heavy focus on civilian tasks and peacebuilding.\(^{522}\)

The South African understanding of peacebuilding seem to be in line with the UN definition generally used, and the different generations of peace operations are reflected in its foreign policy discourse. When it comes to actual engagements, however, peacebuilding does not seem to be the highest priority since most of its engagements concern mediation and negotiation. On the other hand, peacebuilding seems to be understood as intertwined with conflict resolution as a way of preventing renewed conflict.

In the white paper on peace missions, the arguments for engaging seem to be directed at peace missions in general and it is a challenge to specify how peacebuilding is here justified in relation to mediation or peacekeeping. Even if the conceptual difference between the different terms is clear, the arguments with justificatory character do not differ-
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entiate between types of missions but refer rather to missions in an un-
specified way. This is to some extent unsurprising given the overarch-
ing character of a foreign policy document or white paper, but it none-
theless challenges an analysis which is meant to focus on peacebuild-
ing. Even so, it remains possible to analyse the material since the doc-
uments and the interviews provide arguments which attempt to justify political action. Peacebuilding is seen as an important part of peace mis-
sions, though it is not always clear whether the justification strategies are specifically related to peacebuilding or whether they are instead being used in a more general sense. The phrase *peace missions* is used most frequently, and since they cover peacebuilding these arguments are also of central importance. However, as peace missions also cover other issues, it is sometimes difficult to establish if the justificatory at-
ttempts are used of peace missions in general or of peacebuilding in par-
ticular.

**Conclusions**

South African politicians and decision-makers make use of both politi-
cal and moral reasoning in their attempts to justify South African en-
gagement in peacebuilding initiatives. This is one of the findings from this case study. Another finding is presented in the tripartite typology of justification strategies. Several of the justification strategies identi-
fied here are connected to an ambition of showing South Africa’s ability to be a responsible state, and most strategies have a connection to multilateralism. This is based on an analysis of the discourse of the external actor and is developed in a dialectic identity process in which South Africa’s self-image seems crucial.

The emphasis on multilateralism and multinational missions in the case of South Africa is important to gain political legitimacy on the in-
ternational arena but is also a highly conscious way of distancing con-
temporary politics from the apartheid era as well as from colonial and imperial legacies.

The different justification strategies that have been identified – 1) multilateralism, human rights and democracy; 2) the African Agenda; and 3) South-South cooperation – are attempts to justify South African engagement in peace missions and peacebuilding. They have a clear
moral dimension, but it is difficult to draw a clear-cut conclusion regarding their generality and reciprocity. On the other hand, this is not a yes-or-no question, but rather a discussion of the extent to which South Africa’s attempts to justify its peacebuilding engagement can be assessed based on these criteria.

The challenge of establishing the arguments of reciprocity and generality has to do with several aspects, one being that the arguments in the foreign policy discourse tend to be formulated in a general way when not applied to a particular case. It may also be a question of reciprocity and generality being insufficient for this kind of analysis. Let us continue that applicability discussion in Chapter Seven and now continue to the case study of the attempts to justify in Russian foreign policy discourse on peacebuilding.
6. The Russian Federation

Russia presents a fascinating case study in the present context, on three counts. First, since Russia is one of the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council it puts the country in a certain position in world politics. These five are the most influential countries when it comes to decision-making in relation to peace engagements, given their veto power. Holding this prominent position on the United Nation’s Security Council (UNSC) entails a specific type and amount of responsibility as well as certain expectations. Second, as might come as a surprise, Russia has a history of contributing to peace missions. This contribution primarily concerns seconding personnel and funding to the UN structures, but to some extent also to what Russia claims to be peace operations in the post-soviet region. Russian leaders have had to develop an approach towards peacemaking as a direct consequence of the number of regional conflicts which erupted in the wake of the fall of the USSR.523 Third, Russian peace engagement is often regarded with suspicion due to its continuous use of military strategies as third-party responses to different crisis. Nonetheless, peacebuilding activities with Russian involvement are also taking place. Even so, this mistrust may provide greater incentives to offer attempts to justify engagement in peace missions. The Russian interest in peace missions is, as with most countries, largely a reflection of its foreign policy priorities and interests yet has often been portrayed as limited or non-existent. However, a review of Russian foreign policy shows traces of peace operation priorities at several levels. The case selection is further motivated by the limited amount of scholarly attention given to Russia’s views of and approaches towards peacebuilding.

The purpose of this chapter is to analyse how the Russian Federation is justifying its engagements in peacebuilding initiatives and to scrutinize which strategies being are drawn upon in the justificatory process.
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Furthermore, it will also address which audiences the justificatory attempts are directed towards. The questions governing the analysis of this chapter are therefore centred on how Russia is justifying its engagements in peace missions abroad. What justification strategies are being used, and how? In addition, this study also asks which ethical and moral resources Russia is drawing upon in the justificatory process. To understand Russian peace engagements in a systematic way several methods have been applied, as discussed in Chapter Four. The research design is a combination of a qualitative critical analysis and semi-structured expert interviews, applied in order to identify the justification strategies being used in the official discourse guiding Russian peacebuilding engagements.

This case study contributes to our understanding of Russian engagements in peacebuilding abroad, its justification of peacebuilding, and the role of ethics in foreign policy more generally. By focusing on one type of critique or on a few countries’ positioning within a well-defined and specified debate within international relations, it is possible to gain a deeper and more nuanced understanding of the reasons and reasoning behind a given stance. Given the complexities of international relations, many issues are intertwined in different ways. By focusing on the issue of peacebuilding, matters of military and humanitarian interventions are given prominence. In the conceptual clarification in Chapter Two, I showed how these are different. However, in the Russian case, which is, I argue, governed by a militarized discourse, military intervention, conflict resolution and peacebuilding appear to be intertwined.

**Change and continuity in Russian foreign policy**

To understand Russia’s contemporary foreign policy and current approaches to peace initiatives, it is necessary take into consideration the aspects of the development of the Soviet Union. The larger picture is also needed as background and context in order to identify the most relevant attempts to justify as well as justification strategies for Russia’s engagement in peacebuilding.

The history of the Russian Federation dates from 1 January 1992, but the linkages to the Soviet Union (1922-1991) are several. From the perspective of international law, Russia in general is considered a contin-
uator of the Soviet Union given that Russia, among other things, assumed the Soviet Union’s place in the UN Security Council. However, the reaction of other states towards this continuation was not uniform. The Russian Federation seems to see itself as a continuation of the USSR, as exemplified when Russian president, Boris Yeltsin, in a letter dated 24 December 1991

[...] informed the Secretary-General that the membership of the Soviet Union in the Security Council and all other United Nations organs was being continued by the Russian Federation with the support of the 11 member countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States.

In addition, scholars such as Andrei P. Tsygankov have argued that the traditional foreign policy debates survived the fall of the Soviet system and that Russia’s post-communist behaviour therefore needs to be understood in its historical context.

The Soviet legacy of the Russian Federation is evident in many political arenas in Russia today, not the least its foreign policy. Much of Russian foreign policy is centred on a quest for Great Power status, which can be understood as a quest for returning to the glory days of the empire when Moscow was recognized as a centre of global power. In addition, Russian foreign policy is generally influenced by both change and continuity over the years, which holds for the period of the Soviet Union as well as for the contemporary Russian Federation. Scholars have argued that the traditional foreign policy debates survived the fall of the Soviet system and that Russia’s post-communist behaviour therefore needs to be understood in historical context. However, the role of peacebuilding missions during the Soviet era was less prominent than during the 1990s or the beginning of the 21st century.

When taking this historical perspective into account, it becomes challenging to distinguish between Russian and Soviet involvement in
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peace operations. Several contemporary peace engagements were initiated either during the latter years of the Soviet Union or in direct relation to its disintegration. Many of the relationships between the Russian Federation and other counties are very much entangled with the Soviet legacy of Russian politics. One way of separating them analytically is to focus empirically on the period after the fall of the Soviet Union while at the same time remaining mindful of the legacy of contemporary interstate relations.

The change and continuity that shape Soviet and Russian foreign policy can be traced back to the Tsarist period, through the Soviet era, and up to today’s post-Soviet era. The fall of the Soviet Union makes Russia a young country with a very long and influential history, which also shapes Russian engagement in peace issues. A historical overview shows several key events that have been very influential in the development of Russia’s foreign policy. Overall, the main developments during the Cold War, its end, and the break-up of the Soviet Union have all heavily influenced both domestic and international trajectories. Other key events which have had great influence and which took place during the period in focus for this study can be thematically summarized as changes in head of state and foreign/defence ministers, events connected to nuclear weapons and arms negotiations, deployments of troops and interventions, and different types of strategic partnerships. This is exemplified by the formation of the Collective Security Treaty Organisation by Russia and five other ex-Soviet states in May 2003.

Russian foreign policy in the post-Soviet generated era is a well-researched topic which has sparked much scholarly debate and an extensive body of literature. To name a few influential works, scholars such as Andrei Tsygankov (2016) have explained the shifts and continuities of Russian (and Soviet) foreign policy though a constructivist approach focused on identity formation. Jeffrey Mankoff (2012) explicitly focuses his analysis on the role of Great Power politics in Russian foreign relations. And Bobo Lo (2002) has analysed the driving forces behind Russian foreign policy in the context of national interest. These works take a broadly analytical view on Russian foreign policy, covering the conceptualizations of near abroad and far abroad.
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The terminology of near and far abroad can be considered controversial, given the context of which they were created. Near abroad refers to the other republics of the former Soviet Union, and far abroad refers to the rest of the world. The near abroad has also been called the Russian “sphere of influence”. This can take the form of both formal and informal expressions of interest but usually comprises an asymmetric power relationship in which Russia is the most powerful actor. In this study, post-Soviet space and the world beyond will be used as designations for geographical prioritizing. Much research on Russian foreign policy in the near abroad can be categorised as either one or several of the following four types of explanations: individual-level, domestic-political, ideational, and geopolitical. However, all types should be taken into consideration in order to better understand and explain Russian foreign policy.

Despite the linkages to the Soviet Union, foreign policy experts argue that today’s Russian Federation is neither suited nor aspiring to take on the role held by the Soviet Union as a superpower rival to the United States. Yet, much of Russia’s general foreign policy, as well as its foreign policy on peace issues, is focused on an alternative world order not monopolized by the West. This is also where BRICS is actualized, and it has been stated that

These five leading ascendant powers could create a world order that will be more just and balanced than what we see now.

This is one of the statements upon which the BRICS countries agree, but this citation comes from a Russian foreign policy expert. Russia seem to be one of the driving forces of this alternative world order, yet it is not stated in the foreign policy documents exactly how this alternative should be organized.

531 These are two controversial concepts, and they are not part of an explicit policy used by the Russian government. Instead, discussion is usually of spheres of interest and strategic homes. The concepts derive from the 1992 Karaganov doctrine with specific reference to the Russian-speaking minorities in the former Soviet states, especially the Baltics.
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Lo (2002) describes the state of mind that characterizes Russian foreign policy as an “imperial syndrome”, one that is shaped by the experience of the previous empire as well as a sense of a potential future sphere of influence. Lo is not saying that contemporary Russian leadership aspires to rebuild the Soviet Union, but rather that it exhibits a state of mind which assumes or predicts influence in the former Soviet republics.537 This is relevant for an understanding of Russian engagement in peace missions, since much of Russia’s engagement has primarily taken place in the post-Soviet sphere.

What often seems to have been the driving force behind Moscow’s foreign policy is whether the West accepts Russia as an equal and legitimate member of the world.538 The quest to be seen as an equal state can to some extent be related to the imperial syndrome, i.e. that the West does not take Russia as seriously as it should or as it did the USSR. As Mankoff puts it, the scepticism goes both ways:

[… if Russians too often see the United States as an arrogant power that ignores their interests, the United States tends to see the Russian Federation as a country that has not completely broken with its imperial past and refuses to play the role of a responsible stakeholder in the international system.539

Yet, this is not to say that Russia has any kind of special rights in the international system; instead, it is rather understood that Russia is like any other country.

Russian representatives seem to regard the influence in the former Soviet republics in part as a boost to its own power in the international system, and they also believe influence in the post-Soviet space makes them more influential globally, something many Western representatives regards with scepticism and connect with covert interests. One potential interpretation is that this is to a large extent grounded in realist thinking about the world order and that it contributes to the creation of a classical security dilemma. However, if Russia wants to be seen as an equal member of the international system, it needs to respect international law and international treaties. One way Russia tries to show that it respects these global norms and institutions is by making continuous
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reference to them in foreign policy documents. However, this is an example of the ambivalence in Russian foreign policy and, in light of the annexation of Crimea and the events in Eastern Ukraine in 2014, should be questioned. Russia argues that it has not violated any norms or laws, but most scholars of international law agrees that the events are both violations of international law and norms.\textsuperscript{540} This is however disputed by the Russian leadership.

Russian scholars and foreign policy experts have argued that Russia early took on the role of security and stabilization guarantor in the former Soviet space, a move regarded with scepticism in other parts of the world, as a measure to restore control and fulfil its own security objectives. It is important to remember in relation to early Russian peace engagements that the West was pleased to see Russia assuming a leading role in peace issues in the former Soviet republics, given the vast number of other crises around the world.\textsuperscript{541} It was simply not possible for the stronger states or the UN to respond to every situation where missions were needed.

Many of Russia’s general foreign policy developments have been directly related to its relationship with the West and Europe. Another clear divide in the foreign policy discourse as well as prioritizing is in relation to the post-Soviet space and the world beyond. General Russian foreign policy has long prioritized the post-Soviet sphere, especially in relation to its perceived need for a belt of good neighbours around the Russian borders, something that is almost ritualistically referenced in many of the Russian Foreign Policy Concepts.\textsuperscript{542} As Mankoff points out, the 2008 Foreign Policy Concept formed a contrast in relation to its preceding versions in this regard since it dropped this particular reference, something which could be seen as a confusion of

[...] how to prioritize the competing desires for a leading role in the post-Soviet space and a cooperative relationship with major outside powers that have their own interests in the region [...]\textsuperscript{543}
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This is a debate which was intensified during Medvedev’s presidency.\textsuperscript{544} The competing desires show the importance of the balance between Russia’s self-perception and that of others.

The division between priorities in the Post-Soviet space and the world beyond in Russian foreign policy is of importance for the analysis of Russian peace engagement since it provides a framework for dividing Russian foreign policy into two categories of prioritization. Although Russian experience of peacemaking started at a low level of intensity in the far abroad, mainly through the UN, it has been largely shaped by experiences in the post-Soviet space where Russia has had to respond to regional conflicts arising in the new post-Soviet states. Soviet involvement in peace processes during the Cold War was limited, partly because the USSR, like the other permanent members, exempted itself from UN missions in order to uphold the neutrality of the organization.\textsuperscript{545}

**Foreign policy and peace initiatives**

Many of the shifts of strategies and priorities that have taken place in Soviet and Russian foreign policy have been reflected in particular in the understanding of national interests.\textsuperscript{546} There are also nuances dependent on who is interpreting events, actions, and statements. For example, between current President Vladimir Putin, Prime Minister Dmitry Medvedev and Minister of Foreign Affairs Sergey Lavrov there are naturally variations in their interpretations of certain issues. However, this study focuses on broader topics than specific individuals and tries to expose patterns in Russian foreign policy which are central for Russian engagement in peace missions. National security and peace engagements are often linked, given that the latter often is driven by the implications of the former. The official accounts of the Russian national interests are expressed in the policy document “National Security Concept of the Russian Federation”, a document which has been revised three times during the period of this study. The first was adopted in
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Russia’s peace involvement

Russia is a potentially influential state as regards peace and security, primarily based on its role in the UN Security Council, its size, and its historical influence in world affairs. In recent years, Russia has according to Roy Allison, continuously

[… ] acted as a qualified pluralist state in a contested normative environment.547

This could be understood in several ways and taps into the debate on the Russian position that the world needs to be reordered along multiple poles. It also addresses the diversity of influential norms in international relations and the variety of norms that dominate. Allison continues by arguing that Russia’s

[… ] view of global norms related to military intervention interact significantly with its conceptions of regional and domestic state order.548

A country’s view of global norms arguably influences its approach to engagement in peace missions.

The geographic spread of Russian engagements in peace missions has been vast during the period of study. Russian peacekeepers have been deployed in the post-Soviet space in South Ossetia, Abkhazia, Transnistria/Moldova, and Tajikistan. In the wider geographical space beyond the former Soviet republics, Russian military and police personnel have been deployed via the UN in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo and Metohija, Haiti, Angola, Chad, Sierra Leone, and South Sudan. Russian peace observers have been sent to UN missions in the Middle East, Western Sahara, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, Liberia, and Sudan.549

In the scholarly literature on Russian involvement to restore peace in peace operations and peace missions, much attention is paid to military
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interventions. This is mainly done by focusing either on Russian involvement as such or in relation to its responses to Western-led interventions.550 Also, much of the contemporary official Russian discourse around peace missions is centred on the concept of peacekeeping. I would argue, based on a literature review, analysis of the foreign policy documents, and analysis of textual data from expert interviews, that the Russian discourse on engagement in peace missions is highly militarized and securitized. Even so, the interviews offer an interesting discrepancy. Eight of my respondents made clear that Russia is not involved in and does not prioritize peacebuilding. At the same time, seven of the interview participants argued that Russia is involved even though peacebuilding is not one of its most prioritized areas.551 This, too, reveals signs of Russia’s ambivalence towards peace missions and peacebuilding.

The militarized approach and discourse on peacebuilding can be exemplified in several ways. First, the Ministry mainly in charge of peace missions is the Ministry of Defence. Peace missions often generate joint collaborations between different ministries, such as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Emergencies, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Finances, and Ministry of Defence, but it is mostly the latter that takes the main responsibility in tandem with the political leadership.

A second example of why the discourse can be seen as militarized is that the personnel sent to UN missions are mainly military experts/observers or uniformed personnel such as military or police. This indicates that a) these are the spheres in which Russia wants to contribute (i.e. political will), b) these are spheres in which Russia has the capacity to contribute (i.e. capacity), and c) there is a prioritization of seconding personnel with military expertise since these people will likely have more senior positions within the missions (i.e. strategic measure). This is interesting in relation to an unofficial policy which, according to Bratersky and Lukin, Russia has traditionally adhered to, namely the non-participation in peace missions of military contingents from the Great Powers.552 In the light of this informal guideline, sending military observers can be interpreted as a substitute for military contingents. Bratersky and Lukin argue that Russia has followed this policy and prefers that peace missions be staffed by third countries, which also is a
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common stance among the five permanent UNSC members. There may also be other explanations for this preference, for example, that it might pose a challenge to secure domestic political support for seconding personnel to faraway places, or that there might be a weaker connection to Russia’s national interests given the geographical distance.

A third example of why the Russian discourse on peace missions can be interpreted as a militarized discourse is the focus on halting violence and not becoming engaged in institutional post-conflict reconstruction. This can also be analysed in the terminology of negative and positive peace, in which Russia seems to focus primarily on negative peace, that is, ending violence, rather than long-term sustainability or positive peace. Experts on Russian involvement in peace missions point out that Moscow stresses the importance of not being involved in regime change in conflict or post-conflict contexts. This stance is in line with the prioritizing of principles of non-intervention and non-interference that are often referenced in Russian foreign policy. However, this stance seems to be more clearly visible in the documents than in the actual implementation of decisions and actions because, once the fighting has stopped, Russia often strongly promotes a status quo solution with limited involvement by external actors, at least if the conflict is geographically located outside the post-Soviet space.\(^{553}\) The involvement of the Russian state is often more extensive and intense when it comes to contexts within the post-Soviet sphere and the Russian sphere of interest. To some extent this is unsurprising since national interest makes geographical proximity an important factor. Russian involvement in the post-Soviet sphere is often politically very loaded and tense. Yet, another sign of the militarized priorities of the Russian Federation is its proposal to put together and activate a military staff committee, something that it would only be possible to activate through the participation of all five permanent members of the UNSC.\(^{554}\)

The Russian military, which is the most common category of personnel seconded to its international peace missions, is seen by several scholars as diverse and in transition. Diverse in the sense that a large majority is relatively untrained, employed on short-term contracts, and still in a traditional mindset when it comes to warfare, while a small part is well-trained, modernized and adapted to more contemporary

\(^{553}\) Interview, Moscow July 2017
\(^{554}\) Bratersky and Lukin 2017:138
forms of warfare. This could to a large extent be seen a strategic measure, using financial resources to develop parts of the forces while the main part is merely kept turning over. This is also a consequence of the previous employment of Russian personnel in international peace missions, since these people have acquired training from the UN that may differ from Russian military training. This capacity-building outcome can be an attractive feature of seconding personnel to UN missions and can also be seen as a strategy for attracting personnel seconded from other countries.

In the interview material there is support for Russia’s critical stance towards regime change in war and post-conflict situations. It seems possible that this fear of getting politically involved in other countries can be interpreted in different ways. One potential interpretation is based on principal grounds while another is connected to political explanations. On the principal level one potential stance that can be interpreted from the Russian government is the importance of legitimacy under international law and that illegitimate means should not lead to regime change. It may also be a question of protecting one’s own stance on non-intervention and the importance of sovereignty.

Another potential interpretation may be that this is a stance about responsibility, in that if regime change takes place on the basis on initiatives taken by external states, it comes with responsibilities. This could also reflect a view that if a state is unprepared to take the necessary responsibility, it should not act to change the status quo. Peacebuilding is extremely challenging and scepticism towards regime change can be understood as a way of recognizing this challenging complexity, since intrastate post-conflict societies often confront fragile states following regime change. This is one potential interpretation, but it could also be a question of lack of capacity or, again, a sign of Russian ambivalence.

Two strands of engagement

Two strands of peace engagements can be identified when studying Russian foreign policy discourse. The first is concentrated on a regional level, where the main actors are organizations such as the Collective
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Security Treaty Organization (CSTO)\textsuperscript{556}, the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS)\textsuperscript{557}, and to some extent the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) and the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO)\textsuperscript{558}. The second strand is the engagements that are taking place within the UN system. These strands differ on three different points, namely, in relation to: 1) geographical and political priorities; 2) organizational structure; and 3) terminology.

Firstly, Russian involvement in peacekeeping and peacebuilding is geographically and politically divided. Russian engagement in peace missions tends to be implemented either (a) through regional organizations such as the CSTO and bilateral agreements with another government or (b) through the multilateral structures of the UN.\textsuperscript{559}

There is a division regarding approaches depending on whether it is the structure of the UN or regional organisations, and there seems to be a geographical division governing the choice of path. Crises and post-conflict reconstruction efforts in countries in the post-soviet space, which often happen to be countries neighbouring the Russian Federation, have been more likely to see regional or bilateral solutions, while for crises or efforts that take place in countries further afield, the approach prioritized has instead been via UN multilateral cooperation and missions. The two strands cannot be completely separated but it becomes clear when analysing the foreign policy documents and the interview material that there are different approaches towards the two different strands.

\textsuperscript{556} CSTO was established in April in 2003 by representatives of Russia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Armenia, with the main objective to be able to provide a joint response towards terrorism in the area. Tsygankov 2016:159 It is frequently overshadowed by other organisations operating fully or partly in the post-Soviet space such as the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO) or the Eurasian Union, it has proved to be an important, if limited, vehicle for Russian foreign and security policy. Deyermond 2018:421

\textsuperscript{557} CIS was established as a sort of successor of the Soviet Union by Russia, Ukraine and Belarus in Minsk in December 1991, in relation to when Gorbachev resigned as president of the USSR. Tsygankov 2016: xv. The first years of the CIS was not a straight course and the first public acknowledgement form the Kremlin came in 1995, when the strategic significance of the CIS as one of the Russian national interests was officially declared. Tsygankov 2016:118 It now consists of ten member states; Armenia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Russia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan. Abilova 2016:2

\textsuperscript{558} SCO was largely evolved from confidence-building measures around border talks between Central Asian states, Russia and China, bringing the Eurasian region into sharper focus. Kuhrt 2018:255

\textsuperscript{559} Interview, Moscow July 2017
Secondly, Russian engagement in peace missions is primarily understood as traditional and status quo oriented, with continuous reference being made to the early, traditional, and more limited generations of peace missions.\textsuperscript{560} These were characterized by measures focusing on negative peace (i.e. absence of violence) such as buffer zones and cease-fires.\textsuperscript{561} Russian experts stress heavily that Russia is a strong supporter of the UN and the procedures within the organization, such as the role of the UN Security Council, when it comes to issues of global peace and security. The Russian view of the procedures in the UNSC is that the veto is used to maintain order and stability between the different global powers, often to stop illegitimate actions.\textsuperscript{562} The procedures and mandates are of great importance to the representatives of the Russian Federation, as is the maintenance of balance between different counties and their respective interests. Russia has taken an active role in shaping the UN mandates.\textsuperscript{563}

Thirdly, the terminology around peace engagements seems to be unclear and partly overlapping. It is unclear since the terminology used within the Russian administration as well as scholarly community is instead framed as conflict resolution, conflict settlement, or peacemaking. Russian decisions makers will not use the terminology of peacebuilding: conflict settlement is the most commonly used term.\textsuperscript{564} On the other hand, peacemaking can be referring to the larger spectrum of peace initiatives, but the material from the interviews indicates that it is rather a question of peacekeeping. In addition, peacekeeping is understood as a specific type of action. According to Professor Yulia Nikitina, it is not completely clear what the Russian approach to peacebuilding is, but

[...]

I interpret this in accordance with other statements from Russian leaders in that the principles of non-intervention and sovereignty are of primary importance in international law. In the preceding citation there is an

\textsuperscript{560} Interview, Moscow June 2017
\textsuperscript{561} Kenkel 2013:122ff
\textsuperscript{562} Interview, Moscow June 2017
\textsuperscript{563} Nikitin 2013
\textsuperscript{564} Interview Moscow 6 July 2017
\textsuperscript{565} Interview Moscow 6 July 2017
explicit reference to Chapters Six and Seven of the UN Charter, which govern mandates of interventions and peace missions.\textsuperscript{566} Peace enforcement is stretching the limits of international law and, according to some Russian decision-makers, is in fact a violation of it.\textsuperscript{567}

In several interviews, it was emphasized that Russian approaches towards peacebuilding are an understudied area as well as an area under development. All respondents stressed the central need for peace missions and operations to be in accordance with international law. This is stressed as important for moral, political, and legal reasons.\textsuperscript{568} This was further explained, particularly in one interview, as being based on a quest for global justice and on the necessity for all states to be taken seriously, something which I interpret as an issue of morality. The same participant stressed that legal reasons were of crucial importance for the Russian leadership, since this is a question about legitimacy.\textsuperscript{569} It seemed as though the participant was also emphasizing the aspects of legitimacy and legitimization as a political reason.

I interpret avoidance of the terminology of peacebuilding as an indication of a short-term perspective towards peace missions and peacebuilding, which is again mainly directed towards negative peace in that it focuses on the absence of violence. However, a few of the participants stressed that there are also initiatives, engagements, and projects that are directed more towards positive peace and long-term reconstruction; but they are few. In addition, they are to be found in other ministries and under different headings.\textsuperscript{570} By other ministries respondents meant ministries other than the Ministry of Defence and Ministry of Foreign Affairs. One example that was mentioned is the Ministry of Finance. Again, these are not very common and tend, according to the respondent, to be less political in character and focus more on allocation of aid, depreciation of debts and loans, and business exchange.\textsuperscript{571}

\textsuperscript{566} However, as referred to in Chapter Two in this study, the UN Charter does not provide an explicit legal basis for either peacekeeping or peacebuilding. Yet, such actions are often associated with Chapter 6 and Chapter 7 (and occasionally Chapter 8). More recent peacekeeping missions due to their complex nature would be authorised as “peace enforcement” under Chapter 7, but this is separate from peacebuilding.

\textsuperscript{567} Interviews Moscow June & July 2017
\textsuperscript{568} Interviews Moscow June & July 2017
\textsuperscript{569} Interview Moscow July 2017
\textsuperscript{570} Interviews Moscow June & July 2017
\textsuperscript{571} Interviews Moscow June & July 2017
Change and continuity in Russian peace approaches

All peace missions are unique in their local conditions and contexts, but a few similarities or overarching trends can be identified. The uniqueness of a context makes the external response to some extent unique as well, even though there are also similarities in approaches. Scholars such as John Mackinlay and Peter Cross (2003) have argued that it is difficult to generalize about “Russian peacekeeping” as such and that Russia’s responses often are contextually bound. One notion that has been advanced in relation to Russian peace initiatives is that Russian peace involvement has been a “Russian answer to a Russian problem”572, something that might be seen as paralleling the notion of “African solutions to African problems” that is often referred to in African contexts.

Russian (or Soviet) engagements in peace and security were initiated early on as a result of their role in creating the UN. This contributes to the continuous engagement though UN peace missions over time. However, even though Russia has been involved, its approach has evolved from total rejection to moderate tolerance and then reasonably active support of many operations.573

The analysis of the interviews indicates that Russian initiatives in the post-Soviet space and its Western sceptics exhibit several features. First, it shows the ambivalence of the West being satisfied with Russia taking on the actions while being at the same time not sufficiently satisfied. Russia’s early peace operations in the former Soviet space were criticized for lacking impartiality and neutrality and often failed to obtain UN legal endorsement and international financial support.574 This has several potential explanations, for example, that there was ambivalence insofar as the West was both satisfied and dissatisfied. Or, secondly, that they were initially satisfied by Russia taking on the action but then dissatisfied by the outcome. Thirdly, it could be related to ambivalence in the communication from the Western countries in terms of double commands. This is relevant for the justification of these particular initiatives for several reasons, for example due to the expectations of capacity to act and to deliver on what has been agreed upon.

572 Mackinlay and Cross 2003:203
573 Nikitin 2013:158
574 Mackinlay and Cross 2003:14
Besides the UN, Russia has also been involved in peace missions, or rather operations, in the post-Soviet sphere. These operations were initiated in the early 1990s and have over time either turned into frozen conflicts or changed into bilateral collaboration on matters such as security, trade, and debt reduction. Russian military personnel have had several significant deployments in the post-Soviet space. However, given that the character of the Russian presence is military, this is not a question of peacebuilding.

The four initial operations in which the Russian Federation was the leading state took place in Moldova’s Transnistria in 1992, Tajikistan in 1992, and Georgia’s South Ossetia and Abkhazia, which turned violent in 2008 but where the Russian involvement was initiated much earlier. The conflict between Georgia, Russia, and the Russian-backed self-proclaimed republics of South Ossetia and Abkhazia, arguably located within Georgia’s borders, escalated swiftly in 2008. The conflict in Abkhazia had been frozen since 1993, but in 2008 Russia intervened in Georgia, triggered by an attack by the Georgian military on South Ossetia. Russia was heavily involved and was officially seen as a third party to the conflict between the Georgian government and South Ossetia, a conflict which was more active than the conflict in Abkhazia even though the Abkhazian conflict was more intense in terms of battle-related deaths.

Scholars have analysed these four initial missions in different lights. Some have been highly critical, arguing that Russia was applying illegitimate measures, while others have been seeing it as promising initiatives for cooperation in the region. David Lynch elegantly framed this as

[...] the evolution of Russian ‘peacekeeping’ policy since 1992 is a prism through which to view the wider evolution of Russia’s approach to the CIS.

Some Russian experts tend to distinguish between the operations and missions in Transnistria, Tajikistan, South Ossetia, and Abkhazia on the one hand, and events in Ukraine and Syria on the other. The latter two
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are understood as being of a different character in relation to international law and circumstances on the ground.\textsuperscript{578} Transnistria, Georgia’s South Ossetia, and Abkhazia are sometimes characterized as “frozen conflicts” defined by unresolved incompatibilities. Russia and the CIS were jointly carrying out the operations and missions there, with Russia functioning as the lead nation and backbone structure provider. However,

After the war in Georgia, Russia was keen to demonstrate that drawing new borders around Abkhazia and South Ossetia was a special case and that it was serious about its responsibility as a peacekeeper in the contested enclaves of Nagorno-Karabakh and Transnistria.\textsuperscript{579}

The main aim of the missions was to stabilize the area and end the violence. Yet, in the words of Dmitri Trenin, there has been no breakthrough in any of these conflicts, and it has become clear that Moscow is unable to single-handedly broker any peace settlement.\textsuperscript{580} These “peace experiences” have shown to be very different in all four contexts, but at the same time setting a precedent for Russia’s engagement in future peace endeavours.\textsuperscript{581} Russian foreign policy experts often portray Tajikistan as a success story, primarily based on the positive outcome in that the Russian-driven mission was able to assist in stabilizing the situation.\textsuperscript{582} Also, this is the one mission in the post-Soviet space that has not resulted in a frozen conflict.

The priority of peacebuilding

In official Russian foreign policy documents, it is stated that supporting post-conflict peacebuilding efforts is one of the fourteen priority areas of their international development assistance.\textsuperscript{583} This can be interpreted in several ways. Firstly, that peacebuilding is one prioritized area amongst several others, which could imply that it is not a high priority. On the other hand, it is one of fourteen prioritized areas, which on the

\textsuperscript{578} Interviews, Moscow June & July 2017
\textsuperscript{579} Trenin 2009:67
\textsuperscript{580} Trenin 2009:67
\textsuperscript{581} Mackinlay and Cross 2003:4
\textsuperscript{582} Interview, Moscow June 2017
\textsuperscript{583} The Russian Federation 2014
contrary could be understood as an area of prioritization. The most reasonable interpretation, based on the other documents as well as the literature review, is that it is not a highly prioritized area in Russian foreign policy. Peacebuilding is instead referred to via the UN system, primarily through the UN Peacebuilding Commission architecture.\textsuperscript{584}

Secondly, this could suggest that the Russian understanding of peacebuilding, as in long term post-conflict reconstruction, is closer to an understanding of development assistance than to peacekeeping, which is seen as a more military endeavour. Another possible interpretation is that the practice of supporting post-conflict peacebuilding is a prioritized area precisely because it is mentioned in the document. It is stated in the Concept of \textit{Russia’s Participation in International Development Assistance} from 2007 that Russia intends to provide assistance to

\[\ldots\] Supporting activities aimed at the speedy resolution of military conflicts in all regions of the world, post-conflict peacebuilding, progressive socioeconomic development of post-conflict countries and prevention of the renewal of military standoff, \textit{inter alia}, through Russia’s increased participation in international peace support operations and in the context of Russia’s activities in the UN Peacebuilding Commission;\textsuperscript{585}

The citation indicates a prioritizing of efficient conflict resolution, peacebuilding, socioeconomic development, and conflict prevention. It is not further specified what peacebuilding entails but indicates that peacebuilding is understood as socioeconomic development and the prevention of a relapse into conflict. Even if the overarching trend seems to lean towards a prioritizing of peacekeeping and to have been influenced by an understanding of negative peace, this passage does indicate an understanding of positive peace. However, when I interpret the foreign policy documents and the material generated from my interviews, I would argue that the Russian approaches to peacebuilding are primarily characterized by negative peace. In several of my interviews, the experts mainly refer to stability rather than prosperous development. This is one of the indications I interpret as a sign of an understanding of negative peace. In addition, the analysis of the complete set of foreign policy documents makes continuous references to peace missions

\textsuperscript{584} Interview Moscow, 6 July 2017
\textsuperscript{585} The Russian Federation 2007:8
as being a question of stability but also to finding solutions to incompatibilities by military means.

The preceding citation also supports the conclusion that Russian peacebuilding discourse is militarized since it emphasizes Russia’s involvement in peace operations. This is further exemplified by the Military Doctrine, which states that the main tasks of the Armed Forces, in peacetime or during the immediate threat of aggression and war, is to contribute to both regional (CSTO, CIS) and global (UN) architectures:

[…]

29. The Russian Federation shall provide military contingents for the CSTO peacekeeping forces to participate in peacekeeping operations as decided upon by the CSTO Collective Security Council. The Russian Federation shall also provide military contingents for the CSTO Collective Rapid Reaction Forces and the Collective Rapid Deployment Forces of the Central Asia Collective Security Region to promptly respond to military threats to CSTO member states and accomplish other tasks assigned by the CSTO Collective Security Council.

30. The Russian Federation shall provide military contingents for peacekeeping operations mandated by the UN or the CIS in accordance with the procedure established by the federal legislation and international treaties of the Russian Federation.586

This citation is found in the Military Doctrine and is an example of the peacekeeping focus. On the other hand, since this is the Military Doctrine, the language can be expected to be focused on defence. There is no mentioning of the word “peacebuilding” in this document. However, what is mentioned, and what could be interpreted as a sign of peacebuilding, is a reference to recovery.587 This could also be interpreted differently but since the aim here is to address attempts to justify peacebuilding, which is what is searched for.588

When looking at Russian peace engagement over time, the four missions in the post-Soviet sphere during the early 1990s can be understood as a single cluster of initiatives or engagements. These were managed under the auspices of the CIS and CSTO with Russia as the main actor,

586 The Russian Federation 2014: paragraph 29-30 (p.10)
587 The Russian Federation 2014
588 This could also be interpreted as implying that the doctrine offers a codification for the precept that military violence, if used wisely, can be employed strategically to enhance foreign policy goals and interests. However, this lies beyond the scope of this dissertation.
hence they had multilateral characteristics but were largely driven by Russia. These are characterized by issues of defence and security. Another cluster of missions are those that take place via the UN. These are wider in scope and include all generations of peace missions, from ceasefires to peacebuilding. This accords with the two strands in Russia’s peace engagements discussed above.

Even if peacebuilding does not seem to be a top priority, it clearly figures in the foreign policy documents. In the Concept of the Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation of February 2013, it is stated that Russia has an

[…] intent to participate in international peacemaking activities under the UN auspices and within the framework of collaboration with regional and international organizations, regarding international peacemaking as an effective instrument for settling armed conflicts and fulfilling post-crisis nation-building tasks. 589

The citation indicates support for the UN as the main venue for Russian peace engagement even as it also references the full spectrum of peace endeavours in its mention of post-conflict tasks.

Engagement through the UN

Russia’s main peace engagements are taking place within the UN system; this is stated in several documents and is one of the official positions of the Russian Foreign Ministry. The main decision to deploy a peace mission is taken by the UN Security Council, of which Russia is a permanent member. The UN Military Staff Committee then have strategic control of UN seconded forces. 590 In addition, the UN has agreements with the CSTO, the SCO, and the CIS on the issue of maintaining international peace and security. 591 For example, a Memorandum of Understanding between the CSTO and the Department of UN Peacekeeping was signed in September 2012 on the initiative of the Belarusian presidency of the CSTO. 592
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Since the establishment of peacekeeping operations within the UN system, the Soviet Union and, later, Russia have contributed with seconded personnel. In addition, Russia is the seventh-largest funder of UN peace operations and contributed 4.01% of its yearly budget for 2016, which is the lowest percentage of the five permanent members of the Security Council. As a permanent member of the Security Council, Russia has also been in a position to influence the definition of the key principles that oversee the establishment of peace missions. Certain obligations follow on that position on the UNSC, and representatives are in charge of making sure that issues of staff recruitment, planning and implementing of the missions, getting sufficient funding from the member countries, and various logistical matters are all worked out. The budget and resources are subject to General Assembly approval but it is the UNSC that authorizes a mission though a Security Council resolution and the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) that leads the peacekeeping operation.

Representatives of the Russian Federation are continually arguing that Russia takes a great interest in questions of global peace and security and therefore also peace missions. Bratersky and Lukin highlight in particular the statement made in 2013 by Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs Sergei Lavrov that

[...] Russia consistently places huge importance on peacekeeping.

Deciding what this means is an intriguing task. Russia contributes in several ways, with contributions ranging from uniformed personnel such as military experts and police officers to funding and drafting of mandates. Russia also hosts several training sessions for military and policy personnel as preparation before they join a peace mission. The training sessions are also directed towards capacity-building measures for uniformed personnel in the post-conflict environments. Even though Russia contributes in various ways, the contribution needs to be understood in relation to other states. An expert on Russian UN peace engagements stated that “Russia is contributing enough to have a say”. Russia is contributing with both funds and personnel but
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arguably mainly in a symbolic way and mainly in order to always have a voice at the table. It was also stressed that Russia should contribute more than it does today.⁵⁹⁷ This view, on the need for increased involvement, is also reflected in the literature, as when Alexander Nikitin states that

[...] Moscow’s significant political involvement is not adequately reflected in the level of its contributions of personnel and finances to UN peacekeeping.⁵⁹⁸

The Russian Federation’s contribution of uniformed personnel to UN peacekeeping activities can be seen as relatively active: as of 30 June 2016, Russia holds 68th⁵⁹⁹ place out of 173 countries by contributing a total of 95 seconded personnel, including 52 UN military experts, 38 police officers, and 5 troops.⁶⁰⁰ In relation to the other BRICS countries, Russia’s position as 68 is modest: India is ranked as number 2, China as 12, South Africa as 16, and Brazil as 19. The United States is ranked as 74, United Kingdom as 37 and France as 33.⁶⁰¹

The Russian contribution to UN missions peaked in the years 1993-1996, largely due to the Russian contributions to UN missions in the Balkans and former Yugoslavia, although about 20% of Russian peacekeepers at this time were sent to Angola, Cambodia, and the Golan Heights.⁶⁰² Yet, there has been a small but steady decline in Russian military and police secondment in recent years.

As of 31 August 2016, Russia had seconded personnel in ten out of twenty ongoing UN peace missions; Western Sahara (MINURSO), Haiti (MINUSTAH), the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO), Cyprus (UNFICYP), Sudan and Abyei (UNISFA), Kosovo (UNMIK), Liberia (UNMIL), South Sudan (UNMISS), Côte d’Ivoire (UNOCI) and the Middle East (UNTSO). The mandates differ between the different missions, which illustrates that Russia is involved in several types of missions, ranging from monitoring missions (referenda in Western Sahara, ceasefire in Cyprus, truce supervision in the
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Middle East), stabilizing missions (Haiti, DRC), interim security or administration missions (Sudan and the Abyei region, Kosovo) to peace-building missions (Liberia, South Sudan, Côte d’Ivoire).  

The Russian view of the UN has been somewhat sceptical, however, particularly after the end of the 1990s. Russian representatives ceaselessly raise objections to drafted mandates that include any actions or parameters that might be perceived as encroaching upon the national interest of the host state, arguing that it often tends to be too much in line with Western interests.  

Olga Abilova describes the contemporary deployment of Russians in UN missions as below:

[…] Today, a typical Russian deployment to a UN peacekeeping operation is a small and specialized unit, sometimes only a limited number of military experts. Those teams are spread across multiple locations in order to retain a presence but with few overall contributions. Nevertheless, the government’s annual report on peacekeeping from March 2014 along with other official declarations consistently underscores the importance of increasing Russia’s role in peacekeeping as a way of strengthening its authority on the world stage.

I would argue that this quotation captures the Russian ambivalence towards UN peace missions: the Russian leadership wants to participate but is not completely satisfied with the setup. Russia’s position is that the UN peace mission system needs to be reformed. My analysis of the interview material indicates that there are two main reasons for Russia’s scepticism towards the current system: Moscow is worried by 1) the domination of the US and its Western allies and 2) the proven inefficiency of the UN peace missions. This is stressed in the majority of the interviews. Three events are crucial to understand Russia’s scepticism: events in former Yugoslavia as a whole; events in Kosovo in particular; and UN Security Council Resolution 1973 on Libya.

In former Yugoslavia, Russia was involved in seconding personnel through the UN, and its stand on the conflicts in former Yugoslavia should be understood in the light of Moscow’s historical role and interests in South-eastern Europe, which in this case were also bordering states. Additionally, the Balkans resumed a central position in Russian
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politics and Russia’s efforts to redefine its national interests and relations with the West after the end of the Cold War and the fall of the Soviet Union.\textsuperscript{606} The scepticism that arose in relation to this was largely governed by the UN’s reaction to NATO as well as NATO’s eastward expansion.\textsuperscript{607} In addition, Russian leadership has had difficulties in accepting Kosovo’s independence from Serbia and the way in which this was supported by NATO.

The scepticism that arose after Kosovo was largely related to the NATO intervention which was afterwards seen as legitimate but illegal. Russian approaches to NATO are always sceptical, and actions without support in international law are from a Russian perspective regarded as unjustified. This was very serious, and the Kosovo crisis brought Russia and NATO to the brink of open conflict.\textsuperscript{608}

The scepticism towards the current UN system which developed as a response towards the UNSCR 1973 on Libya was largely based on the disappointment of events following the Resolution 1973. Russia interprets the situation as showing that Western powers utilized the mandate in the resolution in a way that did not respect the agreement in the UN Security Council. In the voting, Russia and China abstained, which in practice was identical with allowing a military intervention to force an immediate ceasefire. Russian leaders and diplomats have argued that the mandate initiated by the resolution was interpreted more broadly and exceeded its actual purpose.\textsuperscript{609}

Justification strategies of Russian peacebuilding

Several countries have distinguished themselves as advocates for certain legal, political, and normative stances in the development of international relations. This can be exemplified by different approaches to different policy issues, such as peace initiatives. Without doubt, some countries have more influential positions than others, both in world politics in general and in relation to peace initiatives in particular. The dis-
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cursively and politically dominant group of states consists of liberal democracies, located for the most part in Europe and northern America, which have traditionally often set the agenda and had a monopoly on interpretations of events in world affairs. These countries have also been the most internally stable and had the greatest capacity to act, financially and politically. This domination has been challenged in different ways and dimensions by other influential countries, which do not necessarily share the same political values. Also, less influential countries, which do not have the same leverage in international politics, may still wish to challenge the political hegemony. For example, the paradigm of liberal peacebuilding has received a lot of criticism for being neo-colonial, neo-imperialistic, and focusing mainly on profit-generation and marketization.\textsuperscript{610}

The military interventions in Kosovo in 1999, Afghanistan in 2001, Iraq in 2003, Georgia in 2008 and Libya in 2011 show that since the end of the Cold War major powers have repeatedly become involved in other states.\textsuperscript{611} This applies not only for the Soviet Union or Russia but also for other major powers, such as the United States and others. The legacy of Cold War dynamics is present in both domestic and foreign Russian politics, and Russia has distinguished itself as a consistent critic of Western-led interventions in the name of world peace. Russia is among those countries which on a general level have positioned themselves as challengers of the US-led West. This is to a large extent a product of history and is exemplified by Russia’s involvement in the BRICS collaboration and the SCO.

In the analysis of Russian foreign policy in relation to peace initiatives, I have been able to identify three types of justification strategies. The themes I have found in the documents and from the interviews have been clustered into different types of strategies, to show the nuances in the types of arguments that have been applied by Russian politicians, policymakers and experts. My analysis of official Russian foreign policy discourse on engagement in peace missions abroad shows that there are several ethically grounded premises which are influential as justification strategies for external peace engagements, but also arguments that lack a clear ethical premise. This will be further discussed below.
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The overall foreign policy discourse is kept on a general level, without addressing particular cases, which implies that the overarching documents need to be interpreted in relation to each occasion when they are supposed to be implemented. In general, what is clear from the analysis of the documents is that all foreign policy measures are supposed to contribute to promoting a positive picture of the Russian Federation and the actions should contribute to bilateral cooperation. This is explicitly expressed in the documents, not as a justification strategy but as a way of strategic nation-branding and framing, and as one of the general approaches of Russian foreign policy.

Five guiding principles for Russian peace engagement

In a study of Russian contributions to peacekeeping missions, Olga Abilova explains that the Russian engagements in peace missions can be understood in terms of five different rationales: political; economic; security; institutional; and normative. I regard these rationales as similar to the guiding principles which I identified in the South African case and will for the sake of consistency use the terminology of this study rather than Abilova’s.

On the topic of terminology, Abilova uses the terminology of peacekeeping missions, which I take to mean peace initiatives which have a military component. For the reason of consistency with the conceptual discussion in Chapter Two and the chapter on South Africa, this is what I would call a peace operation. However, Abilova seems to use the terms in a broader sense since some of the issues she covers could be understood as peacebuilding.

The first principle, the political, is connected to Russia’s self-image of being a Great Power. This has not been apparent in the contribution of peacekeepers since Russia does not contribute any substantial number of uniformed personnel or advisors. As one of the respondents put it, it is about showing the flag. On the other hand, Russia has been taking on an active role in shaping the polices of the UNSC towards international conflict resolution. Russia’s representatives at the UN are keen to keep track of the wording of peace engagement in UN documents such as mandates.612 In several of the interviews, Russian experts raised the possibility of increasing the Russian commitment to sending personnel to UN missions, but the first steps towards this have not yet been

---

612 Interview, Moscow July 2017
taken. A sceptic might raise a question here, namely whether Russian engagement only materializes when it is in line with the national interests of the current president and government.

A second principle could be seen as that economic reasons are crucial given that Russia for years has been the second largest supplier of contractor services to the UN. Russia does not make a lot of money on seconding personnel as there are few Russians deployed in UN missions, but in combination with supplying contractors, Russia is the main supplier of air transportation.613 Experts on Russian engagements in the UN point out that there are monetary incentives on both a national and an individual level.614

The third principle is portrayed as a security priority. It is argued that Russian priorities are mainly located in the post-Soviet space, in other words the former Soviet republics.615 This principle can also be interpreted as a question of geopolitics and an expression of the prioritizing of geographical proximity. This would explain the relatively heavy Russian troop deployments in the CIS-region, as compared to Russia’s comparatively low participation in UN peacekeeping operations.616 Furthermore, it can also be understood as a stance that peace involvement is aligned with political and strategic interests.

The fourth principle is the institutional, and here Abilova stresses the potential of accessing operational experience for Russian military personnel, an aspect that is not really addressed by the Russian government’s official documents during the period of study. The prestige of the military is seen as one of the potential obstacles for this type of strategic use of UN secondment.617

The fifth principle is the normative, which for this thesis is the most important. Abilova argues that the normative rationale for Russian peace engagements is grounded in the idea that being a permanent member of the UNSC entails responsibility for questions of global peace and security.618 This may sound counterintuitive since Russia has used its veto more often than the other permanent members. However,
this is to some extent dependent on the context. From the Russian perspective, using a veto can be a way of taking responsibility. Having the opportunity to using the veto power is exclusive to the five permanent members of the Security Council, and the US, China, and Russia have exercised this right continuously over the years. These five principles are supplementary to each other in that they seem to be interpreted as different pieces of a puzzle.

Most recently, Russia has consistently vetoed on resolutions suggesting different actions in Syria and on events related to Ukraine, indicating that the Russian understanding of responsibility differs from a Western understanding. It is important to remember, however, that these discussions are more heavily directed towards intervention, military force, and, arguably, a breach of the principle of sovereignty. However, in much of the Russian engagement in peace missions, there is a clear military aspect. Peacebuilding is largely discussed in military discourses and military structures, indicating a securitization of more long-term peacebuilding engagements.

A typology of Russian justification strategies

The justification strategies identified in the documents and in the interview material are clustered into themes, the first being the reference to international legal doctrines and international principles. These are the arguments identified which Russian representatives are using. The second cluster is framed as continuous references to international peace and security, most often through multilateral organizations and cooperation. The third cluster is related to the second, but with a clearer emphasis on the expectation of addressing and handling humanitarian crises or disasters, regardless of whether they are man-made or natural. The second and third cluster of justification strategies are connected to the self-image of being a guarantor of peace and security, and that there is an external expectation to react and act.
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619 Interview, Moscow June 2017
620 Abilova 2016. This additionally indicates a more distinct interest in the UNSC resolutions regarding these situations.
A. International legal doctrines and principles

One of the most prominent attempts to justify engagement in peace initiatives is the continuous reference to international law. This sometimes explicitly includes international humanitarian law and human rights law, sometimes not, which might be a nuance which offers room for interpretation. However, the maintenance and strengthening of the international rule of law is among one of Russia’s priorities in the international arena, and this is also used in order to try to justify different foreign policy actions.

In the Russian Federal Law No 93-FZ, dated June 23 1995, titled *On Procedure of Providing Civil and Military Personnel for Participation in the Activity of Maintenance or Restoration of the International Peace and Security by the Russian Federation*, it is stated in article two that

In the present Federal Law the activity of maintenance or restoration of the international peace and security with involvement of the Russian Federation shall imply operations of maintenance of peace and other measures undertaken by the Security Council of the United Nations Organization in compliance with the UN Charter, by regional bodies or within the framework of the regional bodies or agreements of the Russian Federation, or on the basis of the bilateral or multilateral international treaties of the Russian Federation, which are not enforced actions in accordance with the UN Charter (hereinafter referred to as peace-making activity), as well as the international forced actions with use of armed forces, realized by the resolution of the UN Security Council, adopted in compliance with the UN Charter, for elimination of a threat to peace, violations of peace, or an act of aggression.621

In this example, both the first and the second type of justification strategies are present since the text explicitly emphasizes the role of international treaties and the UN charter. It also emphasizes the role of cooperation through multilateral organizations.

In the 2013 *Concept of the Foreign Policy*, it is asserted that unilateral sanctions and other coercive measures, including armed aggression, outside the framework of the UN Security Council constitute a risk to world peace.622 This can be understood as indicating an argument
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621 The Russian Federation 1995
622 Russian Federation 2013
in supporting of respect for international law. In addition to international law, both Russian foreign policy documents and the respondents refer continuously to the importance of respecting internationally recognized principles, particularly the principle of sovereignty. As previously mentioned, this is particularly interesting in relation to the events in Crimea, where Russia’s controversial presence prior to the referendum would constitute a breach of that principle.

Russian arguments place great importance on mandates and international law and therefore regard the UN as the only legitimate global actor within peace and security. However, as Bratersky and Lukin notes, Russia supports expansion of the partnership between the UN and regional actors only when it falls under Chapter VIII of the UN Charter. My analysis of Russian engagement in peace missions shows that this fits well with Russia’s strategic interests: in its own neighbourhood Russia prefers to remain influential (via CIS and CSTO) but in places geographically removed, prefers that someone else take the lead. What is crucial is that the UN remains the main actor and that all measures are taken with consideration to the UN Charter. However, as an actor who pays close attention to mandates, it is striking that the regional examples of Russian peace missions all tend to have unclear situations regarding mandates. Contexts such as Transnistria, South Ossetia, and Tajikistan all have slightly ad hoc solutions, even though they were legitimate and legal from a Russian perspective.

Scholars and experts on Russian engagement in peace missions continuously refer to treaties and agreements on military and other types of cooperation. This reflects the militarized discourse as well as the perceived weight of international agreements and treaties. Scholars such as Alexander Nikitin argue that peace operations with this type of legal grounds are exemplified by the treaties between Russia and Tajikistan (1993), Russia and South Ossetia (2008), and Russia and Abkhazia (2008). Nikitin also emphasizes that “formal documented request for military aid by the legitimate authorities of one state addressed to the authorities of another state” is a legal basis for stretching the principle of sovereignty. These types of operations are exemplified by South Os-

623 On the other hand, this is questioned by several legal scholars, who argue that Russia’s understanding of international law tends to be pragmatic and only followed when it is in tandem with Russia’s national interest. See for example Mälksoo 2015:100
624 Nikitin 2017:5; Interviews, Moscow June & July 2017
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setia (1992–2008), Transnistria (1992–present), and Syria (2015–present). The responsibility to protect civilians is mentioned but only as an emerging doctrine yet to be universally recognized.625

The importance of international law for the Russian view of peace missions is also emphasized by Bratersky and Lukin, who note that Russia has introduced a proposal to the UN concerning a collective clarification of the legal aspects of the use of force in international law. Russia’s position is clearly dominated by the principles of sovereignty and territorial integrity, and it views initiatives such as “limited sovereignty”, “humanitarian intervention”, and “responsibility to protect” as contradictions of territorial integrity.626 These notions are also viewed as Western initiatives aimed at undermining the cornerstones of the current world order as seen from a Russian perspective.

This type of justification strategy is most commonly directed towards an international audience, and often used in relation to the argument that the Russian Federation respects international law and takes it seriously. This can be understood as a reciprocal kind of argument, that Russia expects others to do the same. Reciprocal respect is often what international cooperation is about.

Important to note, as this is based on the analysis of the documents and the interviews, it shows the official Russian stance. Scholars of international law, such as Lauri Mälksoo, has argued that this continuous referencing to international law is peculiar in the case of Russia, in that Russia “often give a specific illiberal meaning to the concept of sovereignty”.627 This portrays the tension of Russia as a global actor.

B. Multilateral cooperation

A second type of argument that is used as a justification strategy emphasizes the need for formal global institutions. In the Russian case, this means that the prioritized institutions are those where Russia has an opportunity to exert influence. Russia is one of the permanent members of the UNSC and one of the most powerful of the members of BRICS (even if the collaboration is supposed to be on equal grounds, Russia and China still have some privileges the others do not), and Russia is the driving country behind the CIS and the CSTO. In this sense, Russia
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625 Nikitin 2017:5
626 Bratersky and Lukin 2017:138
627 Mälksoo 2015:100
is a strong proponent for multilateralism in peace missions albeit to some extent on its own terms.

Within foreign policy activities, and in particular peace missions, Russian policymakers and experts frequently refer to the UN. This chimes with the previous reflection that the UN can be seen as a venue where Russia has influence. However, this could also be a legitimacy-creating measure: a UNSC resolution is in a way legitimized by UN procedure, and peace initiatives that are multilateral are generally seen as more legitimate than unilateral or bilateral ones.

Within the Concept of the Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation, dated 18 February 2013, it is stated that the Russian Federation, in accordance with national security, is supposed to focus on

> [...] active promoting of international peace and universal security and stability for the purpose of establishing a just and democratic system of international relations based on collective decision-making in addressing global issues, on the primacy of international law, including, first of all, the UN Charter, as well as on equal, partnership relations among nations with the central coordinating role of the UN as the principal organization regulating international relations.\(^\text{628}\)

This could be interpreted as a preference for international collaboration on equal grounds. As expressed in several of the interviews, representatives of the Russian state prefer to act in multilateral fashion. However, as it also states, when multilateral solutions are inefficient, or impossible, regional or bilateral solutions are seen as viable alternatives. This implies a context-sensitive pragmatism, which can be governed by several different factors.

The *Military Doctrine* of the Russian Federation from 2014 states that one of the goals is to contribute to international peace and security. It is explicitly stated that Russia should contribute troops to CSTO, CIS and UN mandated missions. When it comes to what kind of contribution the Russian military could contribute, it is stated that one of the main tasks of the Armed Forces, other troops and authorities in peacetime is

> [...] participation in peacekeeping operations (recovery) international peace and security, taking measures to prevention (elimination) of threats to the peace, the suppression of acts aggression (breach of the peace) on the basis of the Council’s decisions UN Security Council or

\(^{\text{628}}\) Government of the Russian Federation, 2013
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other bodies authorized to take such decisions in accordance with international law.\textsuperscript{629}

Here, peacekeeping seems to indicate that it is a question of recovery. This blurs the distinction between peacekeeping and peacebuilding in the Russian discourse since a focus on recovery could be interpreted as peacebuilding. In this document, it seems to be that there is a difference in priorities depending on whether it is peacetime or wartime, and this is explicitly mentioned in the text at several occasions.

When it comes to justification strategies, it becomes clear that Russian approaches differ in the post-Soviet space and in the global arena, even though there also are a few overlaps. One of the general approaches seems to be that there is an interest in being involved in various regions. However, the document does not identify prioritized regions but is instead vaguely worded to leave itself open to interpretation. In the \textit{Military Doctrine} it is stated that the tasks of military-political cooperation include:

\begin{quote}
[…] the development of relations with international organizations prevention (of) conflict situations, Conservation and consolidation of peace in various regions, including those involving Russian troops in peacekeeping operations.\textsuperscript{630}
\end{quote}

This suggests a global approach given the record of where Russian peacekeeping personnel have been deployed lately.

This type of justification strategy is most often directed towards an international as well as regional audience. In this case, this means that it is directed towards both a global far-abroad audience and regional, near-abroad audience.

C. Responsibility and expectations

The third cluster of justification strategies are connected to Russia’s self-image as one of the powerful countries that have to respond to man-made or natural humanitarian crises. This reflects both its own self-image and what Russian representatives imagine to be the world’s image of Russia. This was expressed by an expert on Russian peace engagement as being part of Russia’s role as one of the permanent members in

\textsuperscript{629} Government of the Russian Federation, 2014: paragraph 32, p. 11
\textsuperscript{630} Government of the Russian Federation, 2014: paragraph 55
the UNSC. Critics towards the Russian Federation would question this image, and as others has been highlighting, Russia’s main weakness is its reputation and image.631 Contributions to peace and security are necessary for countries that are one of the Permanent Five. Related to the perceived expectations to act, the same expert claimed that Russian presence in several peace operations was a way of “showing the flag”, which could be interpreted as a way of showing that the Russians are taking part in peace missions. Another interpretation could be that this is part of a larger scheme of nation-branding.

The Russian view of being a responsible actor seems to have been very much coloured by their conviction of the crucial need to respect the principle of sovereignty as well as to avoid a unilateral world order with US domination. This could be understood as a moral argument about the kind of world aspired to. Here, I interpret the argument to be based on a quest for equality amongst states in which the principle of sovereignty is of crucial importance. This could also be an assumption of a normative order, i.e. an order where reciprocal and general arguments are possible to exchange.

This third type of justification strategy is grounded in an expectation to react, which also relates to being a responsible actor. The Russian approach to international relations and international law, according to experts, is driven by a striving towards a more equal and responsible world order. This is commonly translated as a multipolar order rather than the unipolarity which has long governed international relations. Being responsible is here understood as adhering to and respecting international law and treaties and abiding by agreements. This is understood as a requirement for other actors to know that you are meeting your responsibilities and that they can count on you to follow the agreed-upon solution. A clear trend in the interviews is that Russia views respect for the principles of non-intervention and sovereignty as a condition for being a responsible actor.632

The types of engagements that are envisioned are defined as follows:

Participation of the military and civil personnel in the activity of maintenance or restoration of the international peace and security may include monitoring and control over observance of the agreements on cease-fire and other hostile actions, separation of the conflicting Parties,

631 Simons 2018:201
632 Interviews Moscow June and July 2017

246
disarmament and breaking up of their subunits, carrying-out of the en-
gineering and other operations, assistance in settling the problems of
refugees, rendering of medical and other humanitarian assistance, ful-
filment of militia (police) and other functions on providing security of
the population and compliance with the human rights, as well as carry-
ing-out of the international forced actions in compliance with the UN
Charter.

The Russian Federation may participate in the peacemaking activity
also by providing foodstuff, medications, other humanitarian assis-
tance, and means of communication, transport vehicles and other mate-
rial-technical resources.633

These definitions leave open the possibility of engagements that are not
only military, which is otherwise the most commonly recognized state
employed category in relation to peace missions. Russian experts have
expressed the importance of expanding Russian engagement via per-
sonnel seconded to the UN, including both uniformed and civilian per-
sonnel.634

This third type of justification strategy seems to be used somewhat
differently, depending on which audience it addresses. It has been used
for an international audience as well as for regional and national audi-
ences. Generally, a foreign policy discourse is directed towards several
different actors, as becomes clear also in relation to peacebuilding en-
gagements. In this case, it seems as though domestic and foreign policy
have become intertwined.

Summary of the typology
To summarize the typology based on the case study on Russian engage-
ment in peacebuilding, a methodological or terminological question is
of primary importance. Since peacebuilding is not a prioritized practice
in Russian foreign policy, this is more precisely a typology of Russian
attempts to justify engagement in peace missions more broadly. The
typology consists of three parts: 1) international legal doctrines and
principles; 2) multilateral cooperation; and 3) responsibility and expec-
tations. These are all related to each other but are different enough to be
regarded as distinct justificatory strategies. The connection proposed is

633 The Russian Federation 1995
634 Interview, Moscow July 2017
that international law governs multilateral cooperation and that both international law and multilateral cooperation build upon an expectation that states will meet their international responsibilities.

Multilateral cooperation seems to Russian experts to be a way of creating greater legitimacy for political action, but this, too, rests upon an agreement about cooperation and responsibility. Responsibility can to some extent be understood as related to reciprocity in the sense of predictability. As a reminder, Forst understands reciprocity as meaning that claimants may not demand any rights or privileges which it denies its addressee. I would argue that Russia sees itself as coming from a challenger’s perspective and that their role in international relations is not respected, but that their foreign policy is concerned with respecting others. However, and importantly also depending on perspective, to argue that Russia is a responsible actor in international affairs can be a sensitive statement, perhaps less for Russia itself than for other former Soviet republics, in view of the destabilizing of Crimea.

In the analysis of the role of peacebuilding in Russian foreign policy, I have found that this is instead framed as peacemaking, but that there are different types of justificatory attempts. As suspected, political justificatory attempts dominate the discourse, but moral and ethical attempts to justify are also present and play an important role. This leaves open the possibility for an analysis of the kind of justificatory attempts that have been offered.

**Dimensions of justification**

The type of justificatory attempts offered in the Russian case are, as with the South African case study, primarily political, but there are also justificatory attempts based in morality. The Russian discourse is a realist and militarized discourse, which seems to be centred on issues of defence and security, but here, too, arguments about moral character are put forward. There are several references to responsibility, equality amongst states, and the normative aspiration towards stability. This indicates that even militarized discourses have room for moral argumentation.

---

635 Forst 2014b:214
Reciprocity and generality

The baseline for assessing generality and reciprocity is that the arguments are accessible and relevant. In the Russian case, the arguments are not very accessible or transparent, but arguments are nonetheless provided, and they are relevant. Yet, they require more interpretational work than the justificatory attempts in the South African case, for which the interviews have been of crucial importance. In comparison to the South African case, Russia’s foreign policy documents are less available and accessible. South Africa has a white paper specifically focusing on engagement in peace missions; in the Russian case the equivalent does not exist or has not been found. A document on Russian participation in peacekeeping has been initiated but was never finalized due to budgetary constraints. There is a document on Russia’s Participation in International Development Assistance but, according to the definitions used in this dissertation, developmental work and peacebuilding are separate areas. In addition, this document only briefly mentions peacebuilding. A related note on the material is therefore that the interviews are more important in the Russian case, since the documents do not provide the optimal level of detail.

On the other hand, the possibility of carrying out this study indicates that there is also some level of reciprocity and generality in Russian foreign policy on engagements in peace missions and peacebuilding. This seems to open up the possibility of a discussion of audience in so far as the arguments seem to be provided for different types of audiences.

The arguments upon which the typology is based can be seen as reciprocal in that the arguments which Russia presents do not demand any rights or privileges which it denies to its recipient. As mentioned earlier, it is rather a question of emphasizing normative stances that Russia argues it is itself being denied by others. When it comes to generality, these arguments, i.e. international law and principles, multilateral cooperation, and responsibility, also seem to reach the standard. This would imply that the arguments are justified, according to Forst. However, this needs more nuancing as it does not seem adequate to use the formal criteria of reciprocity and generality in order to assess the justificatory attempts of external states in peacebuilding engagements.
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636 Abilova 2016:3
Russia’s position of power

Russia’s view of its own role in world politics in general seems to be based on a challenger’s perspective. Russia often portrays itself as a sound and responsible actor which respects and promotes international law where others undermining international laws and treaties. This is connected to Russia’s position of power. Russia seems to have both defensive and offensive elements in its foreign policy, but the self-perceived role seems to be primarily defensive.

Russia’s position of power differs depending on the geographical scope. As has been stated earlier in this chapter, Russia clearly prioritizes the post-Soviet space in its foreign policy. This is explained both by geographical proximity and a striving for protection of national interests and national security. This does not mean that Russian leadership does not care about what happens in the rest of the world, just that there are other mechanisms which governs the different spaces.

Russian global aspirations are to some extent a balancing act between Russian imperialistic tendencies on the one hand, and on the other hand a question of legitimate claims to equality within the international system. However, it is important to remember here that even though they are linked, these are two different questions. The first question considers the Russian policies and actions in a limited geographical area to which there are previous connections, while the other question is about a wider, global perspective. These cannot be completely separated but there is a nuance when it comes to audience, since the first is directed towards a closer, more clearly defined audience, while the second is directed towards a broad, global (but often seen as Western-dominated) audience. Tsygankov argues that Russia, throughout history, either has tried to imitate or compete with the West.637 In addition, much of Russia’s foreign policy is dominated by the power balance with the US.

Western hegemony inherits an asymmetry built into the global system, which Russia is not alone in questioning. Several voices have been raised in relation to the inequality that governs the international system, both in material and representational terms. The principle of sovereignty is the functioning mechanism to ensure the equality among countries, but in the first place, this is not always respected, and in the sec-

637 Tsygankov 2016:2ff
ond, the principle of sovereignty does not capture the discursive asymmetry in international relations in questions of room for interpretation and agenda setting.

If Russia’s understanding of power is to be analysed in Forstian terms, it would seem like a challenge to do this at the level of noumenal power. Much of Russia’s understanding of power seems to be governed by a classical international relations realist account in which power is equivalent to military strength. Yet, Russia’s own military power is not as developed as it once was and even if major military reforms have been enacted lately, Russia is no longer one of the most powerful countries in terms of military power. However, it retains nuclear weapons, which has greatly influenced this equation.

An understanding of peace and peacebuilding

The analysis of Russian foreign policy on peacebuilding shows that much of Russia’s involvement with peace issues is in relation to peacekeeping rather than peacebuilding. As noted above, this accords with the conclusion that Russia’s foreign policy on peace issues is a militarized discourse which seems to be governed by an understanding of peace as negative peace. In this, it is the absence of violence that is the primary goal and there is an explicit cautiousness about engaging with political issues in other countries. Russian understanding of peace also seems to be characterized by peace as stability, which also reflects the model of negative peace.

Another finding is that Russian approaches to peacebuilding seem to be either a question of conflict resolution or an issue connected to developmental aid. This follows from the limited focus on peacebuilding in Russian foreign policy discourse, since this is an underdeveloped area. The Russian approach to conflict resolution is held to address the core issue of the conflict, which to some extent can also be related to the prevention of reoccurring conflict. But if the understanding of positive or qualitative peace is long-term prosperity in combination with sustainability, perhaps the Russian approach to and understanding of peacebuilding is closer to development assistance. This is also supported by the way that peacebuilding is discussed in the Concept from 2007, *Russia’s Participation in International Development Assistance*, rather than the other documents. The other documents include Russian approaches to peacekeeping, but primarily in military settings such as
the *Military Doctrine* and the *Concept of National Security*. In the *Military Doctrine*, an area covers political-military and military-technical cooperation of the Russian Federation and foreign states. While this could be interpreted in terms of peace engagements, it is primarily in militarized terms. Again this is exemplified in the following prioritizing

[... ] d) the development of relations with international organizations Prevention conflict situations, Conservation and consolidation of peace in various regions, including those involving Russian troops in peace-keeping operations;\(^638\)

This indicates activities which could be interpreted as peacebuilding, such as prevention and consolidation. However, this is not further explicated in the document and several of the interviewees have stressed that Russian involvement in peace issues is primarily via military structures.

Conclusions

Let us now sum up how Russia justifies and understands its engagement in peace missions abroad. Russia, like most countries, constructs arguments within its foreign policy discourse that aim to create legitimacy and justification for its actions. This practice takes place at several levels and is made by several people. The justification strategies used have been portrayed as a threefold typology where the first strategy consists of clear referencing to international law, the second consists of an emphasis on multilateral collaboration, and the third is constructed on the basis of external and internal expectations about action. These are directed towards different audiences, such as international, regional, and national, and there are often overlaps with the audience towards which the strategies are directed.

Several of the strategies identified are connected to the ambition of emphasizing Russia’s ability to be an important state that takes responsibility for global peace and security. This quest for responsibility is also visible in the many other cases, but is here expressed from a different position, indicating that the understanding of notions such as security differs between different states.

\(^{638}\) Government of the Russian Federation 2014: paragraph 55
One important finding in the case study on Russia is what could be interpreted as an ambivalence characterizing Russia’s approach to peace missions and peacebuilding in particular. This ambivalence is also present in the attempts to justify engagement in peace missions. This could be exemplified by the prominent role of international law in Russia’s foreign policy, which was at the same time violated during the events in Crimea and Eastern Ukraine. The analysis of the foreign policy documents, together with the interviews, shows that Russia’s approach to peace missions as well as their justification thereof is less consistent than, for example, in the case of South Africa. Based on the material I am analysing in this study, the attempts to justify Russian engagement in peacebuilding seem to be less systematized. Yet, in Russia’s case it seems possible to argue that Russian decision and policy-makers to a large extent are seeking respect from other countries.

Another conclusion which could be drawn from this case study is that the criteria of reciprocity and generality need modification and supplementing in order to capture fully the political action of trying to justify engagement in peacebuilding. The contextual case studies have therefore contributed by showing that the Forstian theory of justification based on reciprocity and generality is insufficient for capturing the attempts to justify engagement in peacebuilding. It is now time to turn to the next chapter, where a modification of Forst’s theory is developed.
7. Towards a justificatory order of peacebuilding

This dissertation offers a tentative theory of a justificatory order of peacebuilding. By combining critical peacebuilding research with ethics and justification theory with empirical research, it aims to extend the field of political ethics into the field of peacebuilding. The aim of this final chapter of this dissertation is threefold. Firstly, I set out to systematically answer the research questions posed in Chapter One. This is done by discussing and summarizing the findings and preliminary conclusions of the preceding chapters. Secondly, I articulate the contours of a normative theory of a justificatory order of peacebuilding. Here I suggest and discuss one criterion and six conditions for justified peacebuilding by external states. Thirdly, I discuss how this dissertation contributes to ongoing research debates and highlight its wider relevance for research in ethics.

The overarching research question that has governed this study is how we should understand justified peacebuilding and assess attempts to justify peacebuilding engagements. This main question is divided into three sub-questions. The first sub-question is how and in what ways external states justify their engagements in peacebuilding in post-conflict societies. By exploring the justification strategies South Africa and Russia use as peacebuilders, I have assessed their attempts to justify their engagements in peacebuilding initiatives. In addition, as an initial step, this study analyses these countries’ understanding of the concepts of peace and peacebuilding, since this seems to govern their attempts to justify engagement in peacebuilding initiatives.

The second sub-question is how these justificatory attempts are to be assessed. Here it is suggested that the actors’ way of reasoning and acting needs to be analysed in a holistic way that also considers global developments. Given increased globalization, states are to a greater extent affected by global processes, something that should affect their foreign policy decisions and therefore also peacebuilding engagements. In
what follows, I will also discuss different attempts to justify peacebuilding as well as how these justificatory attempts should be understood and assessed, based on the two cases of South Africa and Russia.

This study has also sought to suggest a reasonable criterion and conditions for the justification of peacebuilding engagements. A third and final sub-question focuses on what the criteria for justified peacebuilding are. This question is posed in order to begin articulating a theory of a justificatory order of peacebuilding.

The introductory chapter as well as the methods chapter demonstrated why it can be valuable to focus on the roles played by South Africa and Russia as peacebuilding actors. This study indicates that it is in fact constructive to analyse these particular states. I have shown that they are trying to justify their engagements and that there are both differences and similarities between them as well as between them. Russia and South Africa offer nuances in their approaches and abilities towards peace and peacebuilding. Let us touch upon their approaches here and later return to them in relation to the discussion of the typologies.

Both South Africa and Russia are regionally important actors, something which places them in a particular role in their region. Yet, each country’s role as an international actor has varied over time and across geographical space. Their respective historical legacies shape their current approaches towards justification and attempts to justify engagements in peacebuilding. In South Africa, there was a clear shift from the apartheid to the post-apartheid period. During the post-apartheid period attempts to justify foreign policy were taken more seriously. In the early days of the new South Africa, however, peacebuilding was not a common practice. This has changed in recent years and South Africa’s justification of engagement in peacebuilding seems to have increased over time. In its pivotal White Paper on peace missions from 1998/1999, South Africa made serious attempts both to increase engagement in peacebuilding activities and to justify those engagements.

In the Russian case, a change from the Soviet to the Russian foreign policy rhetoric seemed to indicate an increasing interest in greater engagement with peacekeeping and peacebuilding missions. Yet, this has not been implemented and could perhaps be explained by the increased
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639 It is important to remember in this context the historical development of peacebuilding as a concept, as demonstrated in Chapter Two. Only after the end of the Cold War did peacebuilding appear on the world stage.
attention to peacebuilding issues globally. To some extent, Russia’s approach to foreign policy in general and peace missions in particular, seems to be governed by pragmatism and symbolism.\textsuperscript{640} For example, as was highlighted in one of the interviews, Russia is aware of the symbolism of “showing the Russian flag”. Peacebuilding and attempts to justify peacebuilding engagement are present in both the Russian official documents and the interview material, but it is not the most prioritized area. As highlighted in Chapter Six, several of the interview participants stated that Russia is not involved in peacebuilding, while others stated that peacebuilding engagement does exist but that there is room for expanding it. This tension in the interview material indicates in practice two different perspectives, one emphasising the Russian peacebuilding engagement and the other disputing it.

Another observation from the interviews in the Russian case is that there is a different terminology. The most commonly used Russian word is миротворчество (mirotvorchestvo) which is sometimes translated as “peacemaking” and sometimes as “peacekeeping”. It is also translated as “peacebuilding”, although this is rare.\textsuperscript{641} This can be seen as evidence of a risk for some conceptual confusion. It might also indicate that the Russian understanding of peacebuilding is close to negative peace, in its focus on peacemaking and peacekeeping. While the documents analysed in this study are the official English versions, this ambiguity connected to language is not interpreted as problematic as the Russian representatives have selected the translated words. Yet, it indicates an interesting language-related nuance with relevance for a discussion of the Russian understanding of peacebuilding. A similar conceptual issue is not present in the South African case. As stated earlier, South Africa has been more explicit as a partner in peacebuilding initiatives, particularity after apartheid; however, its role and self-proclaimed responsibilities also seem to have grown lately. This increased interest in peace engagement may be based on a global trend that is not specific to these two case studies. It indicates, however, an interesting trend with regard to historical legacy of both cases and global development at large.

\textsuperscript{640} March 2018:81

\textsuperscript{641} In the Russian language, миротворчество (mirotvorchestvo) is translated to мир – in this context peace, and творчество – creation, which literally would give peace creation. This could be seen as similar to peacemaking, but “creation” seems more creative than “making”.

256
Furthermore, this study has made use of a few analytical questions governing the empirical analysis. These questions have addressed how actors representing the state of South Africa and Russia justify their engagements in peacebuilding processes abroad. In addition, these questions also addressed the ways in which Russia and South Africa are engaged in peacebuilding and how they have prioritized their engagements during the period of study. I have further analysed which justificatory strategies the state representatives use and to which audiences the arguments are directed. This has enabled an analysis of the understanding of the concepts of peace and peacebuilding as well as the interrelated concepts of peacekeeping and peacemaking. Additionally, the analytical questions address whether different audiences might potentially affect the type of arguments used in attempts to justify peacebuilding engagements. Hypothetically, it makes sense to assume that different audiences would generate different types of justificatory attempts. The analysis of these cases, however, does not show clear support for this on a substantial level. Rather, this seems to be a question of framing. This could potentially be explained by several factors, the material of this study being one such factor. Foreign policy documents are commonly constructed with a broad audience in mind. The policies are usually developed based on the general objectives that govern a state’s activities and relationships with other states. But the documents are influenced by domestic considerations as well as by the behaviour of other states. This makes it challenging to analyse whether the different documents are directed towards different audiences, because they are of a general character. On the other hand, this general character contributes to an analysis of the arguments found in the documents, including to what extent they could be seen as reciprocal or general.

As presented throughout this dissertation, the discussions and analyses are based on these different questions. This is achieved by developing a theoretical framework based on justification theory in combination with the case studies of Russia and South Africa. Consequently, I have explored the role and justification of the agency of external states by assessing how they are trying to justify their peacebuilding engagements. My articulation of a theory of a justificatory order of peacebuilding is informed by the theoretical discussion in addition to the case studies. This will increase the relevance of the theoretical argument by basing it upon the approaches of state representatives rather than hypothetical reasoning.
One of the key elements of this dissertation concerns the difference between justification strategies, attempts to justify and justification, a distinction that helps to show the differences between the political and the critical normative level. Justification, in this case justified peacebuilding by external states, is an ideal. However, an ideal cannot be realized and instead it governs actions and arguments. It also provides a reasonable platform for criticism. Justification strategies on the one hand, are here understood as political strategies presented in a political context. These strategies are different attempts to justify actions, consisting of both moral and political justification. Attempts to justify - on the other hand - are political actions carried out in a political context by political actors. That is why attempts to justify consists of political arguments. Even so, political arguments have a moral dimension, as is demonstrated throughout this study. Finally, the political agency of actors in this study is understood as having been constructed by the representatives of the states of Russia and South Africa.642

One implication, for example, for the justificatory attempts provided by external states is that engagement in peacebuilding is governed by the connection to many other political interests and areas. This interconnectedness is both influenced by, and in itself influencing, power relations. Foreign policy is a broad spectrum of policy areas and interests and is to be understood as one part of a state’s total responsibilities. In addition, foreign policy is also affected by policy decisions in other areas, not least by domestic politics. Also, scholars have demonstrated that ideational factors have an important place in the creation of foreign policy.643 Realists understand power increasingly in ideational rather than just material terms. This requires adapting to the study of soft-power tools and international norms as part of states’ realpolitik.644

642 To recall: the terms state, government, and representatives of the government are used interchangeably throughout this study. This makes the official documents part of the state but not all interview participants are state representatives, as discussed in Chapter Four.
643 Kropatcheva 2018:46, Tsygankov 2016:265-269. Kropatcheva has argued that neo-classical realism is characterized by an attempt to integrate systemic/structural and domestic and ideational aspects into systematic and coherent analyses while also showing the interaction between them. This is of importance here since it stresses the significance of ideational aspects. Further investigation on this topic lies beyond the scope of this dissertation.
644 Kropatcheva 2018:49. This argument is primarily made in relation to analyses of Russia’s foreign policy. This feature is unlikely to be specific to Russia but probably forms part of a larger trend affecting many other countries.
Peacebuilding in the two case studies is shown to be a form of soft power, most explicitly so in the case of Russia. It is also visible in the South African case but in less strategic and pragmatic fashion. The discussion will now turn to a discussion of the explicit results of this study.

**Analysing attempts to justify peacebuilding**

We shall now turn to the findings of the first research question and do so in relation to an analysis of attempts to justify engagement in peacebuilding. The question is *how, and in what ways, do South Africa and Russia justify their engagements in post-conflict societies?* This research question is explored on the basis of contextualized knowledge from the case studies, generated via official documents and interviews. As has been presented in previous chapters, the findings from the case studies are summarized in two typologies, one for each case. In the South African case, the typology consists of three parts: 1) Multilateralism, human rights and democracy; 2) African agenda and African solutions to African problems; and 3) South-South cooperation and solidarity. The typology developed on the case of Russia is somewhat different. This typology consists of: 1) International legal doctrines and principles; 2) Multilateral cooperation; and 3) Responsibility and expectations. These typologies make possible a discussion of similarities and differences between the justification strategies used in the two cases. The role of the case studies is here to contextualize and assess the applicability of Forst’s formal criteria. They show that moral dimensions of political arguments are present when South Africa and Russia try to justify their engagement in peacebuilding initiatives.

The typologies are built on justification strategies in which political and moral justification is used, stressing the moral dimension of the external states’ attempts to justify their engagement in peacebuilding initiatives. The justification strategies are, as are any arguments made in this setting, political in that they have political meaning and content. But, as has been demonstrated, there is also a dimension of morality present in these arguments. In my dissertation I have systematically searched for arguments of political and moral justification of peacebuilding engagements. I make the interpretation that a moral dimension is present in the attempts to justify engagement in peacebuilding.
If, however, morality is found in the justification strategies or the attempts to justify, can be discussed further. For example, different types of normative theories seem to be used in the discourse on engagement in peacebuilding. This diversity is in line with Reina Neufeldt’s discussion as presented in Chapter One. Neufeldt argues that deontological and utilitarian reasoning are the dominant approaches in debates on ethics of peacebuilding and her argument is that it is necessary to take a holistic approach which allows for input from other normative theories, such as care and virtue ethics. The findings and tentative conclusions of this dissertation support Neufeldt’s analyses that utilitarian and deontological ethics dominate not only the ethics of peacebuilding in general but also the arguments offered by particular states.

The holistic account could be seen as compelling and appealing in that it allows for the possibility of various normative accounts. However, this should be understood as eclectic rather than holistic. The risk of a holistic approach is that it provides, perhaps unintentionally, a basis for contradiction. This contradiction can result from the absence of the consistency and coherence that are crucial for normative analysis.

The arguments upon which the justification strategies are based have moral content. Yet they can be situated on different levels. Some of them – for example, international legal doctrines and responsibility and expectations, as in the Russian case – can be interpreted as having a more fundamental character, similar to principles. Multilateralism, as it is found in both cases, can be interpreted as having a procedural character since it refers to a mode of cooperation. Yet, it is important to remember that multilateralism in the materials is substantiated on the basis of moral reasoning. This moral reasoning is exemplified by how host states have a right to demand legitimate grounds for external engagement, as is the case with every other situation and for any other state. This reasoning is connected to justice and hence also to morality. “African solutions to African problems” and the “South-South dimension” are both based on a justice ideal and a quest for global justice.

In addition, the moral dimension in the arguments can be understood differently depending on the normative theory to which they speak. To give an example, multilateralism can be interpreted in a deontological way, focusing on the principle governing it. Yet, it could also be interpreted in autilitarian way, focusing on the consequences it can generate. As has been argued throughout this study, the deontological reasoning

645 Neufeldt 2014:12
seems most plausible and should be preferred in situations of conflicting ways of reasoning. Let us now look at the two case studies.

Differences and similarities of the typologies

The analysis and discussion of the cases as well as their typologies show that there are both differences and similarities in how these two states try to justify their engagement in peacebuilding. Both cases, for example, have indicated a recent broadening interest in peacebuilding and have elaborated on how this might affect the role of South Africa and Russia as peacebuilders. This makes it intriguing to compare the case studies of the countries’ respective peacebuilding approaches and justification strategies, even though this study is not explicitly comparative but instead comprises two case studies. An initial hypothesis was that there would be different ways to create legitimacy and different attempts to justify peace engagements in the different cases. This has shown to be the case, as is reflected in the findings summarized in the two typologies of justification strategies.

Another observation is that South Africa and Russia are both keen on referring to multilateralism. However, South Africa does this in a more nuanced manner than Russia: South Africa explicitly uses arguments about democracy and human rights, which Russia does not. The discussion of the findings in the typologies allow for a more dynamic understanding of the justificatory process of external engagement in peacebuilding. The point of similarity between how South Africa and Russia try to justify engagements in peacebuilding lies in their advocacy of peacebuilding via multilateral organisations. This is clear from both cases. However, in light of their different space for agency in different multilateral organisations, their ways of doing this differ. Russia has a special role in the UN as one of the permanent members of the UN Security Council, which puts Russian representatives in a good position to influence all UN decisions. How this has utilized is to some extent a different question. Yet, both have important roles in their regional environments. Russia primarily acts in the post-Soviet space via CIS and CSTO and to some extent the SCO, while South Africa plays important roles in SADC and the AU. This can be understood as indicating which actors or collectives South Africa and Russia see as important. An important difference is that Russia’s role in its region is much more sensitive and tenser than South Africa’s role on the African
continent. Yet, South Africa has been accused for being the big brother on the block, while on the other hand Russia by many is considered an imperial power with expansionist ambitions and visions. Importantly, the UN is of primary importance for both states.

The analysis of attempts to justify engagement in peacebuilding prompt further questions. For example, in order to try to justify an action, it seems reasonable to have an idea of what that action conceptually means. Here, that would be a question of the understanding of peacebuilding and, by extension, peace. This raises at least one additional question: what understanding of peace do South Africa and Russia have? As has been shown in the two preceding chapters, South Africa and Russia both seem to have a militarized understanding of peacebuilding albeit to a different degree. Russia’s discourse is more militarized than South Africa’s, even if both states directly or indirectly emphasize the military aspects. In the Russian case, most activities fall under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Defence, while in the South African case most peacebuilding efforts are governed by the Department of International Relations and Cooperation. That finding indicates a symbolically important difference, since the activities of a foreign ministry are typically not military whereas the activities of a ministry of defence are by definition military. Furthermore, since the South African Ministry of Foreign Affairs made a point of changing its name to DIRCO (Department of International Relations and Cooperation), this takes the South African discourse even further away from the military. Yet, an important detail in this regard is that the majority of South African personnel seconded to peace missions are still military, or at least uniformed, staff.646

Non-interference is important to both states, as it would be to most, given the importance of this principle in international law and international relations. Yet Russia emphasizes it more explicitly than South Africa. That it is more explicit in the Russian case can be explained in the Russian adherence to a more militarized discourse.

The vision of peace and peacebuilding provided by the states’ justificatory attempts is a peaceful and stable world. This is idealistically
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646 In July 2018, South Africa seconded 51 police officers, 15 UNMEM (United Nations Military Experts on Mission), 1152 troops, and 18 staff officers to ongoing UN missions. Source: Contributors to UN Peacekeeping Operations by Country and Post, Police, UN Military Experts on Mission, Staff Officers and Troop
portrayed whereas both states and their international relations are governed by more material factors. Additionally, there seem to be differences in what this vision entails between the cases. Yet, based on the material, it is not possible to find any nuances within the cases when it comes to different audiences. Hence, they, rather unsurprisingly, seem not to offer different visions of peace to different audiences. Therefore, their understanding of peacebuilding seems to be contextually bound and does not seem to differ in relation to audience. This conclusion is only tentative since it would require a different type of material and full examination in a different type of study.

Peacebuilding is an academically and politically constructed concept, far more nuanced and complex in the literature than is implied by the states’ foreign policy documents. These documents are of an official and general character in which one might expect some overarching conceptual discussion. A brief conceptual discussion is given in both cases but is most developed in the South African case. My interpretation is that peacebuilding is not used or referred to as distinctly as I had expected. This applies for both South Africa and Russia. Yet, it can also be explained by the official character of my material.

In the Russian case, the justificatory attempts seem to be based on the governmental structure as well as the discourse, both in the documents and among experts. As discussed above, most of the initiatives in Russia are governed and led by the Ministry of Defence, which is in itself an indication of a militarized understanding. This might have potential implications for the justificatory attempts provided for engagement in peacebuilding. For example, it implies that the engagements are carried out by military means. On the other hand, perhaps the Ministry of Defence also works with measures towards positive peace, but this is not clear from the material. This dependency on governmental structures was not unexpected in the Russian case but is more surprising in the South African rhetoric. Russia tends to understand peace as stability, which can be interpreted as an understanding of peace as negative peace, as the absence of violence. South Africa’s understanding of peace is shifting more towards positive peace, embracing and emphasizing development and prosperity to a larger extent. Another but related question concerns what kind of peace Russia and South Africa support. Based on the analysis of their justificatory attempts, it is clear
that South Africa prioritizes human rights promotion and democratization to a far greater extent than Russia does. Russian representatives, for example, emphasize that Russia prefers to defend the status quo.

**The role of sovereignty and soft power**

For both Russia and South Africa, the notion of sovereignty is – as for any state - utterly central. This seems to be the case both on the level of principle as well as conceptually. But how should this be understood in the context of South Africa and Russia respectively? In what way is sovereignty important? Sovereignty has an overarching importance for understanding how the international community is organized since it governs relations between states. Sovereignty can also be seen as connected to the issue of national interest and national security. Taking the position of a descriptive realist but normative non-realist, this study recognizes the anarchic structure of international relations. Yet, the non-realist normative position opens the possibility for acknowledging the moral aspects in the relations between states. Sovereignty is to some extent what governs national interest in that it separates states from each other. This makes it reasonable for states to view sovereignty as utterly central: their existence is dependent on that very principle. Sovereignty is therefore also of importance for the understanding of peace since this is one of the principles that governs international relations and aims, historically speaking, at peaceful coexistence.

Further, Russia’s and South Africa’s understanding of sovereignty seem to be a combination of the different forms of sovereignty as were discussed in Chapter Two. Krasner’s types, *international legal sovereignty, Westphalian sovereignty, domestic sovereignty* as well as *interdependence sovereignty* all seem to be of relevance in the states’ understanding of the principle.647 Yet, they seem to be important in different ways. In relation to involvement of peacebuilding, it seems like Westphalian sovereignty is of primary importance, as it is this type that creates the need for justification in the first place. It refers, in the words of Krasner, to a political organization based on the exclusion of external actors from authority structures within a given territory. However, when it comes to the justificatory attempts of their peacebuilding involvements, it is rather international legal sovereignty that seems most important. This form is associated with mutual recognition, which seems
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647 Krasner 1999:3-4
similar to Forst’s criteria of reciprocity and to some extent also generality. The last two forms of sovereignty, domestic and interdependence, seems to be least connected to external states involvement in peacebuilding initiatives. These rather seem connected to the internal aspects of the state, which, on the other hand, external states to some extent is a part of when it comes to peacebuilding according to the notion of proxy agency.

Forst seems to accommodate a position of moral cosmopolitanism although also acknowledging the importance of states and state sovereignty. As mentioned in Chapter Five, Forst takes the view that states are necessary for upholding the system and that a central part of this is sovereignty. His position can be summarized as one of transnationalism in which the right to justification is a central part. Forst also offers a discussion on peace and, as demonstrated in Chapter Three, views peace as a value and justice as a principle. This implies that justice provide means of which we could judge peace, as well as determine what kind of peace we should strive for.648

Generally, it seems as if the principle of sovereignty has developed from a strong categorical principle towards a conditional, weaker one during the last decades, allowing for a more flexible interpretation of the principle. This is also reflected in the development of peacebuilding. The principle form of sovereignty allows only limited action by external actors in host countries. This is closely related to the principle of non-intervention. Peacebuilding can still take place on the basis of invitation from the host state. The conditional form of sovereignty is more flexible regarding what states can do within other states’ territory. It is on this spectrum, ranging from the principle form of sovereignty and non-intervention to the conditional form of sovereignty that options such as humanitarian intervention and the principle of “Responsibility to Protect” (R2P) have developed. Importantly these are not issues of peacebuilding, as demonstrated in the conceptual discussion in Chapter Two. Peacebuilding is different from both humanitarian intervention and R2P. Yet, the development of the principle of sovereignty potentially also affects attitudes towards peacebuilding. This makes the principle of sovereignty of importance for peacebuilding as well as in relation to attempts to justify engagement in peacebuilding.

648 Forst 2014b:73
It is also of central importance in relation to international law. Russia, for example, explicitly refers to international law, of which the principle of sovereignty is a cornerstone. This seems to be done in a way that indicates that all states are subject to international law and that they should all respect it. On the other hand, this could also be interpreted as another ambivalence in the Russian case. Russia seems to ignore international law when it suits itself but they are steadfast defenders of sovereignty and non-intervention when it concerns themselves and their allies. Another way of interpreting the continuous references to international law might be that it raises the point that both Russia and South Africa in their historic situations are creating their identity in their foreign policy. By referencing international law, it creates a frame for its foreign policy as well as peacebuilding engagements.

What makes sovereignty of additional importance in relation to attempts to justify engagement in peacebuilding is that findings from the analyses indicate that sovereignty plays an important role in the discourse on peacebuilding. This is particularly visible in the case study on Russia. The aim of the principle of sovereignty is to create equality among states, however, it is known that material factors interfere in this principal equality. The principle of sovereignty also seems to be used as a way of addressing justice, which adds to the moral dimension of arguments that make use of sovereignty.

An additional aspect that is of crucial importance in peacebuilding is power, this relates to both soft and hard power. Arguably, peacebuilding can be understood as a kind of soft power. Scholars such as Goetze argue that peacebuilding is a globalisation process, of which power is of central importance. This seems as a possible conclusion on the basis of the case studies, yet it is more distinct in the Russian case. Peacebuilding as soft power is particularly emphasized in my interview material. One finding from the analysis of the case studies which also has relevance for the role of soft power is that Russia more often seems to react to different things in relation to engagement in peacebuilding. South Africa instead approaches its engagement in peacebuilding with a deliberate strategy. South Africa also reacts but more often seems to act.
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649 Goetze 2017:1ff Yet, Goetze’s definition of power is different than for example Forst’s. She states that power is about the quality of social relations, and not only about material but also social and ideational factors. (p.7). This relational aspect, however, have some resemblance to Forst’s definition or power.
One discussion that seems to be of importance in relation to soft power and the case studies’ position is connected to their attitude towards their own responsibility as regards peacebuilding. Responsibility in peacebuilding seems to be a factor in both cases. In Russia, this is used as an explicit justification strategy. In South Africa, much of the reasoning after apartheid has been related to an ambition of creating an image of being a reasonable and responsible partner. Importantly, when the reasoning turns into a question of nation-branding, it is no longer an issue of justification since this is not related to justice. One example of this, which has been referred to several times, is the symbolism of “showing the flag”, as was highlighted in the Russian case. The image of a country can be of importance for various reasons, but it is not central for assessing justification or justificatory attempts.

Let us now summarise the answers to the first research question. The typologies show how South Africa and Russia are using justification strategies trying to justify their involvement in peacebuilding. By taking this question one step further, the similarities and differences between the two cases have been discussed. As has been shown there are several similarities as well as differences between the Russian and South African attempts to justify their involvement in peacebuilding. The main similarities are that both countries are paying great respect to the importance of multilateralism, they also have a militarized discourse on peacebuilding, and emphasize non-intervention and sovereignty as crucial. They also seem to share the vision of a peaceful and stable world, but they have slightly different approaches on how to get there. Both countries seem to have a contextually bound understanding of peacebuilding, and they are both heavily dependent on governmental structures in their approach to peacebuilding, which does not come as a surprise.

There are also several differences. These are primarily visible once it comes to Russia’s and South Africa’s approaches of handling the above-mentioned similarities. Russia and South Africa have different ways of referring to multilateralism, for example, but both of them seem to be doing it in a way aiming for increased legitimacy.
The applicability of reciprocity and generality

Let us now turn to the second research question, which is mostly related to the applicability of Rainer Forst’s formal criteria of reciprocity and generality. Forst’s theory of justification constitutes the main starting point for this dissertation’s theoretical discussion, and the application of his concepts of reciprocity and generality builds on the conceptualisation of peacebuilding as offered in Chapter Two.

The second research question is how are justificatory attempts of peacebuilding to be assessed? The Forstian formal criteria of reciprocity and generality seem to be of crucial importance when analysing the justification strategies which states use in attempts to justify their engagements in peacebuilding. The applicability of reciprocity and generality has been briefly discussed in Chapters Five and Six, but this chapter will analyse and discuss the applicability of these criteria more systematically. Therefore, the following section will discuss potential conclusions of what reciprocity and generality mean, contextually and in relation to the cases. Importantly, the fulfilment of and demand for reciprocity and generality is not something which can be answered in a simple yes or no. Rather, it seems to be a matter of the ways in which an argument can be seen as reciprocal or general.

This study has shown that both South Africa and Russia are working and acting within the paradigm of providing reasons for their engagements. They are trying to justify their actions with regard to peacebuilding. This is important for several reasons. First of all, this study demonstrates that morality has a role to play and that attempts at moral justification are present when actors try to justify, or legitimize, external states’ engagements in peacebuilding. Second, if something is said or stated, it activates responsibility aspects. Once an argument is articulated, the person or entity stating it can be held accountable. This is important because it indicates that arguments presented in a rhetorical foreign policy setting can and should be assessed on the basis of responsibility and accountability. Hence, the fact of the arguments having been articulated provides an opportunity to assess the practices of the states critically.

However, there are a few challenges for the Forstian model. These became clear in light of the contextual application of the criteria for states’ attempts to justify their engagement in peacebuilding. One of these challenges is related to who the receiver is or, in Forstian terms, who those concerned of the arguments, are. This is connected to the
availability of the arguments and hence their generality. If generality is interpreted as meaning that the arguments are equally accessible and acceptable to everyone, it places a very high demand on the arguments. Yet, in Forst’s model generality should govern “all those affected”, and, since this is narrower than “all”, it places fewer demands on the arguments. The arguments found in the foreign policy discourses are, however, general in the sense that they are accessible for others, but it is not completely clear whether they are available to those concerned. Furthermore, who these others or concerned are is not clear. Perhaps a modified interpretation might be that the arguments should be equally accessible for other actors – in this case, states – in a similar position. Here, the position could be based not only on power. Yet, since the arguments in the foreign policy discourse on peacebuilding have been identified and are researchable, this indicates that they are accessible to people outside the context. This is, however, not per se the same as saying that they are accessible and acceptable to all concerned. Nonetheless, if we are to understand the arguments as being assessed on the basis of their acceptability and accessibility to other states in a similar position, it seems more reasonable to assess their degree of generality.

Generality can perhaps also be understood depending on whether the audiences are national or international. On a national level, this seems to be a question of equality among citizens as well as their opportunities for accessing and accepting the arguments in a comprehensible way. Ultimately, arguments should be comprehensible to a rational person and hence accessible and acceptable. In an international setting, this becomes a question of agency and equality among states. This is where the principle of sovereignty plays an important role in providing a standard for all sovereign states. Yet, the principle of sovereignty aims at harmonising the asymmetrical power relations between states. It is a principle that provides equal opportunity for states to view each other as equally sovereign. But this balance of power does not succeed in practice. In this sense, sovereignty can be understood as a necessary baseline tool for assessing states’ arguments towards each other. This requires then that states respect the principle of sovereignty. The discussion will now continue by focusing on the criterion of reciprocity in the context of states’ attempts to justify their engagement in peacebuilding.

Reciprocity in the context of justification and attempts to justify engagement in peacebuilding is here understood as taking place when a
state assumes that it reciprocally has to justify its claims, arguments, and actions towards other states and that it expects other states to justify their claims, arguments and actions in return. As highlighted in Chapter Five, South African foreign policy is officially guided by the notion of *Ubuntu*. The general relevance of the notion in South African foreign policy also makes it important for understanding South African engagement in peacebuilding. It seems useful to understand *Ubuntu* in relation to reciprocity, since it is understood as a way of recognizing and respecting the other. Reciprocity is about recognizing the importance of providing and expecting accessible and acceptable arguments, and this likely relies on the aspects of mutuality inherent in *Ubuntu*. Given that *Ubuntu* guides South African foreign policy it seems possible to assume that the arguments provided will likely be encountered in other states’ foreign policy on engagement in peacebuilding, if they are reciprocal. A possible interpretation could be that given the role of *Ubuntu* in South African foreign policy, it would increase the probability of finding stronger support for reciprocity in South African foreign policy in general, as well as on peacebuilding.

The Russian approach towards providing arguments for trying to justify their engagement in peacebuilding seems to be more ambivalent. This may be an indication of the identity creating phase as referred to in Chapters One and Four, but it could also be an indication that Russian decision-makers do not yet have a clear strategy for how to prioritize issues with regard to peacebuilding. Importantly, identity politics is difficult to do in a reciprocal way as it, in its essence, is subjective.

Due, however, to Russian state representatives also providing arguments to justify engagement in peacebuilding, despite the militarized discourse, this indicates that they expect other states to do the same, i.e. some level of reciprocity. A militarized discourse can be connected to an understanding of peace missions as being primarily a question of peace enforcement and peacekeeping. In both cases, the military is involved. Nonetheless, the Russian discourse on peacebuilding seems to be more militarised than the South African, as presented above. Additionally, Russia seems to associate peace missions with peace enforcement, peacemaking and to some extent peacekeeping. These generations of peace missions are all mostly connected to negative peace. In the South African case, the nuances of the different generations of peace missions seem to be more explicit. In addition, peacebuilding has a more prominent role in the South African material.
To summarize, my interpretation, based on the second research question, is that Forst’s criteria of reciprocity and generality are applicable in analyses of states’ foreign policy discourses on peacebuilding. However, his criteria need some modification. What has become clear throughout this study is that they should also be supplemented by additional conditions so as to enable greater intercontextual applicability.

A justificatory order of peacebuilding

Let us now turn to the third and final research question of this dissertation which is what are reasonable criteria for justified peacebuilding? Although, based on the model I suggest, the question should rather be reformulated as what are the criterion and conditions for justified peacebuilding? The answer to this question offers a modification of Forst’s criteria, as well as a set of more practical conditions.

In keeping with Forst’s reasoning about what makes humans human, which was presented at the beginning of Chapter Three, the political nature of human beings is understood as a social context that entails norms and institutions, which regulate human coexistence. The justificatory order consists of the norms and institutions that govern both cooperation and conflictual coexistence. One question raised by Forst’s discussion of justificatory orders and the application of the concept of peacebuilding is: how might a model for a justificatory order for peacebuilding be constructed? This formulation is different from the research questions in the introductory chapter but builds on the third and final research question: what are the criteria for justified peacebuilding? This criterion and these conditions, I propose, can be understood as having the structure of a model for a justificatory order for peacebuilding.

With regard to a justificatory order of peacebuilding engagements, the baseline is that the arguments should be reciprocal and general. This involves a certain degree of mutual acknowledgement and recognition of the need for justification and justificatory arguments. This can be formulated and understood as the right to justification as well as a duty in Forstian terms. In the case of states, it is then a question of both a right and a duty.

One way of talking about a justificatory order is to formulate certain normative conditions for what such an order should contain. These normative conditions can be understood as the frames or frameworks for a
reasonable justificatory order of peacebuilding engagements. I propose one criterion and six conditions for formulating a justificatory order for engagement in peacebuilding initiatives. It is reasonable to ask why the criterion and conditions I am suggesting are needed as there are attempts of articulating post-conflict-relevant criteria within the tradition of *jus post bellum*. As shown in Chapter Two, the existing *post bellum*-criteria are wider in their scope and does not explicitly enough address the role and ethics of external actors in post-conflict processes. My suggestion is different from the just war criteria discussed in previous chapters in several ways. For example, the just war and *post bellum*-criteria focus on the conditions under which it is justified to go to war or under which wars are to be fought. Yet, scholars working on *jus post bellum* are, as discussed in Chapter Two, address the conditions for justice after war. However, they do not address the question of justification of external peacebuilding in a contextual setting. Therefore, I interpret a need to develop criteria that are sensitive to contextual knowledge as well as power, to achieve reasonable justification of external peacebuilding initiatives. Next section will explore this model.

Criterion and conditions for justified externality

A reasonable justificatory order should allow for a set of conceptual conditions to be met. These are suggested as one criterion, mutual acknowledgement, and six different conditions for political justification of peacebuilding by external states. These six conditions are articulated as follows; 1) focus on positive peace; 2) aiming for rebuilding institutional capacity; 3) inter-contextual sensitivity; 4) transparency, relationality and rationality; 5) beyond national interest; and 6) formulated in non-geopolitical terms. These are different in character, which allows for a potential hierarchy between them. They also allow for an assessment of reciprocity and generality to different degrees. The first part of the model functions as an overarching moral criterion. This initial criterion focuses on mutual acknowledgement, which is a development and modification of Forst’s criteria. The following six conditions build on this first criterion but propose conditions for reasonable and tenable moral and political justification. These need to be discussed more in depth, starting with the criterion of mutual acknowledgement.
One criterion for justified peacebuilding

The criterion of mutual acknowledgement of the need for reasonable arguments is a modification that is based on Forst’s principles of reciprocity and generality, which in turn is another way of framing Kant’s categorical imperative. The modified criterion is based on two steps. Firstly, it is directed towards states’ attitudes to providing arguments as justificatory attempts. This implies that the state representatives are not only providing arguments but they are doing it in a way that is reciprocal and general. Secondly, this modified criterion is also based on the view that states are aware of the need for the arguments which aim for reciprocity and generality. In addition, they take this need seriously. This implies that the arguments are articulated in a context for justification and that they strive towards the ideal of justification. This is based on a possibility of assessing the arguments degree of reciprocity and generality, but adds further emphasis on the aspects of collaboration in peacebuilding. The reason for modifying Forst’s formal criteria is to better adapt them to a context for states’ moral and political justifications of peacebuilding involvements.

Importantly, mutual acknowledgement should not be confused with consensus with regard to justificatory reasons. For Forst, consensus is not a condition for justification, but reciprocity and generality are. Such reasoning should not be confused with the Hegelian idea of recognition but is instead closely connected to the Forstian model. Importantly, consent and consensus are not the same thing here. Consent is here understood as a positive affirmation that external states’ support is also welcomed and supported though local structures. In that sense, consent addresses dimensions of local ownership and places further emphasis on the crucial importance of local actors. In other words, the host state can invite external states to become engaged in the host state’s peacebuilding process; this signals their consent to the act of becoming involved. It does not say anything about consent to the justificatory reasons provided by the external state, which are expected whether or not the peacebuilding initiative takes place following an invitation. Perhaps it is reasonable not to have such high expectations about attempts to justify when the engagement occurs following an invitation, but this does not reduce the expectation of an actor to provide reciprocal and general arguments.

Where this criterion builds on Forst’s reasoning explicitly, the following six conditions are implicitly connected to Forst and his theory
of justification. One of the findings in this study indicates that Forst’s criteria are important but insufficient for evaluating external states’ justification of peacebuilding engagements. Therefore, the six conditions are proposed as additional supplements, as conditions for political and moral justification which modify the theory to better fit the peacebuilding context. Forst’s formal principles offer the starting point for a moral framework for analysing justificatory attempts of peacebuilding engagements, which is of central importance for analysing external agency in peacebuilding. Yet, as has been indicated through the analyses, Forst’s theory does not help us enough regarding the contexts. He refers to justification narratives, contexts of justification, and orders of justification, but these are placed on a theoretical level. Forst argues that the principle of justification, building on reciprocity and generality, must be applied differently in different contexts of justification. This is not only an application of the principle, but an interpretation and recursive reconstruction of the validity claims raised by each justificatory context.650

Forst’s discussion of orders of justification and normative orders is related to his understanding of contexts of justification. When applying his theory of justification to external actors’ justificatory attempts with regard to their own engagement in peacebuilding initiatives, a possible interpretation is that the global community of states, led by the UN, offers an example of a context of justification. Here, states provide arguments to each other. Some of these are attempts to justify certain actions, for which reason they should be assessed based on the criteria of reciprocity and generality. By elaborating on the applicability of contexts of justification, and by further relating it to the justificatory attempts, which external states provide in their foreign policy, both South Africa and Russia can arguably also be interpreted as contexts of justification. However, this seems to depend on whom the state is directing its arguments towards. It seems reasonable so long as the arguments the states provide are directed towards their own citizens. Once the arguments are provided outside of the state, the context of justification would seem to be larger than the state. Yet, there is an important nuance here between the global conversation and the conversation within different states. One suggestion is to view states, in this case South Africa and Russia, as sub-contexts of justification. This makes clear the distinction between the two levels of justificatory contexts. The division

650 Erman 2012:1
makes the two levels connected but also separated, just as states are
discrete entities, which collectively make up the global community.

In regards to Forst’s discussion of justification narratives, he clarifies
that humans are situated in a spatio-temporal context of interrelated
meanings. This also holds true for the arguments of states and state rep-
resentatives that this study is examining. This is important for several
reasons. It clearly situates the arguments in a particular context. This
context is governed by its history as well as its contemporary surround-
ings. That ties the arguments and the actors providing them in the case
studies to the context in which they are constructed and situated. The
global context is also present in the particular case studies since the
states affect and are affected by global events and developments.

Within external states’ justification of peacebuilding, the justifica-
tory arguments should be presented in a generalizable way. This needs
to be taken seriously as should the reciprocal dimensions. These dimen-
sions add to the aspects of just and justified circumstances for engaging
external state actors, as well as for external state actors to get involved.
In addition, in a justificatory order of peacebuilding, there is a need to
create room and space for the necessary measures, i.e. create room for
agency.

Six conditions for justified peacebuilding

The first condition for justified peacebuilding addresses the kind of
peace that the external state is focusing on. In the conceptual discussion
of peace and peacebuilding in Chapter Two, it became clear that posi-
tive peace tends to reduce the probability of a relapse of violence. This
is the main reason for having a condition focusing on the kind of peace
being promoted. This could be interpreted as a utilitarian argument, but
I would still stress the principal focus on positive peace. Positive or
qualitative peace focuses on the long-term effects of peacebuilding, ad-
dressing the root causes of the organised violence and addressing issues
such as justice, reconciliation, and rectification. There is a fine line be-
tween suggesting a specific kind of peace on the one hand, and accounts
of paternalism on the other. Yet, the concept of positive peace and the
more recent concept of quality peace have arguably determined some
context-specific variations.

The second condition is connected to the first. By focusing on posi-
tive or qualitative peace, actors usually become engaged in rebuilding
institutional capacity. This may imply a particular understanding of
what type of government is governing the post-conflict state since it can be argued that this criterion inherits a democratic component. For reasons of reciprocity and generality, democracy helps to facilitate the possibility of portraying arguments in a reciprocal and general way.

It is challenging to formulate general conditions that have relevance for highly context-specific measures and engagements. In order to do so, justificatory attempts need to address inter-contextual sensitivity, which is the third condition. This implies an ability to adapt to the specific context and the contextual circumstances with knowledge, tact, and delicacy. This can be further elaborated with regard to the timing of when justificatory arguments are provided as well as how specific they are. In this study, the arguments are primarily studied as guidelines governing actions before they take place. This follows the deontological Kantian tradition, which this study takes as point of departure. As stressed earlier, consequentialist reasoning is hard to assess from the outset since you simply do not know how the consequences of the actions will play out. Therefore, principles governing actions beforehand therefore offer a better way of assessing moral arguments. When it comes to how specific the arguments are, this study is searching for arguments that govern more than one context. The character of the South African and Russian official documents is not case specific. For example, an argument in South African foreign policy on engagement in peacebuilding is not directly levelled at an initiative which is supposed to take place in Bujumbura, the capital of Burundi. It is, rather, an argument governing all South Africa’s peacebuilding efforts. These specific arguments can potentially be found in documents that are usually classified. On the other hand, the purpose of this study is to assess the general justification strategies.

However, the example of specific strategies with regard to certain host states is of interest for the criterion of generality since these also put higher demands on the arguments being accessible and acceptable to those affected in the host country. The general character of the arguments used in the justification strategies makes it possible to explore states in similar positions as receivers of the arguments, as discussed above. An additional factor in relation to inter-contextual sensitivity is the vital need for critical reflection and source criticism. In politically sensitive milieus there seems to be a higher risk for misleading knowledge and propaganda. No less important in all peacebuilding contexts, however, is that there is usually more than only one story. The
power asymmetry between internal and external actors in peacebuilding is one of the key reasons to why justification and justificatory attempts of engagement in peacebuilding is needed.

The fourth condition is based on the fact that justificatory attempts and justification should be done in a transparent, relational, and rational manner, where justificatory reasons are both given and received. This is connected to reciprocity but differs in being more focused on the actual possibilities of formulating justificatory attempts and practical aspects of sharing them. The condition can be assessed on the basis of a modified version of reciprocity and has similarities to the criterion of mutual acknowledgement. Yet, it is different in that it focuses on the context of the arguments, rather than the argument in itself. The modified version of reciprocity means that the context allows for this kind of arguments, and it assumes that others in similar positions are also in surroundings that have a similarly flexible structure. The first criterion is primarily normative, while this condition is primarily procedural.

A fifth condition is based on a postulation that justificatory attempts of engagement in peacebuilding is a question that is not only about national interest, but also about sufficient decency. National interests needs to be compatible with legitimate and morally defensible politics. In general, foreign policy is primarily centred on national interest and formulated in terms that recognize and strengthen the preferred understanding of national interest. However, peacebuilding is primarily centred on supporting states that have experienced civil war. This is often related to issues of national interest for the countries engaged in peacebuilding, that is, as an incentive for getting engaged. For example, the South African urge to have stability at their borders, could be understandable to maintain domestic law and order. Nonetheless, this is not a sufficient argument for getting engaged in peacebuilding in neighbouring states. This has to do with both reciprocity and generality. Even if national interest as a concept can be understood as having implications for the reciprocity between states, the very nature of national interest makes it dependent on the particularities of the state that articulates it. There might well be similarities in how states prioritize in relation to their national interest, but it seems far-fetched to assume that national interest is articulated in a reciprocal way: its very nature is to protect the state rather than accommodating collaboration between states. Even so, these can overlap.
In addition, the sixth proposed condition is a geopolitical one. This implies that justification should be made in non-geopolitical terms. Arguments articulated in geopolitical terms seem difficult to assess on the basis of reciprocity and generality since they are constructed in the middle of power asymmetries. These power asymmetries potentially lead to domination by the most influential power, making it impossible to combine with a Forstian theory of justice. To some extent, this can seem contradictory to condition number three. The difference is that the character of the arguments, whether inter-contextual sensitivity or sensitivity to context-specific measures, does not inherent a power asymmetry in the way geopolitical interests do. This means that it should be governed by non-territorial interests; an ideal justificatory order for peacebuilding initiatives recognizes the need for peace engagement in a way that is not formulated in geopolitical terms. 651 This is not to say that geopolitics are unimportant for the justification of peacebuilding, but that peacebuilding should be governed by reasonable conditions for success rather than by the national interests of the external actors. In the South African case, it was clear that the agenda primarily has been focused on the African continent. Yet, this has rather been portrayed in terms of capacity as well as historical and personal ties, rather than arguments of national interest. This is not to say that national interest and geopolitics does not matter in the South African case, but it indicates that there are different ways of framing arguments for justification of involvement. I argue that arguments formulated in geopolitical terms tend to be less adequate than those which are not, not least in moral terms. Geopolitics often ties into issues of national interest, putting peacebuilding engagements into close proximity to the external state complex. 652

The criterion and different conditions can be understood as addressing different parts of the peacebuilding process, but they are also intertwined. As previously mentioned, mutual acknowledgement is to be seen as setting the moral framework for justification of external states in peacebuilding. The first condition, focus on positive peace, tends to be content-related, addressing the kind of peace that is the goal of the actors. The second condition addresses a condition related to purpose,
aiming for rebuilding institutional capacity. These two can be understood as conceptual conditions. The following conditions, i.e. inter-contextual sensitivity, transparency, relationality and rationality, beyond national interest, and formulated in non-geopolitical terms, are instead process-related conditions that are more focused on the practical aspects of how to justify, or how to try to justify, external states’ engagement in peacebuilding.

The criterion and conditions can be used as critical tools to assess and evaluate external states’ attempts to justify their engagement in peacebuilding processes. To some extent, they take the findings of this study a step further by enabling analyses of specific peacebuilding engagements in particular contexts. It can be a challenge to discuss to what extent we can know whether the criterion and conditions have been met in a context for peacebuilding engagement. It is possible that we cannot know the answer to all of them. This makes it more reasonable to focus on the extent to which they have been met, even if that also requires a certain amount of accessible information. If applied to a specific peacebuilding engagement in a particular context, access to material becomes of crucial importance for making an adequate analysis. Yet, what implications do the suggested criterion and conditions have for our understanding of the justificatory order of peacebuilding? This is a tentative line of reasoning, but it seems plausible to continue developing it by testing it on context-specific cases.

It may be reasonable to suggest that there is a hierarchy between the criterion and the conditions, which makes some more important than others. As I have indicated above, both the criterion and the conditions are different in character. The criterion is situated at a higher level than the conditions, which tend to be more pragmatic. Yet, the Forstian formal criteria function as an overarching guide for all of the suggestions I am making here.

Moral and ethical principles of peacebuilding

The discussion has now returned to the research questions of this study, but there is one aspect that needs further attention. This concerns the role of ethics and morality in foreign policy in general and peacebuilding involvement in particular.
Besides the justification strategies already identified within the peacebuilding discourse, the ethical principles which figure as underlying guidelines that have been identified in this study are the principles of human dignity, solidarity, sustainability, empathy, need, do no harm, care, respect, and a quest for global justice. This is yet another example of different types of normative theories being present in moral reasoning. The question is how these should be understood. Importantly, it is necessary to clarify that there is a combination of different normative theories. Some, such as the focus on need, do no harm, and care could be seen as utilitarian, while human dignity inherits a classical Kantian approach. For the sake of consistency, the Kantian deontological approach is the one adopted here, following as it does the logic of the study.

Some of these principles, approaches, and conditions are present in both the official documents and the material from the interviews, including solidarity, sustainability, human dignity, respect, and the quest for global justice. These could be seen as normative or ethical principles, while the others, such as empathy, need, do no harm and care are rather practical principles, approaches, or conditions. One way of systematically organising them is to assess them based on whether they are referring to either, 1) motive (for example need), 2) an approach or a particular way of acting (for example, do no harm, or empathy), or 3) as a goal or aim (for example respecting human dignity).

The principles, approaches, and conditions are directly or indirectly mentioned in the interviews or interpreted on the basis of the literature review of the ethics of peacebuilding. These principles, approaches, or conditions have both descriptive and normative content and can be assigned to different levels. Some are normative, others descriptive, and yet others are pragmatic.

The principles, approaches, or conditions are all deep and multifaceted and cover an array of nuances, but within the context of external states engagement in peacebuilding there is a reasonable connection to each principle. These principles are derived from the case studies and form the conceptual discussion of peacebuilding, and it is clear that there are different types of normative theories built into these concepts. Some have utilitarian tendencies while others have Kantian. This shows, in addition, the diversity of normative approaches utilised in foreign policy and peacebuilding. Human dignity is central for all human beings’ equal value and respect, one of the purest principles connected
to human rights. Solidarity is the communitarian ideal of people caring for each other solely on the grounds of being humans. Solidarity is related to empathy. Showing empathy does not have to be expressed between individuals but can have a more communitarian note. An important difference between solidarity and empathy is that solidarity always has an in-built equality component in all concepts derived from the principle.

In the context of externality in peace initiatives, the idea of need is connected to the idea of basic needs and is, in some sense, about a basic service provider or a provider of the framework setting up basic service provision. Within a peacebuilding context, this is often the role of a peacebuilding mission. In addition, the principle of do no harm is essential for external actors in peacebuilding processes in general and in basic service provision in particular. This fragile situation is not able to cover for potential mistakes, and all external initiatives must be guided by the principle of do no harm in order to not spark a return to violence. There is an obvious need to be aware of the local contexts in the peace process, especially in order to avoid unwanted and unforeseen consequences.

Other important principles that have figured as generators for justification strategies include the notion of respect and the quest for global justice. Respect figures in several shapes and concerns gaining respect as a responsible actor in both domestic and international settings. The reasoning around global justice is both with representation as well as with asymmetrical power structures that are inherent in the concept of external states’ engagement with peacebuilding.

Concluding remarks

It is important to study international political collective agency in relation to peacebuilding in order to improve contemporary peacebuilding activities and create better conditions for sustainable peace. External actors, not the least states, play a prominent role in peacebuilding processes. This study of the justification of external international political collective agency develops and improves existing theories of justification. It contributes to the articulation of an ideal peacebuilding strategy but is developed with the cases in mind. Hence, this study contributes to different fields by combining them. It develops justification theory
by working with empirical cases and develops empirically driven re-
search by working with ethics and normative dimensions.

I have based the development of this study’s theoretical approach
upon the findings of the case studies. In this sense, the case studies have
illustrated how Forst’s two formal criteria reciprocity and generality can
be interpreted in specific contexts for the purposes of political reasoning
and action. This theoretical reconstruction has been developed through
an assessment of the applicability of the Forstian criteria to external
states’ attempts to justify their engagement in peacebuilding initiatives.
Since Forst’s criteria seem to have the potential for contextualization,
these have been tested via the case studies of South Africa and Russia.
Context-based analyses have shown that the criteria of reciprocity and
generality are of importance when assessing states’ attempts to justify
their engagement in peacebuilding. However, they are not sufficient and
need modification and supplementation. This is what I have offered in
the modified criterion of mutual acknowledgement and the six condi-
tions for political justification of peacebuilding by external states, as
presented above.

This is a dissertation in ethics, and the study seeks to contribute to
the discipline in several ways. First, given the suggestion of part of a
theory of a justificatory order of peacebuilding, the criterion of mutual
acknowledgement can be regarded as a primarily moral, but also as pro-
cedural to some extent, by virtue of the central importance of its impli-
cations for ethical analysis. It is also clear that Forst’s formal criteria of
reciprocity and generality, though important, are insufficient when an-
alysing contextual and situated attempts to justify the political actions
of peacebuilding engagements.

I have examined how critical theory can be utilized as a critical tool
for studying attempts to justify external state engagements in peace-
building initiatives. I have shown that Forst’s theory is insufficient
when it comes to analysing external states’ attempts to justify peace-
building and I develop Forst’s theory by articulating new conditions for
political justification. The tentative conclusions of this study offer tools
for critical ethical analysis by modifying reciprocity and generality and
by suggesting an additional criterion as well as six conditions. This is
intended as a contribution to the development of critical theory in the
Kantian tradition.

As with all theories, as well as all studies, there is room for critique
and critical questioning. This is also one of the points of departure for
this study, that critique and critical theory help us develop our understanding and interpretation of the world. Yet, this study is an attempt to advance our understanding of the justificatory order of peacebuilding by suggesting a modified criterion and the six conditions. As demonstrated in Chapter Two, there are already attempts to formulate criteria for *jus post bellum*. However, these differ in several regards. First, the criterion and conditions which I have proposed are explicitly focused on external actors’ engagements in peacebuilding processes, while the suggested *jus post bellum* principles are broader in scope in that they address both internal and external actors.

How, then, can peacebuilding be justified? As this study has shown, states make use of different ways of trying to justify their involvement in peacebuilding. This is exemplified by references to international legal frameworks, as well as multilateralism as the preferred way of addressing the issue of peacebuilding. This shows that states are trying to justify their engagement in peacebuilding processes abroad. However, the cases also show that there are different interpretations of what peace and peacebuilding is. In addition, this addresses the rhetorical level, and the analysis does not cover the potential implications or implementation of the justificatory attempts in the states foreign policy and peacebuilding practice. Further, the cases studied make use of moral and political justification when seeking to justify their engagements in peacebuilding activities in other states. This shows that morality has a role to play in foreign policy discourse in the two case studies, as there is a clear moral dimension in these arguments. Since ethics is understood as a critical tool for assessing morality, this also proves the role of ethics in foreign policy, particularly peacebuilding.

Throughout this study, I have systematically scrutinized the research questions through critical intertextual analysis of official documents and guidelines. In addition, I have interviewed key stakeholders in order to gain access to relevant contextual information. The guiding documents and doctrines for South Africa and Russia’s foreign policy in relation to peacebuilding show several normative elements that function as entry points into a debate on the role of moral justification. This makes it a reasonable interpretation to conclude that the moral dimension is of importance for states getting involved in peacebuilding processes in other states.

The justificatory practices of states could and should be assessed by moral and normative standards, yet, this can be done differently. The
model suggested in this chapter, has been developed for the purpose of assessing states’ moral and political justificatory attempts of their peacebuilding involvements. This offers a suggestion towards an account of a justificatory order of peacebuilding.

I argue that this study offers a plausible attempt to assess the justificatory attempts by external states in peacebuilding. Yet, the findings and conclusions necessitates further testing and refinement. On the other hand, my interpretation is that I have evidence that supports the preliminary conclusions I draw. The tentative conclusions are contextual, as the development of the theoretical model is based on delimited material in two cases. For example, other theories, more extensive material, and other cases could lead toward other conclusions.
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Appendix 1. Interview questionnaire

This questionnaire shows the main pool of questions used in this study.

Introduction
Brief presentation of the researcher and project, as well as the purpose of the interview. Permission to record and take notes, informed consent.

Part I: Terminology and prioritizations
- Which areas would you say are the most prioritized when it comes to engagements in foreign policy in general? Peacebuilding in particular?
  - a) themes b) geographical areas (please provide examples)
- Which are the main prioritizations when it comes to engagement in peacebuilding processes? Particular issues, topics, regions, countries? How are these made? How are these motivated?
- What characterizes South Africa’s/Russia’s understanding of peacebuilding? How would you describe the South African/Russian approaches to and/or understanding of a) peace, b) peacebuilding, c) human security, d) post-conflict reconstruction?
- Which is the main terminology being used in relation to peacebuilding?

Part II: Procedures and documents
- Please describe the typical process if South Africa/Russia would decide to get involved in peacebuilding processes abroad.
  - What are the main stages of the process of getting involved in peacebuilding? Where are the decisions taken?
  - Which are the main governmental agencies involved in these issues? Main stakeholders/platform(s) (ministries, governmental agencies, organizations)?
- What is the role of national/regional/international organizations in the process? In what way is there cooperation? What could explain variation in preferred platform(s) and organizations? Why?
- What explains decisions to get involved?
- What guiding documents are there, governing engagement in peacebuilding? Who is responsible for producing them? Who approves
them? Are there any particular official documents in regards to peacebuilding that might be available, (expect the main foreign policy documents available online)?

- Which mandates govern peacebuilding involvement? Who is responsible for producing them? Who approves them?
- In what ways are South African/Russian peacebuilding engagements legitimate? How are they justified?
- In what ways are peacebuilding engagements legitimate?
- How is South African/Russian engagement in peacebuilding legitimised? How is it justified? Is there a difference?

Part III: Structures and networks

- Are there any historical ties governing decisions of getting involved?
- Which networks are considered to be most important? Why?
- What are the reasons for working via the UN structure?
- What might explain the variation in that South Africa/Russia sometime are contributing via the UN, sometimes via regional organizations and sometimes engages bilaterally? Are there some general patterns?
- What role does peacebuilding have within the BRICS?
- Do the South African/Russian approaches towards peacebuilding tend to be short term, long term or both? What might explain this?
- What explains the variation between missions in terms of geographical spread in regards to seconded personnel via the UN (or other organizations)?
- Do South Africa/Russia have the capacity to respond to all requests of getting involved in peacebuilding?

Part IV: Expectations

- Which expectations are there on South Africa’s/Russia’s involvement in peacebuilding?
- What is the view on reforming the UN/UNSC?
- How do you see the future of South Africa’s/Russia’s engagement in peacebuilding?

Conclusion

- Are there any additional thoughts about the topic you would like to share with me?
- Could you recommend someone else I should talk to here in (Cape Town, Durban, Pretoria, or Johannesburg/Moscow)?
- Thank you for taking time to meet with me. (Exchange of business cards)
# Appendix 2. Official documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of document</th>
<th>Year (and date, if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Republic of South Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Building a Better World: The Diplomacy of Ubuntu</em></td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Defence Review</em></td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Defence Review</em></td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Russian Federation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>On Procedure of Providing Civil and Military Personnel for Participation in the Activity of Mainte-</em></td>
<td>26 May 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nance or Restoration of the International Peace and Security by the Russian Federation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation</td>
<td>30 November 2016 (previous versions published 12 February 2013, 12 July 2008; 28 June 2000; April 1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept of the Russian Federation’s State Policy in the Area of International Development Assistance</td>
<td>20 April 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 3. Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACP</td>
<td>African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>African National Congress (SA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>African Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASIC</td>
<td>Brazil, South Africa, India, China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNC</td>
<td>Bi-National Commissions (SA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRICS</td>
<td>Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR</td>
<td>Centre for Conflict Resolution (SA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS</td>
<td>Commonwealth of Independent States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSTO</td>
<td>Collective Security Treaty Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRCO</td>
<td>Department of International Relations and Cooperation (SA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFA</td>
<td>Department of Foreign Affairs (SA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOWAS</td>
<td>Economic Community of West African States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBSA</td>
<td>India, Brazil, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJR</td>
<td>Institute for Justice and Reconciliation (SA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMEMO</td>
<td>the Institute of World Economy and International Relations of the Russian Academy of Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGO</td>
<td>International Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICISS</td>
<td>International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRA</td>
<td>Lord Resistance Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINURSO</td>
<td>United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINUSTAH</td>
<td>United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDC</td>
<td>Movement for Democratic Change (Zimbabwe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGIMO</td>
<td>Moscow State Institute of International Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONUC</td>
<td>United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONUSCO</td>
<td>United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NAM  Non-Aligned Movement
NATO  North Atlantic Treaty Organisation
NEPAD  New Partnership for Africa’s Development
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 Ragnar Holte, Etik och jämställdhet. (Equal Rights for Women and Men–An Ethical Study.) 1978.
14 Per-Olof Lundberg, Människan i själavården. En teologisk analys av människosynen i själavårdsliiteratur från 1945 till 1984. (Man in Pastoral Care: A Theological Analysis of the View of Humanity in the Literature concerning Pastoral Care Published between 1945 to 1984.) 1992.
17 Alf Tergel, Church and Society in the Modern Age. 1995.
18 Per Sundman, Human Rights, Justification, and Christian Ethics. 1996.
24 Kersti Malmsten, Reflective Assent in Basic Care: A Study in Nursing Ethics. 1999.


40 Elena Namli, Per Sundman, Susanne Wigorts Yngvesson (red.), Ethiska undersökningar: Om samhällsmoral, etisk teori och teologi. (Ethical Investigations: On Social Morality, Ethical Theory and Theology.) 2010.


43 Elena Namli, Human Rights as Ethics, Politics, and Law. 2014.


