The Bellicose Politics of Peace

by

Renée Erica McBeth
B.A, University of Western Ontario, 2007

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department of Political Science and Cultural, Social and Political Thought

Supervisory Committee

The Bellicose Politics of Peace

by

Renée Erica McBeth
B.A., University of Western Ontario, 2007

Supervisory Committee

Scott Watson, (Department of Political Science)
Supervisor

Warren Magnusson, (Department of Political Science)
Member

Michael Asch, (Department of Political Science)
Member

Abstract

Supervisory Committee
Scott Watson, Department of Political Science
Supervisor
Warren Magnusson, Department of Political Science
Member
Michael Asch, Department of Political Science
Member

Despite its presentation as a pragmatic and universally applicable path to peace, the author argues that liberal peacebuilding offers no clear break from past colonial and imperial relations. Liberal peacebuilding is, in fact, colonial in its attempt to penetrate the markets and political systems of post-conflict countries and restructure economies and political life through the hegemonic imposition of liberal norms, facilitating their integration into global capitalism and a liberal community of states. The "liberal peace" created by this political and economic order often involves violent conditions of assimilation and exclusion. Moreover, the confluence of security and development concerns in the 1990s has set the strategic foundation for the incorporation of locally-driven "civil society" approaches to peacebuilding within statebuilding operations.

In this thesis, the author identifies existing criticisms of peacebuilding, and, drawing on theorists such as Michel Foucault, Partha Chatterjee, David Scott, and Jenny Edkins, initiates a deeper critique that considers the historical context of colonialism, legitimations of violence, the construction of the non-west in categories of development, and the relations of power and knowledge associated with liberal approaches to making peace. The author provides a historical and political overview of wars in Angola, proposing that discourses and practices of international peacebuilding have concealed the continuation of war by other means.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments

There are many friends and colleagues who deserve thanks for the final version of this thesis. My supervisory committee members, Scott Watson, Warren Magnusson and Michael Asch, have each taught me a great deal and have been impressively patient and supportive throughout the writing process. Thanks, Scott, for taking my ideas seriously and asking challenging questions, Warren for your wise instruction and apt syntheses of my writing and Michael for your encouragement. Although they were not involved in the writing of this thesis, I am very thankful for my undergraduate teachers at Huron University College – Mark Franke, Arja Vainio-Mattila and Wendy Russell – who gave me an invaluable introduction to critical theory and international studies and inspired me to pursue graduate studies.

Thank you to Danielle Taschereau Mammers who spent countless hours talking with me about all my random insights, motivated me to keep going at several moments of crisis and read countless pages of this thesis, from my earliest notes to the final drafts. Danielle and Carly Bagelman are both responsible for innumerable jokes and extensive wasted time during the writing of this thesis – perhaps not the most efficient route to completion, but certainly the only one that suits me. Many thanks to Alex Robb and Liam Mitchell for being good friends as well as thorough and amazingly generous editors. Alex, your genuine interest and thoughtful consideration of my project has helped me think more carefully about my arguments and greatly bolstered my writing. Thank you for all your support. Also, thanks to Marta Bashovski for making us such a wonderful home at the burrow, and for your companionship and inspiration in academic and farmer's market adventures. Christina Travis, Nicole McBeth, Arden Witter and Joëlle Alice Michaud-Ouellet are much appreciated for their ongoing support and entertainment. Clancy O'Malley also deserves much credit for this work, an endlessly selfless and faithful friend from the beginning.

Finally, thanks to my parents for gracefully accepting my critical provocation of a field in which they have worked quite closely. I know people in the field are more keenly

aware of the limits and breadth of challenges facing humanitarian aid programs and post-war reconstruction then academics speculating on theory. But as I've been wisely instructed, one should study the topic they respect enough to give their attention. You led me to this research by teaching me not to overlook poverty or injustice. You also taught me to think for myself before believing what I hear, and not to shy away from saying what I think.

The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada provided funding for a year of research on this thesis, allowing me to spend more time on the community organizing and advocacy work that inspires so much of what I've written here. This is of course a highly imperfect offering and any errors, omissions and inaccuracies are solely my own responsibility.

Introduction

What type of power is it that is capable of producing discourses of truth that have, in a society like ours, such powerful effects?[1]

Definitions of "peace" and "war" are highly political, as they involve the identification and legitimation of violence. I am particularly concerned with the definition of peace within liberal international relations theory because of its influence on contemporary peace theory in North America and Europe, and also because of its influence beyond the West.[2] The concept of peace is central to the very notion of an international state system and international peacebuilding operations. In the pages that follow, I consider both peace and war from a variety of liberal and critical anti-colonial perspectives. Taking seriously the complexity and implications of the terms peace and war, I argue that it is neither simple nor obvious how one might make peace or end war. However, within the literature on peacebuilding in international studies, political science, and peace and conflict studies, there is broad agreement that we build peace predominantly through building liberal democratic states, promoting economic growth and bolstering civil society.[3] The so-

---

[1] Michel Foucault. *Society Must Be Defended,* eds. François Ewals, Alessandro Fontana and Mauro Bertani, trans. David Macey (New York: Picador, 2003), 25.

[2] I have serious reservations about reproducing the category of the "West," but defer to it in reference to particular constructions of political and economic order that have gained substantial prominence in parts of North America and Europe and have helped to reinscribe an impossible continuity among a vast range of territories and Peoples. I follow Michael Shapiro, who notes regarding his use of the term that, "[a]lthough the very idea of the "West" as a separate geographical area and as a separate thought-world is conceptually flawed, for want of a familiar and intelligible alternative, I too resort to it as a geographic/conceptual marker to identify European and American locations and perspectives throughout this investigation. Among other disciplines, a highly institutionalized "area studies" within the academy has made the "West" an almost irresistible discursive gesture." Michael J. Shapiro, *Methods and Nations: Cultural Governance and the Indigenous Subject* (New York: Routledge, 2004), 6.

[3] On the necessity of building liberal democratic states after war, see Charles T. Call and Vanessa Wyeth, eds. *Building States to Build Peace* (Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2008). On democratic peace theory as a basis for democracy promotion in Sub-Saharan Africa, see Abdulahi A. Osman, "Poverty and Democratic Consolidation in Sub-Saharan Africa," in ed. Steven W. Hook *Democratic Peace in Theory and Practice* (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 2010). On the democratic peace more generally, see Bruce Russett, Christopher Layne, David E. Spiro and Michael W. Doyle, "Correspondence: The Democratic Peace," *International Security* 19, no. 4 (Spring 1995): 164-184. The authors respond to critiques to the democratic peace in previous issues, see Christopher Layne, "Kant or Cant: The Myth of the Democratic

called "peacebuilding consensus" involves a range of efforts to create a liberal state system populated by liberal subjects that are increasingly incorporated into capitalist economies and liberal-democratic institutions. It is not clear that the productive effects of these projects are related to the professed objective to build peace, as the liberal peace created by this political and economic order involves violent conditions of incorporation as well as violent exclusions, functioning as a sort of war by other means that legitimizes violence in the name of peace.

Peacebuilding agencies are predominantly created by liberal democratic states and institutions that run peacebuilding operations based on liberal norms. More generally, contemporary International Relations theory is guided by a liberal discourse that normalizes an international state system, wherein all people are supposed to work towards a Western model of state in a "linear and rational fashion."[4] The creation of emancipatory peace is a principal, normative objective of liberalism, and it is generally a utopian hope for future peace within and between a community of states. Peacebuilding theorists take this vision of peace from liberal political theory, making prescriptions for a seemingly benign form of liberalism that is considered something the "international community" ought to enact and something that all individuals should accept if they support the creation of peace in the world. It is the apparent benevolence behind this ethical imperative that makes peacebuilding particularly interesting.

Post-conflict peacebuilding began to emerge in the late 1980s as the product of a resurgence of liberal internationalist thinking after the Cold War, and was first established in the UN system in the early 1990s with then Secretary General Boutros

---

Peace" *International Security* 19, no. 2 (Autumn, 1994): 5-49. Recent scholarship on the democratic peace emphasizes that it is actually the high correlation between wealth and democracy, which tends to occur in stable democracies, that leads to the democratic peace; cf. James D. Fearon and David D. Laitin, "Ethnicity, Insurgency and Civil War," *American Political Science Review* 97, no. 1 (2003):75-90. On the importance of war-torn countries aiming towards a commercial society alongside democratization and the institution of the rule of law, see Graciana del Castillo, *Rebuilding War-Torn States: The Challenge of Post-Conflict Economic Reconstruction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008). On the enforcement of the rule of law, see Joris Voorhoeve, *From War to the Rule of Law: Peacebuilding after Violent Conflicts* (Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam, 2007). On the role of civil society in peacebuilding, see Kofi Abiew and Tom Keating, "Defining a Role for Civil Society: Humanitarian NGOs and Peacebuilding Operations," in eds. Tom Keating and W. Andy Knight *Building Sustainable Peace* (Edmonton, Alberta: The University of Alberta Press and United Nations Press, 2004).

[4] Oliver P. Richmond, *Peace in International Relations,* (London: Routledge, 2008), 38.

Boutros-Ghali's *Agenda for Peace*. This new paradigm of peacebuilding was closely linked to both democracy promotion and international development.[5] From its inception, peacebuilding theory has emphasized economic development and liberalization of trade in states with democratically elected governments that create the conditions for the population to meet its needs through providing "physical peace, public security and basic freedoms to its citizens."[6] Peacebuilding practice is presented as a pragmatic series of tasks meant to prevent a return to war, including election monitoring, reforming and strengthening institutions (especially financial, judicial and administrative apparatuses), and promotion of political participation, rule of law and human rights.[7] All this has been tied to a vision of liberal international order developed decades earlier, found in the reconstruction strategies designed by American policy-makers after World War II for the allied countries in Europe and, after the implementation of the Marshall Plan, in efforts to integrate the former European colonies into this system in the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s. The unfolding of the Cold War challenged the hegemony of the liberal democratic state but, after the fall of the Soviet Union, policy-makers in the West had a new capacity to exert pressure to accept a liberal international order. The primary mechanisms for exerting this pressure have been within the UN and other international organizations, through the distribution of tied aid and in foreign diplomacy. The end of the Cold War stalemate in the UN led to an influx of UN-sanctioned operations based on a liberal peacebuilding model. In this thesis, I focus on the case of Angola, which was the setting for three separate UN peacekeeping operations in the 1990s and, since the most recent peace agreement was signed in 2002, a range of local and international programs have been undertaken with the aim of improving the country's economy, infrastructure and standard of living. [8]

---

[5] Boutros Boutros-Ghali, *An Agenda for Peace: Preventative Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peace-keeping* (17 June 1992, A/47/277-S/24111).

[6] Voorhoeve, *From War to the Rule of Law*, 19.

[7] John Heathershaw, "Unpacking the Liberal Peace: The Dividing and Merging of Peacebuilding Discourses," *Millennium – Journal of International Relations* 36 (2008): 599-601.

[8] While peacekeeping operations monitoring the implementation of peace agreements were originally considered distinct from and a precursor to postconflict peacebuilding, the terms "peace operations" or "peacebuilding operations" are now frequently used to describe peacemaking (negotiating a peace agreement), peacekeeping and postconflict reconstruction and development (or peacebuilding). See Donald Charles

As the product of a debate about what forms of domestic and international governance are the most peaceable, liberal internationalism is characteristic of a form of universalist thinking that assumes that it will be possible to design a world peace at an abstract level and then impress this vision onto the world.[9] It implies, as Oliver Richmond argues, "that a liberal peace could be engineered and brought to all."[10] As this thesis will demonstrate, it is not clear that such practices are building peace: in many cases, they appear to do little more than conceal the continuation of war by other means. National and international bodies design and implement post-conflict reconstruction strategies, involving aid agencies, diplomatic initiatives, military operations and international institutions undertaking a range of interventions to rebuild societies, economies and states impacted by war. In the design of peacebuilding strategies, UN programs and agencies, nongovernmental organizations and other donors provide leadership, support and operational guidelines for reconstruction missions in the field.[11] International financial institutions (IFIs) support these agencies and consider themselves to be authorities on good economic policymaking. Policymakers are expected to modernize and adapt a post-conflict country's existing institutions and design new institutions to support movement towards "market-based policymaking."[12] As theorists such as Graciana del Castillo assert, these kinds of institutional arrangements are considered fundamental to the implementation of post-conflict reconstruction strategies and a critical condition for progress towards political and economic liberalization.[13]

In the 1980s and 1990s, discourses of human rights and development were the predominant rationalization for peacebuilding interventions, but, as Heathershaw, Call and Wyeth, and Jacoby and James note, in the early twenty-first century, peacebuilding

---

Daniel, Patricia Taft, and Sharon Wiharta *Peace Operations: Trends, Progress, and Prospects* (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2008), 106-107.

[9] Ibid., 34.

[10] Ibid.

[11] Ibid., 253.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Ibid.

has seen a shift towards more explicit practices of statebuilding.[14] In these recent cases, peacebuilding is employed as a justification for intervention, armed if necessary, to maintain a liberal political order wherein the state is responsible for peace and security.[15] Where a state falters in this responsibility, other states are obliged to intervene, with the declared intention to create a situation where the state will be able to fulfill these responsibilities acceptably.[16] Foreign interventions by states and international institutions coordinated in the name of statebuilding perpetuate the centrality of the state as the normative tool for the maintenance of peace. However, rather than a source of peace for all, the state of a "civil peace" often condones and exercises violence, and thus it may not be defined as "peaceful" by everyone concerned. The normalized assumption that if not at war (as in armed conflict on a battlefield) the state at hand is "peace," obscures the violence exercised by states and institutions in the context of national and international governance. Liberal democracies use the language of peace and peacebuilding to promote an international political and economic order in which Western states already exercise various forms of political domination. This order is not a steady state, but one that must be actively maintained and recreated. Peacebuilders justify the use of violence when other states do not submit to this order willingly.

Some peacebuilding theorists have offered critiques of state-centered approaches to postwar reconstruction, calling for locally grounded and justice-based approaches that recognize and include civil society actors as integral catalysts for the creation of peace. However, while criticizing certain approaches to the imposition of the liberal state, they

---

[14] Ibid. Also see Charles T. Call and Vanessa Wyeth, eds. *Building States to Build Peace* (Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2008) and Tim Jacoby and Eric James, "Emerging Patterns in the Reconstruction of Conflict-affected Countries," *Disasters* 34, Supplement 1 (2010): 1-14.

[15] For example, at time of writing Canadian armed forces are stationed in Afghanistan in an armed military and peacebuilding operation involving, "postconflict reconstruction, counterinsurgency warfare, and nationbuilding." Patrick Travers and Taylor Owen, "Between Metaphor and Strategy Canada's Integrated Approach to Peacebuilding in Afghanistan," *International Journal* 63, no. 3 (2008), 685. On the "unravelling" of the war-to-peace transition for Afghanistan's "fragile" state amid efforts by international actors to bring security through development aid, the creation of liberal institutions and the legitimization of the government of President Hamid Karzai, see Jonathan Goodhand and Mark Sedra, "Who Owns the Peace? Aid, Reconstruction, and Peacebuilding in Afghanistan," *Disasters* 34, Supplement 1 (2010): 78-102.

[16] Richmond, *Peace in International Relations*, 93. Also see Boutros-Ghali, *An Agenda for Peace* and International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS), "The Responsibility to Protect," http://responsibilitytoprotect.org/ICISS%20Report.pdf (accessed January 18, 2010).

propagate other liberal ideals, including civil society, human rights and individual freedom.[17] These new discourses of locally-driven and socially-conscious development are complementary to political and economic liberalization in that they presuppose predominantly North American and European political rationalities wherein the means of state- and institution-building along with economic and social development create the conditions for peace. Civil society approaches should be situated in the larger historical context of colonialism, wherein political and economic domination was also accompanied by discourses of the civil-ization of colonial society. The peoples of the European colonial empires demanded independence and self-determination. While forced to acquiesce to these demands for various geo-political and economic reasons, the colonial powers made explicit efforts to maintain beneficial political and economic relations with the former colonies and formulated a series of new rationalizations for foreign intervention. Even if the goals of the local or foreign civil society actors involved in contemporary aid industries are far removed from neo-colonial or imperial ambitions, colonial legacies persist in the relations between international donors and aid agencies and the local aid recipients. The field of international development – post-conflict or otherwise – is ultimately driven by discourses of progress that privilege certain forms of authority and knowledge over others. In some cases, the role of grassroots organizations and NGOs in the extension of the liberal state and its ideals is explicitly acknowledged and encouraged by influential politicians in the lead funding nations. For example, former UK Prime Minister Tony Blair's key foreign policy advisor (and the current Director-General for External and Politico-Military Affairs at the European Union), Robert Cooper, has appealed to NGOs to be "key figures in the establishment of what he calls the West's 'post-modern empire.'"[18] Others are less explicit about the imperialist nature of international aid and intervention, but aid policy-makers increasingly frame

---

[17] John Paul Lederach argues that contemporary conflicts require approaches that go beyond post-accord reconstruction and "traditional statist diplomacy," necessitating a comprehensive spectrum of processes at all levels of a society, moving towards "more sustainable, peaceful relationships" through a variety of activities that expect and include leadership and participation from diverse groups within the local population. John Paul Lederach, *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies* (Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1997), xvi; 20; 37.

[18] Jacoby and James, "Emerging Patterns in the Reconstruction of Conflict-affected Countries" 3.

development as an issue of global security, necessitating pragmatic and locally-appropriate solutions within a liberal democratic model of rights and governance.

The adaptation of peacebuilding operations to include an emphasis on local approaches and the promotion of human rights and human security reflect the impact made by pointed critics of top-level approaches to peacebuilding. Many of these criticisms are compelling and I too appeal to some of them in my critique of peacebuilding in Angola when I point to exclusions and problems with the structure of the official peace processes. However, critics seeking "positive" or "sustainable" peace – as opposed to just the absence of armed conflict, so-called "negative" peace – have also given liberal peacebuilding a new legitimating architecture, wherein "bottom-up" or grassroots initiatives are expected to address the everyday needs of people in post-conflict societies, while top-level approaches seek to advance institutions and the economy. Peacebuilding's critics largely remain committed to a liberal international order wherein foreign policy-makers, state officials and corporations organize the means of production and political life, but with certain modifications and consideration for the welfare of the population. Insofar as strategies that might affect some form of peace – or at least lessen war and violence – may emerge from and promote non-liberal ways of acting and being in the world, they are avoided and marginalized or appropriated and incorporated into a liberal and capitalist framework. Further, the human rights discourse on which many of these critics depend developed in the context of a universalist natural law tradition and a legal contract based framework that is co-constitutive of other political and economic tenets of liberalism. Indeed, rights discourse has inevitably had a major influence on the development of the concept of the liberal peace, as these rights are thought to be achieved along with the construction of democratic states and a particular sort of political, legal and economic order.[19] In appealing to human rights discourse and a broader project of peace as order, the demands of most peacebuilding critics, therefore, remain entrenched in the universalizing and modernizing narratives of liberalism.

[19] Ibid., 29.

External demands for assimilation to liberal modes of governance come from other states, donors and international bodies with the capacity to threaten a country's international economic and diplomatic relations, representation in international institutions, foreign aid or security from attack and other interference by foreign governments. Most critics of peacebuilding do not offer a penetrating critique of these violent conditions of assimilation and many deny or accede to the colonial means that might affect a liberal vision of peace. While language such as "local ownership" and "community driven development" satisfies some critics of externally imposed, top-level peacebuilding agendas, in practice such ideals must be compromised because 'lead' nations continue to guide aid policy and priorities.[20] Peacebuilding institutions ask for states and organizations to behave in certain ways in exchange for aid, as only certain projects are fundable and only certain sorts of states are acceptable.[21] Those that refuse are excluded.[22] Thus fashionable development rhetoric that purports to reconcile colonial legacies can conceal the imposition of liberal norms that facilitate the profound penetration of aid organizations, investors and other Western institutions in the political and economic life in postconflict (and often postcolonial) countries. In this context, liberal ideals are tools of Western domination, and, to this extent, they can be understood as weapons of war.

---

[20] For example, the Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre (KAIPTA) is officially "Ghanaian led," but its funding and staff are overwhelmingly from Canada (particularly the Pearson Peacekeeping Centre), France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands and the UK. Training is facilitated by foreign institutions and the Centre itself contributes very little to the content of the curriculum and actual instruction, providing services and a sort of conference facility for 80-90 percent of the activities that go on at KAIPTA. Mark Malan, "Africa: Building Institutions on the Run," in ed. Daniel, Taft, and Wiharta *Peace Operations,* 106-107. Malan writes that the majority of positions reserved for Ghanian officers are empty, although it is theoretically "structured and commanded like a unit of the Ghana Armed Forces." (Ibid). The lack of "local ownership" has been attributed to lack of capacity of local actors and the strong-influence of donor interests. Thus, observers such as Malan are now calling for peacebuilders to "move beyond the politically correct – yet practically flawed – rhetorical call for 'African ownership' of peacekeeping, and [to] move toward are feasible division of labour." (116).

[21] Mark Duffield, *Global Governance and the New Wars* (New York: Zed Books, 2001), 85.

[22] In recent years China has emerged as a substantial source of aid, capital investment and loans and to countries such as Angola that have been more resistant to or unable to meet the political and economic conditions of IFIs such as the IMF and World Bank and other bilateral lenders and donors. See Ali Zafar, "The Growing Relationship Between China and Sub-Saharan Africa: Macroeconomic, Trade, Investment, and Aid Links," *The World Bank Research Observer* 22, no. 1 (2007).

Many theorists have pointed to the various and changing ways that liberal ideals have been used as tools of Western domination. Partha Chatterjee articulates the ways such ideals constitute a paradoxical bind for former colonies that have attained independence and then face an international order where the adoption of modern liberal rationalities is the condition of possibility of externally recognized legitimacy for the post-colony.[23] While local people are "choosing" to adopt liberal modes of governance, that choice has been overdetermined in the context of a hegemonic liberal international order wherein the very notion of building a modern state depends on liberal norms and other approaches are marginalized or dismissed. These problems provoke a more penetrating critique of peacebuilding that requires one to consider the historical context in which peacebuilding has emerged as a rationalization for foreign intervention, taking into account colonialism and neo-imperialism, the legitimation of violence, the way the non-west is viewed and the various relations of power and knowledge associated with liberal and non-liberal approaches to international peacebuilding.

I argue that one should locate the ideological and practical expressions of peacebuilding within a longer history and a broader definition of war. Here one can draw on many theoretical traditions, including feminist views of gender-based violence as a war on women, Marxist analysis of the war between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, or the Ghandian view that economic exploitation is a form of war no less horrible than "proper war":[24]

> An armed conflict between nations horrifies us. But the economic war is no better than an armed conflict. This is like a surgical operation. An economic war is prolonged torture. And its ravages are no less terrible than those depicted in the literature on war

---

[23] Partha Chatterjee, *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse* (Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1986/2004).

[24] On class war, see Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *The Communist Manifesto* (London: Penguin Books, 1888/1985). Marx and Engels write that this war is so significant it defines all written history: "[t]he history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles." (Ibid., 79). On the war on women, see Cynthia Cockburn, "The Continuum of Violence: A Gender Perspective on War and Peace," in ed. Wenona Giles and Jennifer Hyndman *Sites of Violence: Gender and Conflict Zones* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004). Cockburn argues that violence against women occurs on a continuum in both war zones and spaces of civil peace, as "the differentiation and relative positioning of women and men is seen as an important ordering principle that pervades the system of power and is sometimes its very embodiment." (Ibid., 28).

> properly so called. We think nothing of the other because we are used to its deadly effects.[25]

The narratives of liberal peacebuilding and postconflict development support an account of modernity that conceals the recurrence of war within the modern identity and political life, presenting modernity as "a story of pacification, of the marginalization of war, and of the restriction of war-making powers to the sovereign."[26] Whereas the argument presented in this thesis considers the idea that, "modern politics arose as an extension of war by other means."[27] The distinction between these accounts of political modernity is outlined in Michel Foucault's *Society Must Be Defended*, which describes the emergence of historico-political discourses that use war as a principle of analysis for society in response to juridico-philosophical discourses that naturalize and accept the legitimacy of sovereign power.

The thesis borrows the form of Foucault's analysis in two ways, in that I argue that liberal peacebuilding is a juridico-philosophical discourse while conducting a historical and critical political analysis of the field. I situate liberal peacebuilding in a juridico-philosophical tradition because it naturalizes the creation of a civic peace in a modern state, the establishment of the rule of law and the construction of liberal institutions and modes of governance. Along with Foucault and Chatterjee, David Scott, Jenny Edkins, Kevin Durrheim and Melanie White each ask questions that provoke different dimensions of my critique of peacebuilding. These thinkers provide the theoretical foundation for a discussion of the ways that peace can constitute and conceal a continuation of war by other means. In this view, the predominant discourses of peacebuilding can be taken as a site of analysis for broader questions about the violence that makes possible the state, the law and the "civil peace."[28]

---

[25] Mahatma Gandhi, *The Essential Writings* ed. Judith M. Brown (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 56.

[26] Michael Dillon and Andrew W. Neal, "Introduction," in eds. Michael Dillon and Andrew W. Neal *Foucault on Politics, Security and War* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008), 8-9.

[27] Ibid.

[28] Relations of domination constitute a particular form of war that operates at every level of society, state and international system. Although I have written this thesis about international peacebuilding, and specifically Angola, I could just as easily have considered the case of local politics in British Columbia, Canada. The Canadian context is replete with examples of this kind of violence: the mark of Canadian peacekeeping and peacebuilding abroad is insidiously paralleled by wars of assimilation and domination "at

Today, peacebuilding is fundamentally a confluence of security and development concerns.[29] Here peacebuilding theorists incorporate an imperative for a robust security architecture into a liberal framework in the idea that "international institutions, norms and law have potency when backed by force: liberalism may occasionally dispute the necessity of enforcement, but it concurs if force supports international institutions and law according to common norms, behavior, consent and consensus."[30] Thus, peacebuilding inevitably pursues liberal and neo-liberal ideals even at the expense of the ostensible liberal objective to resolve disputes without recourse to war. Military intervention is considered a legitimate means for the creation of a liberal peace because security is considered the condition of possibility of economic development and a form of liberty defined by "limited and regulated freedoms."[31] This type of liberty along with this particular system of states and the forms of modernization and development wrapped up in it are effectively assumed to represent landmarks on a path to peace, with liberal political and economic ideals thereby setting the limits of possibility for what is considered peacebuilding.

This thesis does not attempt to resolve the seemingly illiberal features of liberalism, but identifies some of the paradoxes of liberal peacebuilder's terms of analysis. The orders of liberalism constitute a great bind and postconflict countries accept liberal peacebuilding agendas for many reasons. Even a critique that challenges its underlying assumptions may not be able to avoid all recourse to liberal positions and institutions. The concepts that emerge from liberal thinking – the individual liberal subject, or rights-

---

home" in the relationship between First Nations and Canada. The Canadian Government's shameful policies towards First Nations also helped shape South African Apartheid policies, as South African government officials regularly visited Canada to observe its reserves and residential school system to aid in designing their own policies for the forced displacement and segregation of Black South Africans in "homelands." Yves Engler, *The Black Book of Canadian Foreign Policy* (Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing, 2009), 170. While I recognize very important differences in the experiences of Canada and South Africa, Canadians may be able to see in the South African case some of the complexities of "making peace" alongside colonial legacies that continue to shape material and racialized forms of exclusion and inequality. An analysis of racial inequality and colonialism in Canada is beyond the bounds of my project, but these ongoing relations are important to consider if Canadians wish to think seriously about the implications and possibilities for making peace in or outside of Canada.

[29] Duffield, *Global Governance and the New Wars*, 7.

[30] Ibid., 55.

[31] Richmond, *Peace in International Relations*, 35.

bearing human, for example – constitute very powerful discursive positions from which to challenge inequitable relations.

I am sympathetic to humanitarian efforts as well as to appeals to human rights if this is a discourse that individuals or groups choose to appeal to in a given political context. Accepting that people often have good reasons for appealing to these approaches creates a productive tension evident in my analysis. For those who find a social justice-oriented project appealing, liberal ideals of equality and humanity are difficult, perhaps impossible, to shed and their shedding is difficult to reconcile with strongly held political and ethical imperatives against exploitation. This does not mean that liberal ideals and humanitarian efforts should be held beyond the purview of critique or that one cannot interrupt the naturalization of their hegemony. I take issue with the fact that these approaches are so often pursued and legitimated on the grounds of good intentions and, by pointing to some Angolan practices of peacebuilding in the final chapter, I will attempt to show that many people are already engaged in practices that challenge their universal applicability.

Violence and war can take various shapes and their definition in certain instances can conceal their ongoing inscription in others. I approach a definition of these terms in a provisional manner, attempting to think through some forms of violence and war that are obscured or "unthought" in the peacebuilding literature. I recognize that in expanding my definition of war to include more of what liberal states do, the bounds I set for war will have its own omissions and problematic exclusions. I reiterate that the definition of war is political and contentious: it is an "essentially contested term," to use W.B. Gallie's phrase, which means, people with partly different assumptions and ideas may not agree on its "proper general use."[32] Certain conceptual disagreements arise from essentially contested concepts, which Gallie proposes, are "appraisive" statements used to signify that something valued has been achieved, such as war, or its absence – often defined as peace (though such an opposition is challenged in this thesis). The practice described by an essentially contested term is also "internally complex," with multiple dimensions

[32] W.B. Gallie, "Essentially Contested Concepts" in *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, New Series, Vol. 56, (1955 - 1956), 167.

making up the whole of the achievement and with rules of application that are relatively open to new interpretation in different situations and its features potentially placed in different orders of importance.[33] As William Connolly points out, a "cluster" of broad and variable criteria apply to many of the terms used to describe political life.[34] Essentially contested concepts such as "politics," "violence," "power," "legitimacy," and "freedom" are not a neutral medium used to describe reality. Rather, they set a particular frame for political inquiry by defining criteria that must be achieved before certain actions are considered within the ambit of that concept.[35] In determining which elements are or are not included in a concept, one "invokes a complex set of judgments about the validity of claims central to the theory within which the concept moves…. a change in the criteria of any of these concepts is likely to involve a change in the theory itself."[36] To use such terms without reflecting on the way this frame positions one in terms of a political argument limits one's analysis and, Connolly argues, the possibility of any radical political perspectives: "For to adopt without revision the concepts prevailing in a polity is to accept terms of discourse loaded in favor of established practices."[37]

When something is called war a significant claim is being made about a place and the relations that constitute it, and insofar as similar features are apparent in what is called the 'civil peace,' it makes sense to consider these actions using similar principles of analysis in order to identify continuities and differences in the ends and means pursued in these contexts. This makes it possible to consider war and liberal democracy building alongside each other in the wider context of the post-World War II liberal order, which has constituted an ongoing and variously formulated project to make the West a model for other states and to produce a liberal order that has, central to it its apparently peaceful, institutionalized freedom, equality and comparative economic advantage, a complex of military-strategic relations. My work follows in a tradition of analysis that calls attention to many struggles – including those of women, of the poor, of workers, of subjugated

---

[33] Ibid., 171-172.
[34] William E. Connolly, *The Terms of Political Discourse* Second Edition (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), 14.
[35] Ibid., 2-3.
[36] Ibid., 21.
[37] Ibid. 2-3.

peoples – that are at least as important as those divisions between nations and nation-states that play out as traditional armed conflict. As I will elaborate below, these struggles involve both means and relations of war (including domination and the threat of violence), and continue when the battle for the state ends.

Peacebuilding ignores or trivializes these other crucially important forms of war, setting up war as something completely different, something, Paul Richards argues, that is presumed to be a "mindless" phenomenon that breaks out and "spreads unaccountably, like a fashion."[38] Treating war like a disease that needs quarantine, vaccination and eradication makes war itself something that needs to be attacked, a "common enemy" of humanity, removed from its social context and "foregrounded as a 'thing in itself'."[39] The authors argue that war is more productively conceived when denied this exceptional status (and a "special" explanation), and considered instead as "one social project among many competing social projects."[40] Accordingly, it is both created and potentially moderated through social action. Even non-violence can be used to wage war, which is, by their definition, "long-term struggle organised for political ends, commonly but not always using violence."[41]

For many peacebuilding theorists, war is the "hazard that has first to be contained before other more cultured and desirous developments can occur."[42] A country inoculates itself against this hazard through the establishment of a "legitimate" and "effective" state.[43] In this thesis I argue, on the contrary, that a formal withdrawal or the dominance of one group over others does not mean they are no longer waging war and that it is possible to offer a more rigorous analysis of war and peace if one uses war as a principle of analysis for a range of struggles, social projects and political relations.

It is possible to think about war in terms of relationships and in terms of means. By some definitions of war, it is the range of tools used to resolve conflict that distinguishes

---

[38] Paul Richards, "New War: An Ethnographic Approach," in ed., Paul Richards *No War, No Peace: An Anthropology of Contemporary Armed Conflict* (Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 2005), 2-3.
[39] Ibid., 3.
[40] Ibid.
[41] Ibid., 4.
[42] Ibid., 2-3.
[43] Doyle and Sambanis, *Making War and Building Peace*.

war from peace. The same relationship can exist in both conditions, but when people pick up weapons and fight, the condition at hand is war. Conversely, when people appeal to law courts, arbitration, negotiation, politics and sovereignty, the condition is peace. In other formulations, war is distinguished by a particular relationship, state of mind or, in Hobbes' words, a "posture" wherein one is willing to use force to hurt or kill another.[44] In this thesis, I adopt the premise that there can be warlike relations and warlike means. The peacebuilding literature also refers to war in both ways, but generally focuses on means: if guns are no longer the means, presumably one is no longer talking about war and conflict can play out in the civil peace through democratic debate and non-violent struggle. For example, Michael W. Doyle and Nicholas Sambanis equate peace with the end of armed conflict and adopt two measures to assess "whether the postwar state has entered a path toward democratic civil peace."[45] They are: 1) the Correlates of War (COW) definition of peace, which is fewer than 1000 battle deaths per year, and 2) a "'negative' or 'sovereign peace' reflecting that single sovereignty, a Hobbesian Leviathan has been reestablished and exercises a legitimate monopoly on violence."[46] This second measure indicates a "minimal degree of political assent and participation," which, the authors argue, reflects a level of acceptance or agreement to the peace and the beginning of participation in a democratic process.[47] A broader definition of war includes struggles that occur off the battlefield and within a "single sovereignty," meaning that warlike relations persist despite changing the means of battle. The civil society-focused literature offers something different by focusing on the need to transform relationships and structures of inequality that lead to conflict, but these critiques still do not go far

---

[44] Thomas Hobbes sees war as involving armed conflict, but not defined by it. Rather, Hobbes writes in chapter thirteen of *Leviathan* that it is not only actual fighting that we call war ("Warre" in Hobbes words), but "a tract of time, wherein the Will to contend by Battell is sufficiently know." Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan* Revised Student Edition, ed. Richard Tuck (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press), 88. He continues, "the nature of War, consisteth not in actuall fighting; but in the known disposition thereto, during all the time there is no assurance to the contrary. All other time is Peace." (Ibid., 88-89). Relying on the notion of a will to battle, in opposition to a time when one is assured that there will be peace, Hobbes argues that the essential meaning of war is constituted by a "posture of War" as opposed to actual acts of battle. (Ibid., 90).

[45] Doyle and Sambanis, *Making War and Building Peace*, 18-19.

[46] Ibid., 18.

[47] Ibid.

enough in that they reinstate liberal ideals as part of a universal framework for a liberal order, including the notion of civil society itself.

In attempting to 'think' war in a broader context, I have followed a line of thinking that calls into question certain conceptualizations of war. The justification I offer for this approach is that a broader definition of war allows for a more balanced analysis of peacebuilding. I tentatively define war as the imposition of one will over another in an organized social project for political ends, including any order of domination or oppression. Violence is often, but not always, the decisive instrument used to do this, exercised by an intending agent or in structural conditions. The distinction between war and violence is complicated because war, like politics, is dependent on its performance: their meanings are contained within themselves, but the meaning of both "is revealed only in the *acts* of politics and war."[48] In thinking about these terms, Patrick Owens offers a helpful reading of Hannah Arendt's work on violence, power and force relations. He writes,

> *Power* springs up between people as they act together; it belongs to the group, and disappears when the group disperses. It is a collective capacity. Until this coming together, it is only a potential. *Violence* is an instrument. It is the use of implements to multiply strength and command others to obey. Power can be channeled by the state apparatus. Indeed, this is the necessary precondition for the accumulation of the means of violence by the administrative state. When power and violence are combined, Arendt wrote, 'the result is a monstrous increase in potential force'. It is for this reason that under modern conditions power and force appear to be the same and why violence and power, which is 'derived from the power of an organized space', are combined in modern states.[49]

The conditions of modernity involve the organization of space in a way that rationalizes the exercise of violence on a massive scale. If violence is the instrument used to impose one person's will over another it can also be the instrument that imposes many people's will over others, through, for example, an oppressive social order. In this case one's potential choices are limited by factors that may not be directly related to the imposition of any single will over one's own. The so-called international community sets the limits

---

[48] Patricia Owens, *Between War and Politics: International Relations and the Thought of Hannah Arendt* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 26.
[49] Ibid., 14.

of possibility for political life and what is considered a satisfactory outcome to war or for failed states and other political upheaval. Here, the agents acting to "build peace" become the purveyors of reason and rationalise violence against the unreasonable. Given these broad gestures at thinking through violence, my conception of war includes a range of means used to achieve political objectives. These means include various expressions of violence: direct and structural violence, violence as an instrument used in the name of peace or of war, and the violence of relations of rule that are coercive or consensual but extremely constraining. I maintain that these are qualitatively different forms of violence which are, rather than a singular instrument, more accurately considered historically and contextually specific *violences*.

I begin to expand upon theoretical questions surrounding the definition and construction of peace in Chapter One by tracing a genealogy of peacebuilding, reviewing the emergence of peacebuilding and its various strains as a new manifestation of ideas of international relations established through European colonialism, post-World War Two reconstruction efforts in Europe, decolonization and the end of the Cold War. I look at a series of criticisms that have already been made by observers in the field and argue that ultimately most critics of peacebuilding remain fundamentally committed to the peacebuilding project. That is, they seek change in the ways peacebuilding operations are designed and implemented, but continue to envision a distinctly liberal peace that might be brought to the whole world, even if it also involves efforts to change undesirable socio-economic conditions, is implemented by local people themselves or complimented by distinctly local approaches.

Chapter Two expands on questions about the legitimation of violence, relations of power and knowledge, and the ways the non-west is viewed in the context of past colonial projects and in the context of contemporary peacebuilding. The chapter is framed by Foucault's problematization of the binary opposition of war and peace through a discussion of historico-political and juridico-philosophical discourses. I argue that the juridico-philosophical discourse of peacebuilding illuminates some of the truth effects of

modern power and the ways it legitimates violence.[50] Historico-political discourses of peace critique juridico-philosophical discourses for concealing domination and suggest that the civil peace is founded upon violent relations, often established during war, that also permeate the operation of the state, institutions and everyday social life. Drawing on Foucault and others, I consider the forms of liberal peacebuilding outlined in Chapter One in terms of a theoretical discussion of liberal violence and colonialism and outline a critique of peacebuilding as concealing and constituting a form of war by other means.

Chapter Three focuses on Angola, beginning with an overview of Angola's demography and pre-colonial kingdoms, and then focusing on the foreign intervention in the country during colonization, the slave trade, the war for independence, the recent civil wars and the contemporary makeup of the country. While the Portuguese claimed to have authority over the colony of Angola from the late fifteenth century until 1976, Portuguese rule was always partial and often gained indirectly through alliances with local authorities, creating structures of local-foreign elite rule that have seen significant mutations without a clear break from colonial structures. Opposition to these structures of authority and to Portuguese "pacification" has led to ongoing conflict. This longer historical approach takes seriously the impacts of colonialism on Angola's recent civil war and on contemporary political, economic and social conditions, complicating accounts of the civil war which imply that was an isolated eruption of violent conflict that might be resolved by the construction of a liberal state.

Next, the chapter describes the various peace processes involved in officially ending the civil war and some of the projects and programs have been initiated as 'post-conflict peacebuilding' since the most recent peace accord. Despite extensive humanitarian efforts, and even though observers point to the ways peace is being built in Angola, various forms of armed and unarmed violence continue. Moreover, despite significant reorganization of relations of power, many relations of governance established during the war continue in new ways. The governments' efforts towards "normalization" in the post-war period have focused on establishing state administration in areas of the country

[50] Foucault, *Society Must be Defended*, 25.

previously under the control of the opposing military forces. Furthermore, the formal transition to "democracy" – a process officially initiated in the earlier peace processes – has involved the extension of clientelistic networks and the implementation of neo-liberal economic policies with no significant improvement to the conditions of living for the majority of the population. While it would be difficult to draw extensive conclusions from this brief case study regarding what sort of peace has or has not been constructed – especially without conducting field research, and perhaps not even then – I argue that peacebuilding efforts appear to serve particular political interests, privilege some cultural and political forms over others, and, in at least some ways, conceal and reconstitute war by other means.

If relations of war are inescapable then we may consider how peace and war can exist at the same time, or else not at all. Without arguing that it is possible to achieve any outright end to war, we can identify different approaches to addressing the forms of violence and conflict that are most problematic for those concerned. In the Angolan case study, I describe three practices undertaken on a local basis during and after the recent civil wars that appear to approach peace in terms of what makes sense for those undertaking these actions. These approaches cannot 'overcome' war in any totalizing sense and, while local approaches to building peace *may* be more appropriate and effective than international approaches, these short narrative vignettes are not meant to be a proposal for expanding or changing peacebuilding practice. As I explain in Chapter Three, I include these accounts because, while arguing that war is inescapable, I want to avoid furthering the problematic notion that war is all-encompassing in Angola and sub-Saharan Africa generally.[51] However, an analysis of the sort of peace or war affected by these approaches parallel to the one I make about liberal international peacebuilding would be problematic given my own position as an outsider.[52] Moreover, such an

---

[51] For commentary on the tendency towards such representations in academic literature, see Achille Mbembe, *On the Postcolony* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 8.

[52] I am in a better position to study practices of liberal imperialism and peacebuilding, which materialize out of the country, institutions, agencies and discourses in which I find myself deeply embedded as I have spent seven years in Canadian university programs concerning international development studies, international politics and African politics, I have worked for, volunteered with and studied NGOs in several African countries and my family has done years of peacebuilding and missionary work in Angola.

analysis diverges from the point I wish to make using these vignettes, which is simply that the liberal approach has never constituted a consensus on how one makes peace, and from a broader aim of the thesis, which is to show that the liberal vision of peace privileges particular political and economic forms as the necessary condition for peace while marginalizing nonliberal approaches to making peace and concealing the continuation of war by other means.

In giving an account of the historical contestation between discourses of peace and war, and in proposing war as the very principle of analysis of society, the method of analysis I draw from Foucault casts into relief "the dividing lines in the confrontations and struggles that functional arrangements or systematic organizations are designed to mask."[53] This is a discourse of war, in Philo's reading, that "regards the terrains of *both* discourse and everyday social life as striated by what are ultimately the *same* features of struggle, force, domination and repression that mark the battlefields, war cabinets and propagandizing of real war."[54] These struggles are concealed by very powerful "discourses of truth" that conflate the extension of the liberal state system and capitalist markets with the construction of peace. As the epigraph indicates, this thesis looks at the power relations wrapped up in the production of these discourses and their powerful effects. In particular, I propose a genealogy of peacebuilding, describing its historical emergence as a means of affecting a whole series of "functional arrangements" that entrench state sovereignty within the context of a liberal political and economic order, masking the very real spectrum of violence involved in such processes as well as the features of domination and struggle that mark everyday social life and the state system. As the First Chapter describes, agendas for peacebuilding constitute an ideological rationalization for foreign intervention founded on prevailing discourses of security, development and liberalization with historical linkages to much older forms of liberal imperialism and colonial exploitation.

---

[53] Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended*,7.

[54] Chris Philo. "'Bellicose History' and 'Local Discursivities': An archaeological Reading of Michel Foucault's S*ociety Must be Defended,"* in *Space, Knowledge and Power: Foucault and Geography,* ed. Jeremy Crampton and Stuart Eldon (Hampshire, England: Ashgate Publishing, 2007), 348.

Chapter One

Where reasonable people are in agreement over the unreasonable behavior of others, we can always be sure to find something unresolved that has been deferred, painful scars.[55]

If peacebulding is a new facade built on partially torn-down structures of European empires, then we must know what these historical points of comparison – 'colonialism' and 'imperialism' – looked like. And, if peacebuilding has been raised as a new moral imperative for the extension of a liberal international order built on these crumbling structures, we should find out how this post-Cold War project has been cemented to centuries old foundations and how it strikes new ground. This chapter and those that follow place practices of peacebuilding in a historical context, but will not cover the complete historical and geographic diversity of colonialism. One does not need to know every new instantiation and adaptive turn in the European imperial ventures in order to theorize about continuity with contemporary practices, but as Ania Loomba argues, "we must build our theories with an awareness that such diversity exists."[56] Any generalization is bound to contradict certain particular examples, but this reminds the author and reader to treat the ideas as historically-specific knowledge, not endlessly reproducible truths.

This colonial and imperial heterogeneity is indicative of the fact that liberal imperialism has always evolved, Karuna Mantena writes, "in response to a changing set of imperial dilemmas."[57] I will trace some of these evolutions and comment more on the adaptive dynamic of liberal imperialism in the next chapter. For now, it is important to note that imperialism and colonialism are each defined differently depending on the

---

[55] Theodor Adorno, *Minima Moralia: Reflections on a Damaged Life,* trans. E.F.N. Jephcott (London: Verso, 2006), 92.
[56] Ania Loomba, *Colonialism-postcolonialism* (New York: Routledge, 1998), [electronic version] http://lib.myilibrary.com/browse/open.asp?id=32671&loc= (accessed April 6 2010), xvi.
[57] Karuna Mantena, *Alibis of Empire: Henry Maine and the Ends of Liberal Imperialism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 8.

historical instance one considers, and they are contrasted from each other in different ways. Loomba proposes that "we can distinguish between colonisation as the take over of territory, appropriation of material resources, exploitation of labour and interference with political and cultural structures of another territory or nation," and imperialism as a system where an imperial power wields economic, military and political control in colonized countries, penetrating and controlling markets from another political center.[58] We can distinguish between the terms spatially, thinking of "imperialism or neo-imperialism as the phenomenon that originates in the metropolis, the process which leads to domination and control. Its result, or what happens in the colonies as a consequence of imperial domination is colonialism or neo-colonialism."[59] Loomba reminds her readers that these processes lead to the profound reorganization of relations, writing that:

> modern colonialism did more than extract tribute, goods and wealth from the countries that it conquered—it restructured the economies of the latter, drawing them into a complex relationship with their own, so that there was a flow of human and natural resources between colonised and colonial countries.[60]

Given these features, I refer to peacebuilding as a *colonial* practice to emphasize continuity in processes whereby liberal states attempt to penetrate the markets and political systems of countries with recently ended violent armed conflicts, restructuring economies and political life through the hegemonic imposition of liberal norms, and facilitating their integration into global capitalism and a liberal system of states. Sometimes I use the term *postcolonial* in order to emphasize the real significance of formal decolonization and the term *neo-colonial* to emphasize the unique dimensions of more recent colonial forms. Bearing in mind that neither colonialism nor imperialism are identical processes over time and space, and paying attention to these shifts and changes, it actually becomes easier to draw lines between different historical moments without presuming that this makes them the same.

This chapter situates peacebuilding as a new formulation of imperial and colonial practices that originated long before the emergence of the field in the UN, development

---

[58] Ania Loomba, *Colonialism-postcolonialism* (New York: Routledge, 1998), 6.
[59] Ibid., 6-7.
[60] Ibid., 3.

industries and academic institutions, briefly describing how it constitutes an expression of efforts to establish a liberal world order after WWII, decolonization and the Cold War, an order that conceals the continuation of colonialism and imperialism. Then, the bulk of the chapter presents a series of claims being made within the peacebuilding literature and positions my critique of peacebuilding in terms of each of these claims. The argument I make about peacebuilding is threefold. First, liberal peacebuilders argue that peacebuilding is pragmatic and universally applicable. I argue, on the contrary, that the liberal vision of peace depends on particular ideas of progress with a teleological conception of what a state and its rational subjects can and should be and conceals and perpetuates the continuation of war by other means by defining the limits of political community in such a way that it sets up an opposition between the presence of a "legitimate and effective" state, as defined by peacebuilders, and everything outside of this. Here the condition of the state signals that one is either on a path to peace, security and order, or mired in war, chaos and insecurity. Given the terms of such an arrangement, to reject the liberal peace is to make a comparatively irrational choice. Moreover, the establishment of these limits as norms in international relations precipitates the use of violence against those, presumably irrational, groups and individuals that do not comply with this liberal international order.

Second, proponents of liberal internationalism, specifically in the context of peacebuilding, separate these practices from past practices of conquest, genocide, extraction and subjugation broadly associated with European Colonialism. Claiming to have rejected the hierarchy of race and civilization associated with modern empire, and believing that they act to achieve universally beneficial ends that render their actions morally sound, even indispensable, contemporary peacebuilding theorists attempt to redeem peacebuilding from the widely criticized practice of colonialism. I argue that, while peacebuilding does not facilitate permanent direct foreign rule, it reenacts colonial relations without a real break from those of the past by facilitating the penetration and reorganization of the economic and political life of post-conflict counties in relation to the economic and political order of foreign governments.

Third, while observers in the field have taken issue with the external imposition of peacebuilding agendas as well as peacebuilding's practical failures when it comes to effecting a reduction in armed violence or changes in the structural and relational causes of conflict, its proponents and many of its critics argue that it is possible to modify peace operations to resolve their problematic (seemingly illiberal) features and to expand peacebuilding practice to address inequalities and conflictual relationships. To this end, peacebuilding theory increasingly tries to include "local voices" and aims to provide the means for a genuine "locally-owned" and "positive" peace. While significant shifts are both possible and to some extent evident in changing approaches to peacebuilding, the field continues to be based on notions of universal rationality characteristic of liberal modernity and the maintenance of a liberal international order that entails violent and vastly unequal power relations. Although many critics take issue with the imposition of liberal ideals, their suggestions are ultimately incorporated into peacebuilding practice without disrupting efforts to build peace through molding states, institutions and subjects that operate in line with a liberal framework. Thus, the imperatives for positive peace and development redeem and reinforce the peacebuilding project by providing a new rationalization for continued intervention, and despite the rhetoric of local ownership, other approaches are only included insofar as the do not contradict liberal goals. Those that resist the liberal order are marginalized or coerced into accepting its norms. This is a contradictory dynamic inherent to the liberal peace, with political consequences that cannot be resolved through expanding or refining peacebuilding practice.

What I refer to as "peacebuilding literature" is actually drawn from quite diverse theorists, from Paul Collier who explicitly equates growth in Gross Domestic Product (GDP) to the construction of peace,[61] to John Paul Lederach who argues that relationships are at the heart of conflict transformation,[62] to Michael Doyle and Nicholas Sambanis who advocate for a spectrum of peace operations, including the selective and "impartial"

---

[61] Paul Collier et al, *Breaking the Conflict Trap: Civil War and Development Policy* (Washington, D.C.: World Bank and Oxford University Press, 2003).

[62] John Paul Lederach, *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies* (Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1997), 27-31.

use of armed force or "peace enforcement."[63] The diverse peacebuilding theorists I draw on see themselves as pursuing very different projects – many more or less critical of different forms of peacebuilding – and their diverse arguments do not all correspond with all of the claims I highlight in the literature. As a general way of visualizing the field, I follow John Heathershaw in separating peacebuilding into three strains: *democratic peacebuilding, civil society* and *statebuilding.* Democratic peacebuilding was developed by the UN and major donors after the end of the Cold War, promoting liberal internationalist ideals and specifically postconflict democratization and economic development.[64] Civil society approaches became increasingly prominent in the 1990s and tend to argue for bottom-up "emancipatory" peacebuilding through the work of NGOs and local actors.[65] In this chapter I focus on how civil society discourses are incorporated into forms of peacebuilding as a supplement rather than a genuine alternative. In the next chapter I look at the emergence of the concept of civil society itself as a distinctly liberal idea and, in particular, at its long association with the pacification of individuals to means of subordination, but with the unique feature of removing the need for brute force in maintaining domination.[66] Statebuilding is the most recent strain of peacebuilding. It does not exclude the approaches of democratic or civil society approaches, but points to an increasingly tendency to focuses more specifically on the role of the state and its institutions in the creation of peace.

While different forms of peacebuilding have taken increased prominence at different times, none has replaced the other outright. Admitting that the extensive linkages and overlapping aspects of each strain makes them difficult to differentiate, Heathershaw argues that all three discourses together constitute the current state of liberal peacebuilding, but also maintains that without emphasizing the different strains that run through this discourse, one's analysis can easily conceal important differences. I will not be able to express all the complexities of these different approaches, but will try to

---

[63] Michael W. Doyle and Nicholas Sambanis, *Making War and Building Peace: United Nations Peace Operations* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2006), 316.
[64] John Heathershaw, "Unpacking the Liberal Peace: The Dividing and Merging of Peacebuilding Discourses," *Millennium – Journal of International Relations* 36 (2008), 598-599.
[65] Heathershaw, "Unpacking the Liberal Peace," 607.
[66] Achille Mbembe, *On the Postcolony* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 38.

identify some major differences and argue that peacebuilders and their critics are often tied together by a commitment to the overall project of peacebuilding.

Post World War II Reconstruction and the Expansion of the Liberal International Order

At the end of the Second World War, the United States led western policymakers in the construction of institutions aimed at reducing barriers to trade and promoting economic growth, and the pursuit of a liberal international order spanning the Americas, Europe and Asia. The form of liberal modernity that had emerged in the United States became the basis of the postwar reconstruction efforts and the agenda set for these efforts helped to create the conditions for the Cold War and the militarization of the West.[67]

The European Recovery Program, or Marshall Plan, outlined a particular model of state and economy that would allow for the reduction of barriers to the free trade of goods, services and capital and for the integration of European markets through "normal market forces."[68] Robert Hall of the British Treasury described the Marshall Plan and its proponents, the "New Deal coalition," saying, "The Americans want an integrated Europe looking like the United States of America – 'God's own country'."[69] Specifically, the Marshall Planners proposed that, "an integrated single market promised the benefits that inhered in economies of scale, with the ultimate result being a prosperous and stable European community secure against the dangers of Communist subversion and able to join the United States in a multilateral system of world trade."[70] The American policymakers in the coalition hoped that the Marshall Plan would lead to the creation of an internal market in Europe similar to that of the United States, envisioning the "neo-capitalist" reorganization of American and world economic systems on a model of

---

[67] Robert Latham, *The Liberal Moment: Modernity, Security, and the Making of Postwar International Order* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), 4.
[68] Michael J. Hogan, *The Marshall Plan: America, Britain, and the reconstruction of Western Europe, 1947-1952* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), [electronic version] http://hdl.handle.net/2027/heb.00258.0001.001 (accessed March 29 2010), 428.
[69] Ibid., 427.
[70] Ibid.

"unrestricted" free trade, enforced by international institutions and multilateral arrangements promoting neoliberal economic policy.[71] In other words, before market forces could follow their "natural" course, "institutions with the power to transcend sovereignties and coordinate policies," must "discipline the selfish pursuit of national interests."[72]

The idea of "growth" underscored the Marshall Plan and was to be a shared intention uniting business and agriculture leaders and trade unionists.[73] Policymakers believed growth would bring "social harmony" between organized labour and organized capital, protecting at once both political democracy and private-enterprise capitalism. Thus, the political problems associated with the distribution of wealth and relations of power would be reasonably transformed into technical problems with American business, marketing and engineering solutions. With enough growth, policymakers claimed, there would be no need for class conflict over distribution of wealth: the unionists could have their demands and the public administration could avoid the "dangers of bureaucratic statism" through collaboration with corporations in national and transnational networks and supranational institutions. To achieve growth, the Marshall Planners argued, European countries would need to use American aid to modernize industry, reform fiscal and tax policy, and adopt American labour management practices, modest social programs and other economic measures to increase productivity.[74]

The United States was not able to impose all the provisions of its preferred liberal, multilateral order, including an integrated Europe as an independent military and economic sphere of influence. European countries negotiated certain protections for national employment, social welfare and industries such as agriculture,[75] but the United States was still able to implant the framework for its desired order in certain policy reforms and the establishment of several international organizations that would further

---

[71] Ibid.
[72] Ibid., 428.
[73] Ibid.
[74] Ibid., 428-429.
[75] G. John Ikenberry, *Liberal Order and Imperial Ambition: Essays on American Power and World Politics* (Cambridge, Polity Press, 2006), 41.

their policy objectives for integration and trade liberalization.[76] The objectives of the organizations designed for the implementation of the Marshall Plan, including the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (now the World Bank) and the proposed but unrealized International Trade Organization, were always meant to go beyond the short-term reconstruction of Europe and, according to a 1947 broadcast by William Clayton, these organizations concerned the "long-range trade policies and trade of all the world."[77] The legacy of these organizations has certainly extended beyond short-term reconstruction after WWII and the loans and economic development projects facilitated by the IMF and the World bank (WB) outside of Europe have been pivotal to the maintenance of economic relations between the former colonies and the former European colonial powers as well as the United States and other donors states.[78]

The post-WWII efforts to establish a liberal international order were developed in the context of emerging concerns in the United States and Western Europe about increasing communist threats. These conditions influenced the design of the Marshall Plan and the capacity of Europeans leaders to successfully lobby the US to shift towards a more security-centered reconstruction policy.[79] The Marshall Planners decided that they should create the economic security needed to "immunize" Western Europe against Communist expansion while mobilizing resources and public support for an extensive rearmament project.[80] Ultimately, John Ikenberry argues, the United States agreed to have a more direct and long-term military presence in Europe primarily because of the rise in perceived threat from the Soviet Union.[81] The chief policy objective of American foreign aid, according to a memorandum from the US State Department in May 1947, was to increase integration and strengthen the political and economic position of European countries in order to "create the conditions in Europe to induce the Soviets to negotiate

---

[76] Ibid., 40.
[77] Ibid., 39-40.
[78] On the IMF and WB in Africa, and aid and debt relief tied to "IMF/World Bank-supervised reforms," see Nana K. Poko, "Context and Security in Africa," in ed. David J. Francis *Peace and Conflict in Africa* (London: Zed Books, 2008), 108.
[79] Ikenberry, *Liberal Order and Imperial Ambition*, 34-35.
[80] Hogan, *The Marshall Plan*, 429.
[81] Ikenberry, *Liberal Order and Imperial Ambition*, 44.

with the West rather than continue a policy of unilateral expansion… Moreover, the memorandum argued that US policy should be directed at increasing the Western orientation of European leaders."[82] Britain and France both encouraged a hegemonic American position in Europe through a permanent security presence, and specifically the creation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), with American leadership and permanently stationed American military personnel. This allowed European countries to retain more military capacity for national defense. France in particular, was able to direct its military towards preserving the last parts of its colonial empire.[83]

While explicitly calling for European reconstruction based on America as a model, State Department officials insisted that the United States would only be willing to provide aid if European leaders themselves developed and organized a plan for European reconstruction and economic cooperation. State Department official Charles Bohlen stressed that the United States must recognize the danger of appearing to force "the American way" on Europe, but that this imperative must be balanced with the risks associated with leaving Europe without support for reconstruction.[84] In the negotiations for the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC) – an agreement that came into effect in 1948 for the administration of US aid along with agreements for monetary and trade liberalization – the United States "used its economic strength, primarily in the form of dollar aid, to promote European unity, while at the same time attempting to remain outside negotiations."[85] Thus, without taking an official negotiating position, the promise of aid pushed forward the US agenda, though in a slightly modified form, as the model for postwar reconstruction.

By the end of WWII, imperialism was widely thought to be a cause of conflict and war and the denial of self-determination to the European colonies a contradiction to the struggle against Fascism. American policymakers sought an approach to decolonization that balanced support for the colonial powers, demands for self-determination, and the increasing threat of communism, which was "portrayed as the new and more evil form of

---

[82] Ibid., 32.
[83] Ibid., 44.
[84] Ibid., 32-33.
[85] Ibid., 34.

colonialism."[86] In 1954, policymakers from the Bureau of Near Eastern, South Asian and African Affairs wrote,

> As a means of diminishing the threat to Western interests posed by nationalist demands...the United Stated should make the most practical use of economic, technical and where applicable military assistance so as to influence the process of political change to effect the best compromise of Western interests and to offer the maximum promise of stable non-Communist regimes.[87]

Given the imperative to maintain American "interests" (access to flows of human and material resources from the colonies) and "democratic" allies, the implications of the Cold War for decolonization in Africa were tremendously important. US officials commented in 1956 that colonialism was the main battleground between East and West and that this fight would play out in Africa in the 1960s.[88] The US aimed to create cooperative relationships with African leaders that would gear African states towards "western oriented" democratic and capitalist models and began to supplement aid from their European allies.[89] As pressure from African nationalists increased in late 1950s and 1960s, American officials believed that African countries would gain independence before they were sufficiently "prepared," politically and economically, to run an orderly state. Although the United States officially supported a principle of self-determination for colonial peoples, many US officials believed that Africans were primitive peoples incapable of self-government, or at least a long way away from having such capacities. American representatives in Africa argued that,

> without the discipline and control of Western nations, ancient antagonisms would burst their present bounds and numerous races or tribes would attack traditional enemies in primitive savagery. The native people of Africa tend always to mistrust the leadership of their own kind because in themselves they have not yet as a people achieved sufficient evolutionary stature to understand the existence of motivation other than the compulsion of self-interest of a very low order or fear.[90]

---

[86] John Kent, "The United States and the Decolonization of Black Africa, 1945-63," in ed. David Ryan and Victor Pungong *The United States and Decolonization* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000), [electronic version] http://www.palgraveconnect.com/pc/polintstud2001/browse/inside/9780333977958.html (accessed March 31 2010), 172

[87] Cited in John Kent, "The United States and the Decolonization of Black Africa, 1945-63," 173.

[88] Cited in John Kent, "The United States and the Decolonization of Black Africa, 1945-63," 174.

[89] Consul-general Dakar to US State Department, 23 February 1950. Cited Ibid., 170.

[90] Consul-general Dakar to US State Department, 23 February 1950. Cited Ibid., 170-171.

Given such perceptions of Africa as a continent "full of primitive ignorance, superstition and extensive illiteracy," extensive tutelage was deemed necessary before Africans would be capable of civilized behaviour and self-government, if they ever could:

> To endow these African groups prematurely with independence and sovereignty would only result in creating political entities which would almost immediately become pawns of the Kremlin. Constructive effort without European stimulation would cease and the advances already achieved in bringing these areas a few steps forward from the conditions of the bush and the jungles would in a few years under native control, and as a result of native sloth, dishonesty, incompetence and uncooperativeness revert to the status of conditions now observable in these portions of Liberia which are under direct native supervision.[91]

American policymakers believed, on one hand, that weak, independent African states would be vulnerable to communist influences and, on the other, that delaying African self-determination could likewise lead to violent upheaval and subversive communist involvement. Thus, the Americans also had Cold War-related strategic reasons to encourage the European colonial powers to preserve stability by meeting the demands of African nationalists.[92] Though not able to admit this publicly, John Kent argues, US President Richard Nixon believed that in both Latin America and Africa, the US could not hope for genuine western-style democracy and must turn instead to "strongmen," upholding patrimonial networks in a notably undemocratic fashion, rather than let communism take hold on the continent.[93] The strategic privileging of local elites in the pursuit of American interests in the twentieth century supplemented the elite structures of colonial institutions, and the particularly pervasive practice of *indirect rule,* characteristic of late nineteenth century colonialism.[94] Thus, while explicitly promoting economic and political independence and democratization for African colonies, American foreign policy at the height of decolonisation was concealing efforts to create postcolonial states that reflected the image and form of Western states and the maintenance of imperial domination and elite rule in Africa.

---

[91] Cited Ibid., 170-171.
[92] Despite Portugal's hard stance against African independence, the US tried to retain good relations with Portugal due to the strategic significance of the US base in the Portuguese Azores, and abstained on more extreme UN resolutions on Portuguese colonialism. (Ibid., 180-182)
[93] Ibid., 178.
[94] Mantena, *Alibis of Empire,* 148. I discuss indirect rule further in the next chapter.

The continuation of colonialism and relations of domination was a consistent feature of the twentieth century, during war to peace transitions and amidst shifts from colonial to "post-colonial" states. When requesting the United States strengthen its political and military role in Western Europe, French Foreign Minister Georges Bidault framed US involvement as "collaboration between the old and new worlds, both so jointly responsible for the preservation of the only valuable civilization."[95] In line with variously formulated beliefs in the inherent, but sometimes vulnerable, superiority of Western civilization, the liberal international order pursued in the context of post-WWII reconstruction, decolonization and the Cold War was a tool for the maintenance of American and European military, economic and cultural dominance internationally. As the following discussion will show, practices of international peacebuilding have sustained the pursuit of this order since the end of the Cold War.

Marking Out a Path from War to Peace

As I outlined above, the liberal international order pursued by the allied countries at the end of WWII, and the international financial institutions established in the Bretton Woods system, were based on the belief that a stable economic system was essential to sustainable peace, and that democracies and the market economy provide the ideal in this regard.[96] Although, the discussion above does not necessarily show that policymakers

---

[95] Cited in Inkenberry, *Liberal Order and Imperial Ambition*, 37.

[96] Richmond, *Peace in International Relations*, 35. In fact, the liberal peace has much older and diverse roots than I delineate here. Richmond describes the emergence of a liberal idea of peace as a cosmopolitan ethic seen in various European peace projects in the 18th century, such as Abbe St. Pierre's *Project for Perpetual Peace,* which argued for a European treaty to establish a federation of states "based on justice, equality and reciprocity between both Christians and Muslim sovereigns." (Ibid., 25) Shortly thereafter, Kant argued along similar lines for peace between nations in a cooperative community of free 'republican' states. Immanuel Kant, *Perpetual Peace, and Other Essays on Politics, History, and Morals*, (Indianapolis, Indiana: Hackett Publishing Company, 1983). A liberal concept of peace continued to expand and transform over the next several hundred years, notably in the 19th century with the establishment of International Humanitarian Law (IHL) through the Geneva Convention in 1864 and the subsequent formation of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC, the oldest humanitarian organization and so-called "guardian" of IHL), and in the early 20th century with the establishment of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) and the League of Nations. (Richmond, *Peace in International Relations,* 28) By the inception of the League of Nations in the inter-war period, early liberal visions of utopian peace between states were replaced by a neo-Kantian "liberal reformist" peace, which promoted a principle of self-

were promoting "democracy," as in rule by the people in a broad sense – the promotion of strongmen and capitalism was certainly evident and one might describe this as the promotion of polyarchy (rule by a few).[97] "Democracy" itself is an essentially contested term, in the sense described by Gallie in the introduction, and the "democratic" elements of the liberal peace promoted in "democratic peacebuilding" differs substantially from the strategy during the Cold War. Still, "democracy" is the recurrent language, conceived in post-Cold War democratic peacebuilding as a means to reduce inter- and intra-state war through building liberal democratic states and institutions, which hold regular elections and protect the rule of law as well as free media, free speech and human rights. The assumption here is that liberal democracies required and fostered qualities and economic relations that would reduce their chances of going to war with another.[98] This peace is established through state co-operation with international organizations and the promotion of the liberal norms and values.[99] The political priorities wrapped up in this vision of peace are evident in reconstruction strategies that include institutional reforms favorable to shaping post-conflict countries into liberal states and secure places for economic development. Del Castillo provides a good example in this regard. She writes

---

determination that was quickly applicable to the colonial/post-colonial states along with the rights and constraints of a peace "organized and enforced by a community of states." (Ibid., 33)

[97] Robert A. Dahl, *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971); William I. Robinson, *Promoting Polyarchy: Globalization, US Intervention and Hegemony* (Cambridge: Combridge University Press, 1996).

[98] For a defense of democratic peace theory, see Bruce Russett, Christopher Layne, David E. Spiro, Michael W. Doyle, "Correspondence: The Democratic Peace," *International Security* 19, no. 4 (Spring 1995): 164-184. On the correlation between wealth and democracy believed to lead to the democratic peace, see James D. Fearon and David D. Laitin, "Ethnicity, Insurgency and Civil War," *American Political Science Review* 97, no. 1 (2003): 75-90. While acknowledging that democracy promotion "in practice" has often violated democratic principles, supporting military dictatorships in Latin America, the Middle East and other places around world, democratic peace theorists argue that these subversive interventions and war games, including the U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2003, "did not violate the assumptions of democratic peace theory, since the target was a repressive state." Steven W. Hook and Tood Nelson, "Preface and Acknowledgments," in ed. Hook, *Democratic Peace in Theory and Practice*, viii. This thesis argues that these actions actually pose a fundamental challenge to the assumptions of the democratic peace, which elevates a community of democratic states above "undemocratic" or nonliberal states. Insofar as these assumptions are taken up in democratic peacebuilding theory, the conflation of democracy with a stable and just peace serves to rationalize the violent incorporation of undemocratic states into a liberal and democratic international state system.

[99] Lantham writes that liberal and democratic traditions are combined in the context of liberal democracy to represent a set of "principles and practices that organize a state and society." Robert Latham, *The Liberal Moment*, 11-12. As Lantham describes it, "[t]his cluster includes the holding of free, competitive, and broad-based elections; the restraint of state power vis-à-vis a relatively autonomous civil society; and the commitment to equality, tolerance, and the rights of groups and individuals." (Ibid., 11-12)

that institutional arrangements are considered key to the implementation of post-conflict reconstruction strategies, noting that the removal of "statist" policies – involving "excessive" taxes or bureaucratic barriers for foreign businesses – is especially pertinent in post-conflict countries which previously had central-planning systems. While some institutions are specific to a reconstruction strategy and are meant to be eliminated after the completion of "peace-related programs," most are considered part of the "path of normal development."[100] The implication is that political and economic liberalization is the inevitable outcome of post-conflict reconstruction, supporting Roland Paris's assertion that this is the "common goal" of peacebuilding.[101]

Observers such as Christopher Cramer advocate for "non-orthodox" liberalization because, he argues, low-income countries do not typically recover the revenue lost when export taxes and import tariffs are reduced and replaced in liberalization strategies and "it is unreasonable to expect economic growth and structural change to unfold on the basis of neo-liberal economic policies and the 'light state'."[102] He advocates for certain protections for postconflict countries, including more actively encouraging export-promoting policies and removing protections in rich countries that restrict developing country exports.[103] In this regard, policymakers should learn from the "history of state formation and successful capitalist development," citing studies of America after the revolution and Europe after World War II, which Cramer argues, is a history of "managed integration into the world economy" and state aid for infrastructural development and institutional transformations.[104] Despite looking to mitigate some of the negative consequences of economic liberalization, this approach continues to define the limits of political community in such a way that the presence of a state, with at least

---

[100] Graciana del Castillo, *Rebuilding War-Torn States*, 239.
[101] Paris argues that although peacebuilding agencies are diverse and have no central authority or standardized guiding policy, peacebuilding agencies have adopted a series of approaches designed to create institutions, states and societies conducive to a liberal agenda for peace, namely "peace through political and economic liberalization." Roland Paris, "Peacebuilding and the Limits of Liberal Internationalism," *International Security* 22, no.2 (1997): 63.
[102] Christopher Cramer, "Trajectories of Accumulation through War and Peace" in ed. Roland Paris and Timothy D. Sisk *The Dilemmas of Statebuilding: Confronting the Contradictions of Postwar Peace Operations* (New York: Routledge, 2009), 143; 145.
[103] Ibid., 144.
[104] Ibid., 145.

minimal evidence of privatization, fiscal policy reforms and trade liberalization signals that a country is in a "war to peace" transition.[105]

Even though peacebuilding theorists might accept that the liberal state will never provide complete security from external threats, they assume that a legitimate state will use different instruments than those of a wartime government in protecting the state monopoly on violence and that individuals and groups will trust the state to be "an impartial force that can provide credible security guarantees."[106] As I elaborate in the next chapter, the state can never fulfill the role such an arrangement sets up for it, but the expectation that the state protects peace conceals the violence on which it depends. This chapter shows that the state is both constructed and protected through violence.

Presenting various perspectives on the centrality of statebuilding within peacebuilding, Call and Wyeth's edited collection *Building States to Build Peace* argues that past scholarship neglected the "crucial role" of the state in peacebuilding, and responding to recent developments in scholarship emphasizing the state, "in this volume," they write, "we have sought to examine critically the newfound wisdom about the centrality of state institutions to the sustainability of peace."[107] In considering whether a legitimate and effective state is necessary to build a lasting peace, Call concludes that "[t]he importance of the state for peacebuilding is contingent and problematic," and that the case studies in the volume show that it is dangerous to equate peacebuilding with statebuilding outright. Yet, the answer to the research problem is a "qualified" yes, as their case studies show that "a minimally legitimate and effective state is necessary for sustained peace."[108]

Call criticizes past scholarship for focusing predominantly on negotiated agreements, which "are now recognized as a midpoint, rather than the end point, of peace processes."[109] He argues that a statebuilding project is an equally inadequate synonym for peacebuilding as any previously dominant policy imperative. A necessary but insufficient

---

[105] Ibid., 141-143.
[106] Michael Barnett and Christoph Zucher, "The Peacebuilder's Contract" in ed. Roland Paris and Timothy D. Sisk *The Dilemmas of Statebuilding: Confronting the Contradictions of Postwar Peace Operations* (New York: Routledge, 2009), 28.
[107] Charles T. Call, "Building States to Build Peace?," in *Building States to Build Peace*, ed. Charles T. Call and Vanessa Wyeth (Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2008), 384.
[108] Ibid., 370-371.
[109] Ibid.

condition of a sustainable peace, statebuilding discourse is foregrounded as a constitutive component of a holistic approach to peacebuilding. In other words, statebuilding widens the practice in response to the newly identified needs to focus on effective institutions amid the complex and difficult work of peacebuilding. The current wars in Iraq and Afghanistan are likely the foremost examples of peacebuilding as statebuilding.[110] This turn towards statebuilding since September 11, 2001 and the launch of the War on Terror, does not exclude the "pacifying powers of civil society," promoted with increasing force since this mid-1990s.[111] Rather, the language of "civil society" is reappropriated within a conservative and realist politics that conflates security and human rights. The leader of Canada's federal Liberal party, the official opposition, makes a characteristic argument for this type of discourse, advocating for "imperial policing":

> Imperialism used to be the white man's burden. This gave it a bad reputation. But imperialism doesn't stop being necessary just because it becomes politically incorrect. Nations sometimes fail, and when they do outside help – imperial power – can get them back on their feet. Nation-building is the kind of imperialism you get in a human rights era, a time when great powers believe simultaneously in the right of small nations to govern themselves and their own right to rule the world. [112]

This emerging statebuilding discourse corresponds to the increasing representation of civil war zones and global poverty as cesspools for terrorism and other threats to global security. Paul Collier argues that civil war leads to the collapse of state authority and that without the control of a "recognized" government, such territories "become the epicenters of crime and disease" and an ideal "safe haven" for international terrorism.[113] Collier is likely the paramount example in this regard, taking an econometric and state-centric approach to peacebuilding.[114] He asserts that his work avoids the pitfalls of subjective interpretation, "smashing" myths about the world's poorest countries (those most likely

---

[110] Heathershaw, "Unpacking the Liberal Peace," 613.
[111] Ibid., 609. Also, see Kofi Abiew and Tom Keating, "Defining a Role for Civil Society: Humanitarian NGOs and Peacebuilding Operations," in ed. Tom Keating and W. Andy Knight *Building Sustainable Peace* (Edmonton, Alberta: The University of Alberta Press and United Nations Press, 2004).
[112] Cited Heathershaw, "Unpacking the Liberal Peace,"618.
[113] Collier et al, *Breaking the Conflict Trap*, x; 2.
[114] Econometrics uses statistics derived from observation, quantifying observations about economic relationships in order to analyze and test economic theories about these relationships.

to have a civil war) through the power of statistical analysis.[115] Using quantitative methods, Collier finds that a country's "characteristics" affect its risk of civil war. Economic characteristics are undoubtedly the most important in this regard with the highest risk of civil war attributed to decline in economic growth, dependence on primary commodity exports and a low per capita income that is unevenly distributed.[116]

Collier determines that two groups of countries are most at risk. The first group are low-income developing countries that "have to date failed to sustain the policies, governance, and institutions that might give them a chance of achieving reasonable growth."[117] Collier claims that, "[i]t is imperative that such countries are brought into the mainstream of development," as a country's failure to develop economically is "a key root cause of conflict," creating the circumstances that account for the initial resort to large-scale armed conflict.[118] Once a country has had a civil war the "conflict trap" creates the second high-risk group, comprised of those countries that have had a recent civil war. According to Collier, these countries are thereby at a much greater risk of more conflict, as "the chief legacy of a civil war is another war."[119] Thus, designing international interventions to "stabilize" society is the primary development challenge during the first decade after a civil war.[120] For Collier, stabilization is an economic issue and the possibility of escaping the conflict trap depends upon a range of policy and aid reforms to promote growth.[121] By showing that such policies are associated with economic growth, Collier attempts to "prove" the effectiveness of liberal economic policy in making peace. For the most part, Collier reduces the complicated social projects

---

[115] Paul Collier, *The Bottom Billion: Why the Poorest Countries Are Failing and What Can Be Done About It* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), xii; Paul Collier et al, *Breaking the Conflict Trap: Civil War and Development Policy*, 54.
[116] Collier, Breaking the Conflict Trap, 51.
[117] Ibid., x.
[118] Ibid., x; 51-53.
[119] Ibid., x.
[120] Ibid.
[121] Stabilization is an issue for the entire region surrounding the post conflict country. While civil war reduces the growth rate of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of the country at war, Collier argues that it simultaneously reduces the growth rate of the entire region, as neighbouring countries are forced to burden the economic costs of accommodating large numbers of refugees. Also, a civil war in one country can obstruct trade routes to neighbouring countries thereby increasing the cost of transportation and deterring investment in the region. Moreover, civil war can increase the perceived threat of attack, establish high norms of military expenditure and lead to increased military spending in nearby countries. Ibid., 33-35.

that constitute a war to a series of statistics detailing the income of countries at war and the number of people who have died on the battlefield, but in a move typical of contemporary World Bank practice (which has been criticized for its isolated emphasis on economic and technocratic approaches), Collier's quantitative analysis goes beyond statistics, applying numerical scales to qualitative assessments as well. For example, Collier determines that civil war causes state policies to deteriorate based on the Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA), a five-point scale on economic policy divided into four areas: macro-economic policy (which can be more or less "stable"), structural policy (more or less "conducive to growth"), social policy (more or less "inclusive") and public sector management (more or less "well-managed"). A higher score on the scale indicates "better policies." Collier writes that, while "what constitutes 'good' policies can be controversial, consensus on the recognition of bad policies is wider, and, unfortunately, civil war countries tend to be at this end of the spectrum."[122]

This chapter is not concerned with disputing the connection between material wealth (or poverty) and the occurrence of armed conflict as much as it is with challenging the reductionism of this research wherein Collier naturalizes the extension of the liberal international order by causally linking peace to certain economic policies conducive to economic growth and thereby implies that to choose not to adopt the policies he suggests is to choose war over peace.[123]

The naturalization of this approach to peacebuilding depends on a belief in the universal rationality of the liberal international order. Collier argues that during the Cold War the development of a cohesive international policy regarding civil war was not possible due to the divisiveness of superpower rivalries; however, Collier writes, "we are no longer completely in the dark. We now know enough for a reasonable basis for action."[124] His proposed "agenda for international action" involves the reform of international aid, institutional and military spending, more comprehensive coordination of military and development strategies, and improved governance of natural resources, all

---

[122] Ibid., 21-22.
[123] Other research has challenged this connection; cf. Cramer, "Trajectories of Accumulation through War and Peace."
[124] Ibid., 6.

fundamentally aimed at economic growth.[125] Positioning himself as a seemingly universal juror in assessing those countries at the "bad" end of the economic policy spectrum, Collier condemns the decisions of those he considers unreasonable while legitimating foreign intervention by more reasonable states, encouraging a consensus among liberal democratic states for the imposition of liberal political and economic norms in the context of post-conflict peacebuilding.

As much as the state and economic growth is associated with progress towards peace within the liberal international order, this view of order also corresponds to the wider historical context of liberal modernity. Modernity, according to Lantham, involves the rational organization of social relations that occurs in a state and institutions; it refers to "a complex of collective practices, shared ideas, and forms of organizing social existence with unique historical consequences including nation-states, modern cities, industrial societies, and global markets."[126] The normalization of these modes of organizing political relations obfuscates the violence identified by theorists such as Horkheimer and Adorno, who argue that the orders of modernity and Enlightenment thinking ("the philosophy which equates truth with scientific system"), particularly when coupled with industrial capitalism, have produced and organized rationalised violence in unparalleled proportions.[127] Enlightenment thinking aims for a unified system of understanding based on hierarchically order concepts. Drawing on the work of Immanuel Kant, Horkheimer and Adorno describe the logical ordering of this system of thought:

> Thinking, as understood by the Enlightenment, is the process of establishing a unified, scientific order and of deriving factual knowledge from principles… Any thinking not guided by the system is directionless or authoritarian. Reason contributes nothing but the idea of systematic unity, the formal elements of fixed conceptual relationships… Reason is 'a faculty of deducing the particular from the universal'.[128]

---

[125] Ibid. Although Collier's use of the term "growth" always implies economic growth, and most often the growth rate of a country's GDP, that Collier assumes an "economic" preface each time he says growth reveals a slippage in his entire work wherein he acknowledges that the economic components of his analysis are just part of his study of civil war (referring briefly to social welfare at different times) and yet he continually utilizes quantitative economic "evidence" to represent the entire issue of civil war.

[126] Lantham. *The Liberal Moment,* 13.

[127] Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno, *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments* ed. Gunzelin Schmid Noerr, trans. Edmund Jephcott (Palo Alto, California: Standford University Press, 2002), 66.

[128] Ibid., 64.

Peacebuilding is based on a similar conception of reasonable thinking, such that one might believe that it is possible to design a universal model for peace at an abstract level and then impose this vision onto the particularities and political complexities of the world. The ideas of progress in modernity encourage the subjugation of nature (including people and natural environments) and are conducive to industrial society and its drive for exponential and endless growth in production and consumption.[129] The organization of modernity actually entails great violence because life itself, Horkheimer and Adorno write, "is apprehended in terms of manipulation and administration."[130] This entails the transformation of all of nature into "a repeatable, replicable process, a mere example of the conceptual models of the system."[131] These conceptual models are concerned with the "large numbers," not necessarily the particular case insofar as they are not concerned with who dies, for example, as much as with the guarantee that the general model achieves the desired organization of (political) life.[132]

Overall, the statebuilding approach indicates a belief that peace stems from a particular type of order. It adopts a minimalist interpretation of Boutros-Ghali's *An Agenda for Peace,* focusing on his argument that, "respect for [the State's] fundamental sovereignty and integrity are crucial to any common international progress."[133] While the entrenchment of sovereignty is a foundation of the statebuilding project, Heathershaw argues, "emphasis on sovereignty and the norm of non-intervention ironically foreshadowed the later development of statebuilding and increasing move away from non-intervention."[134] According to Heathershaw, by 2008 statebuilding was the prevailing peacebuilding discourse, having an extensive base of academic, policy-making and popular literature, dominating peacebuilding discussions and spurring an array of

---

[129] Ibid., 65.
[130] Ibid. This is a common theme in German philosophy of the early- and mid-twentieth century. A similar claim is made by Martin Heidegger; cf. Martin Heidegger, *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays* trans. William Lovitt (New York: Harper & Row, 1977). Weber also argues that modernity is characterized by a drive for increasingly rational and efficient calculation of life, see Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* trans. Talcott Parsons (New York, Scribner, 2003).
[131] Horkheimer and Adorno, *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, 65.
[132] Ibid., 66.
[133] Boutros Boutros-Ghali, An Agenda for Peace: Preventative Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peace-keeping, (17 June 1992, A/47/277-S/24111), 17.
[134] John Heathershaw, "Unpacking the Liberal Peace," 609.

research projects "aimed at identifying variables and 'measuring' state sovereignty in quantitative and qualitative terms."[135] These objectivist conceptualizations of state sovereignty and the establishment of "legitimate" states and institutions ignore the "subjective and symbolic dimensions of state sovereignty and political authority more broadly."[136] In Heathershaw's view, legitimacy is produced by subjective or intersubjective interpretation, and upheld by people's beliefs. He argues that the fatal contradiction of externally-manufactured states is evident in the persistent failure of the occupying forces to build independent and legitimate states in Iraq and Afghanistan.[137]

Many peacebuilding theorists recognize the contradictory and often unsatisfactory outcomes of statebuilding as peacebuilding. Barnett and Zucher quote Noah Feldman saying that "we [nation-builders] do not know what we are doing."[138] Yet, they continue, "compromised peacebuilding does not look so bad given the alternatives."[139] Their term, *compromised peacebuilding,* means that local elites and peacebuilders both have a say in the delivery of services and assistance.[140] The alternatives are *captured peacebuilding,* where peacebuidling assistance is distributed entirely in the interests of state and local elites, or *conflictive peacebulding,* where peacebuilders are forced to turn to the "threat or use of coercive tools" in order to meet their objectives.[141] The ideal form of "unimpeded" peacebuilding, *cooperative peacebuilding,* where peacebuilders direct "services and assistance leading to the creation of new institutions that distribute political and economic power to new actors,"[142] is prevented in all but "very rare circumstances" since conflicting goals among concerned parties lead to serious compromises or failure,[143] depending on the strategic negotiations between peacebuilders, "who want stability and liberalization," state elites, "who want to maintain their power," and subnational elites,

---

[135] Ibid., 611.
[136] Ibid., 612.
[137] John Heathershaw, "Unpacking the Liberal Peace," 613.
[138] Barnett and Zucher, "The Peacebuilder's Contract," 48.
[139] Ibid.,
[140] Ibid., 33.
[141] Ibid., 25.
[142] Ibid., 33.
[143] Ibid., 47.

"who want autonomy from the state and to maintain their power in the countryside."[144] The alternative not listed by Barnett and Zucher is the possibility that international peacebuilding might not occur at all. The foreclosure of this choice reveals the fundamental commitment of the authors to a peacebuilding project, as an expression of the privileging of social organization within a state at all costs, even if they do not actually know what they are doing.

The malfunctions of externally constructed liberal states reveal some of the flaws of international peacebuilding, but the problem is not only externally manufactured states, or states whose population does not have a sense of commitment to the political community bounded by the territorial state. Many of the problems behind statebuilding as peacebuilding are inherent paradoxes in the state system itself. States are given the responsibility for providing protection and security for citizens, but they depend on violence to do so. Moreover, where a state does not exist to provide these expected forms of protection and security, other local and international actors depend on violence to create one. Doyle and Sambanis, for example, write that, "the destructiveness of civil anarchy is unacceptable both to all who suffer and to much of the international community forced to observe the suffering"; they then rationalize violent armed interventions on this basis. [145] Specifically, Doyle and Sambanis acknowledge the violence inherent to the peacebuilding problematic, terming this paradox the "Peacekeeper's Problem," wherein "consent is necessary for legitimacy and long-run sustainability, yet coercion will be needed to deal with the factions that resist or defect from the peace agreement."[146] Thus they advocate for the selective use of force to implement part of a comprehensive peace plan, such as the UN force of British troops that "liberated" Freetown, Sierra Leone from the Revolutionary United Front (RUF) in May 2000. This operation, and the ensuing efforts to free 220 captured peacekeepers, train 1000 army personnel and support Sierra Leone President Ahmed Kabbah, is believed to have been a "discrete, impartial, but nonneutral use of force or positive

---

[144] Ibid., 29; 24.
[145] Michael W. Doyle and Nicholas Sambanis, *Making War and Building Peace: United Nations Peace Operations* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2006), 19.
[146] Ibid., 303.

sanctions," and is thus appropriate "peace enforcement" according to the authors' definition.[147]

Peacebuilding justifies the continuation of war by other means based on a problematic opposition where the presence of a "legitimate and effective" state is the sign that one is on a path to peace, security, order and everything outside of this is associated with war, chaos and insecurity. To reject the liberal peace is to make a fundamentally irrational choice – to embrace war and chaos. These limits rationalize violence against anyone irrational enough to reject the liberal peace and thereby inhibit progress towards peace.

Peacebuilding as a Justification for Ongoing Colonial Relations

Claiming to have rejected the racial and civilizational hierarchies of past imperial projects, and maintaining that contemporary interventions constitute a clear break with these violent histories, proponents of peacebuilding describe how peacebuilding avoids the illegitimate means of colonialism. Doyle and Sambanis write that colonialism and neocolonialism are "unacceptable in the current age," due to "the humiliations and costs of international hierarchy."[148] On the other hand, they assert that peacekeeping and peacebuilding are increasingly acceptable means of intervention. This relates to the capacity of the intervention to cease hostilities and create a long-term peace (in which, they argue, the reconstruction of the economy is particularly important).[149] In this regard, they state that, "no matter how well intentioned an intervention is, unless the intervenor can also claim that the intervention is likely to produce sustainable improvement – both peace and human rights – the intervention is unlikely to be either politically or ethically viable."[150] In order to be justifiable the intervention must not contradict other commitments held by the authors (and presumably the interveners), including a respect for international laws and the UN Charter Article 2 Clause 7 prohibition against the

---

[147] Ibid., 316; 318.
[148] Doyle and Sambanis, *Making War and Building Peace,* 19.
[149] Ibid., 6.
[150] Ibid.

violation of state sovereignty.[151] The basic thread of their argument is that, if one acts to protect basic human rights, one acts on global, not national interests, and therefore, Doyle and Sambanis propose, sovereignty is not violated.[152] The UN is considered "a legitimate agent to decide when sovereignty was and was not violated," because the Security Council represents the "collective will and voice" of the "international community," a common construction gesturing to the shared "global interests" which the intervener acts to defend.[153] The combination of states – states of different sizes, cultures, races, religions and forms of governments – that are included in the decisions of this so called "global parliament," Doyle and Sambanis contend, "makes for genuinely international and impartial intervention."[154] Proceeding on faith in its universal impartiality, the authors maintain that the UN is in a position to determine if the intervention is "likely to produce a sustainable improvement," thereby rendering it "ethically and politically viable."[155] This logic of inclusion depends on the notion that if enough voices are heard in the decision-making process, and if everyone involved is considered equal, then the actions sanctioned are "just." This is a sentiment common to liberal democratic ideals of peacebuilding, which I outlined above, involving rational individuals making majority rules decisions based on principles of universal equality, freedom of expression and representation through voting in an election. For Doyle and Sambanis, peacebuilding is "multilateral and impartial" because it is based on a principle of equality among states and the universality of human rights, which "makes the quasi-colonial presence that a multidimensional peace operation entails not only tolerable but effective."[156]

The 2004 UN Report *A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility* (MSW), which proposed the creation of the now fully operating UN Peacebuidling Commission, proposes an approach to peace operations similar to Doyle and Sambanis'. The report states,

---

[151]Ibid., 7. The clause affirms nonintervention, except when mandated by the Security Council under Chapter VII of the UN Charter in response to threats to international peace.
[152] Ibid.
[153] Ibid., 6-8.
[154] Ibid., 8-9.
[155] Ibid., 7.
[156] Ibid., 318.

> Today we are in an era where dozens of states are under stress or recovering from conflict, there is a clear international obligation to assist states in developing their capacity to perform their sovereign functions effectively and responsibly.[157]

MSW draws on the *Responsibility to Protect* doctrine and supports the creation of juridical sovereignty by foreign states and international bodies in the case of "failed states," including an obligation to assist those countries that are identified as being at high-risk of collapse. Nonetheless, the report upholds the notion of an international community in which state sovereignty supposedly precludes foreign intervention. In contrast to Doyle and Sambanis' position that this is resolved through a universal formulation of sovereignty, Heathershaw supports a reading of this doctrine as a hierarchical ordering of international authority with imperial implications. In light of this contradiction, Heathershaw argues, "MSW amounts to the clearest case of a two-tier system of sovereign states (subjects of intervention and objects of intervention) since nineteenth-century advocacy for colonialism."[158] The argument I am making is similar, although in addition to making the comparison between current practices and nineteenth century colonial practices (which I elaborate more in the next chapter), I emphasize the continuity among ongoing transformations in colonial practice. Despite its presentation as problem-solving for conflict-prevention, peacebuilding is "more than a form of praxis; crucially it is a discourse."[159] This discourse shifts and changes older discourses (replacing narratives of civilization and tutelage with modernization, development and the protection of human rights), constituting a new form of ideological rationalization for what happens in a foreign intervention and the imposition of liberal politics and economics on those deemed in need of development and reform.

Rather than consider these interventions (and liberal imperialism more generally) in terms of their greater or lesser capacity to build peace, I propose that peace operations are more accurately considered within a framework of war (or at least with war as a principle of analysis). Peacebuilding literature naturalizes liberal approaches to constructing peace and obscures the complex political negotiations and violent enforcement involved in such

---

[157]Heathershaw, "Unpacking the Liberal Peace," 614-615.
[158] Ibid., 614-615.
[159] Ibid., 602.

operations. In considering peacebuilding as a means of perpetuating and concealing ongoing war and violence, I seek to repoliticize these actions. My point is not that one type of war is better or worse. Peace operations are qualitatively different from each other and from the diverse forms of armed conflict they are meant to address; these are all different means of war with different political consequences, effecting violence of different kinds on widely varied scales. In analyzing them on the same terms (as opposed to perpetuating the assumption that peace operations should only be considered in terms of progress towards peace while other civil and interstate wars are considered in terms of chaos, the impossibility of order and peace), I am trying to show that it does not make sense to rationalize one as "politically and ethically viable" on that the basis that it is better then the other. Instead, I propose that a more balanced analysis looks at the political consequences of each of them under the same rubric. Otherwise, the notion that the alternative is necessarily worse forecloses the most penetrating criticisms of peacebuilding.

Fixing the Liberal Peace: "Local Ownership" of a "Just" Peace?

Peacebuilding practitioners and theorists have made a range of criticisms of peacebuilding practice.[160] In a recent book, *The Dilemmas of Statebuilding,* Roland Paris and Timothy Sisk describe a series of fundamental contradictions underlying peacebuilding, three of which are particularly relevant to the argument in this thesis:

1 Outside intervention is used to foster self-government…

2 International control is required to establish local ownership…

3 Universal values are promoted as a remedy for local problems.[161]

Sisk and Paris argue that another whole series of dilemmas arise at the policy-level in response to these contradictions, which can be "managed" at best, "not resolved."[162] They

---

[160] Doyle and Sambanis, for example, emphasize that the UN's efforts towards impartiality in its interventions does not mean it has always known how to conduct such interventions to "successfully." That is, affecting a "sustainable peace" that supports human rights and includes the majority of the local population. See Doyle and Sambanis, *Making War and Building Peace,* 9.

[161] Roland Paris and Timothy D. Sisk "Conclusion: Confronting the Contradictions" in ed. Roland Paris and Timothy D. Sisk *The Dilemmas of Statebuilding: Confronting the Contradictions of Postwar Peace Operations* (New York: Routledge, 2009), 305.

emphasize that the authors in the volume "offer no falsely simple prescriptions" for the consolidation of peace in post-civil war countries. Still, they remain committed to the project and proceed to write that, "the primary purpose of dilemma analysis is to inform the process of devising more nuanced and effective statebuilding strategies."[163] This sort of call for revision in peacebuilding practice is typical of the peacebuilding's critics and especially among the civil society based literature, which introduces that approaches that generally appeal to the idea of *peace-as-justice*. Specifically, these theorists say that it is possible to resolve the issues of externally imposed peacebuilding agendas and its failure to reduce indirect and direct violence, including the resort to armed violence in peacebuilding practice itself. Critics also argue that peacebuilders can and should expand the practice to address structural and relational issues. While peacebuilding theory has shifted in this regard, increasingly emphasizing "local voices" and "bottom-up" approaches to peace, with some approaches appearing to decenter economic and state-centric approaches and provide the means for reconciliation, social justice and a genuinely "locally-owned" peace, the field remains grounded in the universal rationality of liberal modernity and the perpetuation of an inherently violent and unequal liberal international order. The transformation of states, institutions and economies is now considered a necessary but insufficient condition for peace and "bottom-up" approaches are promoted as complementary to these "top-down" approaches. Thus, peacebuilding is only "local" insofar as local people choose approaches that fit, or could fit, within a liberal framework for global capitalization. Thus, while arguing against liberal norms, these criticisms are incorporated into and reinforce peacebuilding practice in such a way that they actually reinstate liberal norms in the context of criticizing their imposition.

Mary Kaldor suggests that if international efforts are to continue advancing progress that has been made since the end of the Cold War towards stabilizing violent conflicts, policy-makers need to address the threats to human insecurity that create and perpetuate violence through the provision of human development assistance (including building infrastructure and social services), protecting human rights and enforcing international

---

[162] Ibid., 309.
[163] Ibid., 311.

and national laws, not through waging war as they might have in the early twentieth century.[164] Kaldor argues that one needs to differentiate between "new wars" and "old wars," where new wars involve state and non-state actors and are based on "new sectarian identities (religious, ethnic or tribal) that undermine the sense of a shared political community."[165] Not precisely civil wars as opposed to interstate wars, "new wars" blur the lines between what is internal war and what is external. Actual battles take place less often in the new wars while civilians experience more violence.[166] The risk posed by "terror" is too serious to consider "fantasies of 'old war'."[167] That is, it is too destructive to risk using the methods of old wars in light of the current scale of resources and technology available for killing. New wars necessitate new approaches at the level of civil society, carried out within a framework of human rights and international law, which constructs a new form of political legitimacy based on "cosmopolitan consent." Peace is achieved through the creation of "political community," or the increased integration of the postconflict country into a community of states. Kaldor's "new" approach to war continues to support a liberal vision of order wherein all groups ought to form a cohesive whole political community. Here the state is supposed to represent the nation and if there is no unification of the nation, the state's political community is threatened. Kaldor frames her proposed approach in reference to Carl Schmitt's work on political community:

> Carl Schmitt would argue that there can be no political community without enemies. And that where force is used in the name of humanity, the adversary is no longer an enemy but an outlaw, a disturber of the peace, so political community no longer exists. If he is right, the future is very grim; we can anticipate a pervasive global 'new war'. But if we believe political community can be held together by reason rather than fear, then there is an alternative possibility, a transformation of statehood, in which states are no longer intrinsically linked to warfare and operate within a multilateral framework. And as for the argument about humanity, we could turn it on its head. If we dub the terrorists as enemies, we give them political status; indeed this may be what they are trying to achieve. Perhaps it is more appropriate to view them as

---

[164] Mary Kaldor, *Human Security: Reflections on Globalization and Intervention* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2008), 185; 192-195.
[165] Ibid., 3-4.
[166] Ibid.
[167] Ibid., 9.

> outlaws, disturbers of the peace, and to use the methods of law enforcement rather than 'old war'.[168]

The "disturbers of the peace" in the wars Kaldor describes do not comply with the liberal international order and should, in Kaldor's view, be denied political status and punished through the legal apparatus held up by those included in the international political community. Kaldor's approach to the demands of new war depends on a distinction between terrorists in a war against peace – outlawed and deprived of political status – and "enemies" of humanity. Once terrorists are "outlawed," states can fight against them in the name of rights, democracy and the security of others, thereby determining what life is qualified and what is disqualified from the universal rights she advocates. In her attempt to turn Schmitt's argument "on its head," she in fact only shifts the discussion slightly, arguing that a state or political community based on "reason" and multilateral law enforcement can avoid recourse to a politics of fear, violence and war. This approach privileges Enlightenment thinking that distinguishes between those ruled by reason, and those not, forcibly excluding the latter. Said differently, Kaldor believes that the states can shed their connection to war through the law. What states do to enforce the rules they create is associated with the maintenance of peace; these states do not wage a "real" war, they are simply enforcing the rules.

This depends on a belief in the UN as a "global parliament" and impartial rule maker. In the broader definition of war I have proposed, the use of force against those that contest your rules constitutes a form of war. In this view, I propose that Kaldor's proposal does not do away with the intrinsic link between states and warfare, but instead leads us to a new sort of war. There are important differences between resolving conflict through the means of armed conflict and the means of the law, but, the establishment of the rule of law also involves the violent imposition of one wil over another.[169] However, the rational organization of the law naturalizes the authority of police, judges and others

---

[168] Ibid., 10.

[169] In an everyday way, police are given the authority to use any means to enforce the rules and judges are given the authority to imprison those who disobey. On the founding violence of the law, see Jacques Derrida, "*Force of Law:The 'Mystical Foundations of Authority',"* in ed. Drucilla Cornell *Deconstruction and the Possibility of Justice* (New York: Routledge, 1992).

who create and enforce law in response to the "unreasonable" behaviour of others, rationalizing the violence entailed in its imposition.

The poor outcomes of UN operations in the mid-1990s, including Somalia, Rwanda and Bosnia, led to serious critiques of the approaches to democratic peacebuilding that emerged in the early post-Cold War years.[170] Roger MacGinty, for example, argues that "peace processes and peace accords have failed to deliver sustainable peace," highlighting violence, poverty and external intervention as three persistent factors contributing to such failures over the past two decades.[171] In this regard, MacGinty stresses structural violence, quality of life and the need for a definition of peace that comes from the population of the post-peace accord society. Gerd Junne and Willemijn Verkoren argue that peacebuilding must address structural inequalities and discrimination in security forces, state structures, the justice system, infrastructure, education and health care because structures which "benefited some over others" are some of the main causes of armed conflict, and thus, "simply rebuilding preconflict structures" may actually prolong the conflict.[172] John Paul Lederach also draws on models of peacebuilding that are designed to address systemic issues, specific immediate crises, and conflictual relationships, ultimately outlining his own "integrated framework for peacebuilding." Lederach's framework divides "crisis oriented disaster management" from longer-term needs as he argues that different peacebuilding activities apply to different time-frames, ranging from specific short-term (2-6 months long) projects with measurable outcomes, to middle range (1-2 year long) projects such as training for conflict prevention and resolution or developing skills and approaches for long-term

---

[170] Heathershaw, "Unpacking the Liberal Peace," 619. These failures led to Roland Paris's seminal article, "Peacebuilding and the Limits of Liberal Internationalism," which questions the effectiveness of the rapid implementation of liberal political and economic policies during war to peace transitions. Paris proposes that liberalization tends to happen to quickly and can be destabilizing rather than stabilizing. Therefore, he suggests, democratic processes such as elections and the opening of markets must take place more slowly and with an awareness of the complexities on the ground at the end of a war. Roland Paris, "Peacebuilding and the Limits of Liberal Internationalism," *International Security* 22, no.2 (1997): 63.

[171] Roger MacGinty, *No War, No Peace: The Rejuvenation of Stalled Peace Processes and Peace Accords* (NewYork: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006), 8.

[172] See Gerd Junne and Willemijn Verkoren, "Seeking the Best Way Forward," in ed. Gerd Junne and Willemijn Verkoren *Postconflict Development: Meeting New Challenges* (Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2005), 56.

peacebuilding. Moving towards the longer-term, Lederach identifies activities that design social changes meant to prevent future crises (5-10 year blocks) and argues that all activities should be looking towards the ultimate vision of a more "peaceful and socially harmonious future" for conflicting groups. This involves "articulating distant, but nonetheless desirable structural, systemic, and relationship goals: for instance, sustainable development, self-sufficiency, equitable social structures that meet basic human needs, and respectful, interdependent relationships."[173] He positions relationships and the need for reconciliation as a central feature of "conflict transformation," based on the understanding that relationships are at the center of both conflict and long-term conflict-resolution. His conception of reconciliation is explicitly Christian[174] and based on the assumption that people and relationships begin to be restored through an "encounter" involving acknowledgement in a process of "hearing one another's stories" and envisioning the future in a way that acknowledges that "the futures of those who are fighting are ultimately and intimately linked and interdependent."[175] Moreover, he asserts that reconciliation demands innovative approaches that require one to "look outside the mainstream of international political traditions, discourse, and operational modalities."[176] For Lederach this innovation is primarily found in resources from within that society and in finding ways to effectively utilize contributions from outsiders.[177]

Lederach emphasizes the insufficiencies of "traditional" top-level approaches to peacebuilding, which focus on negotiating a cease-fire and designing an agreement on what mechanisms will be used to make a transition from war to peace. This process assigns the potential and practical responsibility for establishing peace to the leaders of the conflicting parties, expecting that the rest of society will be persuaded or forced to abide by the framework designed for the implementation of the reconstruction strategy.

---

[173] Lederach, *Building Peace*, 74-77.
[174] Lederach's vision of Reconciliation requires Truth, Mercy, Justice and Peace, which he takes directly from Psalm 85. He describes the development of these ideas as emerging through his work for a religious conciliation organization in Nicaragua. (Ibid., 27-31).
[175] Ibid., 26-27.
[176] Ibid., 27.
[177] Ibid., xvi.

Traditional approaches assume that "groups in conflict operate according to defined hierarchies of power" and that the framework outlined in the agreement will be practical at a local level "even though in most instances the accord was reached under enormous political pressure and involved compromises on all sides."[178] More than just ineffective, the restriction of peacemaking negotiations to military elites sends a clear message that military capacity and armed movements are the only means of garnering serious attention within the international community.[179] Instead, Lederach argues that peacebuilding necessitates a comprehensive spectrum of processes at all levels of a society, moving towards "more sustainable, peaceful relationships" through a variety of activities that expect and include leadership and participation from multiple areas of the local population.[180] In contrast to top-level peacebuilding, the "middle-range" peacebuilding proposed by Lederach involves activities such as conflict resolution training and the formation of peace commissions, as in Nicaragua or South Africa. The leadership here can involve religious or "ethnic" authorities, academics and NGOs and other humanitarian agencies. In the middle-range Lederach finds "the potential for helping to establish a relationship- and skill-based infrastructure for sustaining peacebuilding processes."[181] Finally, Lederach locates the force for change at the grassroots level, arguing that the local population were the driving force for "all of the recent transitions towards peace" at time of writing, including El Salvador, Ethiopia and Somalia.[182] Lederach suggests that in many cases the main factor in ending conflicts is exhaustion among the majority of the population, rather than "innovative planned transformation."[183] As I elaborate in chapter three, many observers attribute Angola's 'victor's peace' to the

---

[178] Ibid., 44-45.
[179] Ibid., 16-17.
[180] Ibid., 20; 37.
[181] Ibid., 45.
[182] Lederach clarifies what this "bottom-up" force entails in the case of Somalia, where a larger peace process for Somaliland (a northwestern region of the country) emerged from "a process of first achieving discussions and agreements to end the fighting at local peace conferences, by bringing together contiguous and interdependent subclans, guided by the elders if each subclan. These conferences not only dealt with issues of immediate concern at local levels, but also served to place responsibility for interclan fighting on the shoulders of local leaders and helped to identify the persons who were considered to be rightful representatives of these clans' concerns. Having achieved this initial agreement, it was then possible to repeat this process at a higher level with a broader set of clans." (Ibid., 53)
[183] Ibid., 52.

death of Jonas Savimbi (leader of UNITA, *União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola*, one of the two remaining armed factions at the end of the civil wars) at a time when UNITA's military capacity was severely depleted and most Angolans were simply so sick of fighting there was not enough energy to perpetuate the war.[184]

Lederach challenges some of the limits of a liberal political and economic order, attempting to include local approaches and alternative means of peacebuilding, identifying a range of concerns wrapped up in the perpetuation of violence, but like most peacebuilding theorists, his ideas are more precisely a combination of approaches that include, but also go beyond, postaccord reconstruction and "traditional statist diplomacy."[185] Although a "quasi-colonial" peace operations advocated by Doyle and Sambanis appear to be far removed from the sort of social justice and reconciliation called for by Lederach and other peacebuilding theorists of the civil society strain,[186] the synthesis of these "contrasting orientations" is justified by the argument that the "peace enforcement" associated with top-down *peace-as-order* approaches complements bottom-up *peace-as-justice* approaches.[187] The combination of varied peacebuilding discourses, despite their contradictions, occurs in large part because major international organizations write reports and policies that explicitly or subtly adopt and adapt the criticisms and suggestions that come from other academic and policy-making institutions. This means incorporating criticism in the consolidation of peacebuilding. As Heathershaw writes, "[c]onsidering themselves pragmatists, [peacebuilding theorists and practitioners] offer moderate critiques of international practice, but reproduce the basic discursive environment that includes and blends the three neoliberal alternatives of democratic peacebuilding, civil society and statebuilding."[188] In this regard, one could

---

[184] Tony Hodges, *Angola: Anatomy of an Oil State*, (Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2004), 16-17.
[185] Lederach, *Building Peace*, xvi.
[186] For more on the need for social justice in peacebuilding, see MacGinty, *No War, No Peace*. Gerd Junne and Willemijn Verkoren argue that peacebuilding must address structural inequalities and discrimination in security forces, state structures, the justice system, infrastructure, education and health care because structures which "benefited some over others" are some of the main causes of armed conflict, and thus, "simply rebuilding preconflict structures" may actually prolong the conflict. See Junne and Verkoren, "Seeking the Best Way Forward," 56.
[187] Heathershaw, "Unpacking the Liberal Peace," 613-615.
[188] Ibid., 613.

point to the new emphasis on the interdependence of the military and humanitarian aspects of peacebuilding.

The melding of security and development was observed early on by Mark Duffield. In *Global Governance and the New Wars,* he presents research beginning in the mid-1990s showing how the language of development has been increasingly incorporated into military discourses, while security issues have simultaneously become a humanitarian concern.[189] As Duffield writes, "the idea of underdevelopment as dangerous and destabilising provides a justification for continued surveillance and engagement."[190] In this way, liberal thinking about peace and development requires and justifies a pervasive architecture of security. As Duffield notes, the logic of global governance can serve to "normalize violence and accept high levels of instability as an enduring if unfortunate characteristic of certain regions."[191] In addressing the combined security risks of recently resolved armed conflicts, economic instability and 'underdevelopment', liberal peacebuilding supports a pragmatic pacifism while preserving the potential to use force when necessary or just. Richmond locates this logic in liberal thinking generally, arguing that "[l]iberalism offers a version of peace that is plausible within a liberal state and between liberal states, as well as a model to replace failed or non-liberal systems."[192] While the liberal economic and political tenets of peacebuilding programs are explicit in the literature and policy, Duffield argues that the specificity of the notion of peace envisioned here is rarely acknowledged directly.[193] The components of the liberal peace are explicitly meant to produce stability and in its hegemony it does lead to a limited predictability; however, Duffield's work shows that even where this model has been implanted, the specter of perpetual instability is found in the ongoing need for extensive security regimes and liberal wars. However marginalized within or between states,

---

[189] In a related way, an emphasis on the need for economic development increasingly compliments statebuilding discourses as a response to the security concern of 'underdevelopment'. This is evident in Paul Collier's work for example. See Paul Collier, *The Bottom Billion: Why the Poorest Countries Are Failing and What Can Be Done About It* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007).
[190] Mark Duffield, *Global Governance and the New Wars* (New York: Zed Books, 2001), 7.
[191] Ibid., 17.
[192] Richmond, *Peace in International Relations*, 93.
[193] Duffield, *Global Governance and the New Wars*, 85.

violence and war continue to materialize and rupture the liberal vision of peace as ending and averting violent conflict.

The protection of some people's freedom rationalises the denial of others' freedom, including enforcement by military apparatuses and international norms, such as the Responsibility to Protect doctrine, that create a semblance of order at the international level by means of institutions and relations that "minimally constrain the liberty of actors including states, democratic publics, corporations, groups, and individuals to set the terms of their own existence in liberal modernity."[194] The question here, which is taking increasing prominence in academic literature in the social sciences (as much from critical observers in the field of peacebuilding as from theorists of politics and the history of ideas more generally) seems to come down to, 'Is it possible to separate these illiberal forces from liberalism?' Kaldor contends that the violence of the State and the liberal peacebuilding project can be successfully averted, but according to Oliver Richmond, the use of violence is inevitable. He argues that this is the "classic liberal conundrum": the impossibility of finding a true consensus leads to a discussion of the grounds for exceptions to peace, when violence or war is deemed necessary or tolerated in the name of a "more limited consensus…which will be imposed on those at the margins who may resist it."[195]

Robert Lantham also argues that military interventions are not inconsistent with but rather *common to* the extension of the liberal order. In particular, military-strategic relations are entrenched in international liberal order, as Latham describes it, "in the play between freedom, order, and military power." [196] Military force facilitates an order that requires less institutionalization, less public consent and less intervention into political liberties then other approaches to establishing order through international governance. In other words, as a means of social control, military force preserves more autonomy for actors in the international system. It is not simply that military force is used to protect and secure the post-WWII liberal order, but that "military relations and power grows out of

---

[194] Lantham, *The Liberal Moment*, 5.
[195] Richmond, *Peace in International Relations*, 35.
[196] Ibid.

and is an important element in the political dynamics *internal* to liberal order."[197] I argue that the liberal peace constitutes the continuation of war by other means because of the ongoing presence of military and strategic relations. Thus, I propose that one should analyze the practices used to construct the liberal peace on the same terms that one would analyze a war, looking at their political consequences instead of setting it apart as a thing in itself.

In this chapter, I reviewed the dominant trends in peacebuilding literature and considered what peacebuilding theorists claim to be doing as well as some of the problems critics of peacebuilding have already pointed out, arguing that insofar as states and international institutions propose that there is a universally applicable path to peace based on liberal political and economic ideals, they demarcate the limits of possibility for political community. Reiterating these limits through practices of international peacebuilding, peacebuilders elevate particular ideas of progress – characteristic of Enlightenment thinking and liberal modernity generally – as conditions of inclusion, deeming all other choices irrational by comparison. These practices thereby perpetuate colonial relations of governance. While critics have called for local ownership, reconciliation and social justice in peacebuilding, the dominance of liberal economic and political systems globally prevents a genuine transformation of (neo)colonial relations to the effect that non-liberal approaches are only included if they do not threaten liberal ideals and are often marginalized. This is made possible because the limits of political community defined by liberal peacebuilding set up the conditions of the civil peace (and liberal order) in opposition to the conditions of war (and chaos, or the impossibility of order), attributing a perpetual moral imperative to peacebuilding over any alternatives and obfuscating the various ways that violence and relations of war pervade the operation of the state, institutions and the conditions of modern politics. In Chapter Two I delve more deeply into questions of colonialism, the legitimation of violence and the ways the non-west is viewed in light of these persistent problems in current practices and critiques

[197] Ibid.

of peacebuilding, aiming to enrich existing critiques and formulate a more deeply penetrating analysis of the peacebuilding problematic.

Chapter Two

Sovereignty was not replaced by discipline. Discipline was not replaced by biopower. Power is also palimpsestuous. It is inscribed on us; we also inscribe it on ourselves, through many institutionalized writing practices.[198]

Ongoing wars of exploitation and assimilation permeate the "civil peace." In *Society Must Be Defended* Foucault undertakes a genealogy of two discourses, one of power and resistance, struggle and war, in contrast to another of sovereignty and the law. According to Foucault, the former discourse proposes that "politics is the continuation of war by other means," and that "peace is waging a secret war."[199] Building on Foucault's formulation of the discourse of perpetual war, this chapter considers how international peacebuilding constitutes an expression of a juridico-philosophical discourse that naturalizes the creation of a civic peace in a modern state, the establishment of the rule of law and the construction of liberal institutions and modes of governance. Foucault reminds the reader how processes of institutionalization created complex webs of discipline and regulation in the European context, and specifically he studies their development in France from the fifteenth to eighteenth centuries. The historical specificity of Foucault's work limits its applicability to colonial and postcolonial studies; in any case, David Scott cautions against overbroad generalizations about colonial governance. Still, Scott argues that a particular colonial rationality emerged at the end of the eighteenth century that is aptly described by Foucault's term "governmentality," which he described as "the conduct of conduct" (if translated literally from the French), wherein (returning to the English translation), "individuals effect by their own means or with the help of others a number of practices on their bodies and their souls, thoughts,

---

[198] Michael Dillon and Andrew W. Neal, "Introduction," ed. Michael Dillon and Andrew W. Neal *Foucault on Politics, Security and War* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008), 13.
[199] Michel Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended,* ed. François Ewals, Alessandro Fontana and Mauro Bertani, trans. David Macey (New York: Picador, 2003)*,* 50.

conduct and way of being."[200] Governmentality is simultaneously characterized by two modalities of power: one which is "totalizing and centralizing" and another that is "individualizing and normalizing."[201] This form of colonialism displaced the old problematic of sovereignty, which commanded direct obedience, with one of "government."[202] The political rationality of government deploys tactics to create certain conditions conducive to achieving particular ends. In this chapter, I continue the discussion I began in Chapter One, where I argued that peacebuilding is a new ideological rationalization for foreign intervention that perpetuates colonial relations of governance.[203]

While it is beyond the scope of this thesis to examine fully the colonial "governing effects" of international peacebuilding projects, this chapter draws out the specific means and justifications for colonialism as a form of governmentality. Specifically, this chapter elaborates on the elements of self-transformation in liberal imperialism, including notions of ethological governance evident in the work of post-Enlightenment theorists such as John Stuart Mill, by showing how it compels people to behave in "ethical" and "rational" ways. Melanie White and David Scott provide a theoretical basis for examining the ways that these ideas of progress and reform operate in the context of colonial governmentality, and Partha Chatterjee unravels the paradox thus facing post-colonial subjects attempting to build an independent nation-state.[204] I argue that these political rationalities persist in contemporary practices of peacebuilding, as peacebuilding agencies advise postconflict countries to adopt the political and economic tenets that guide liberal states and

---

[200] Michel Foucault, *Dits et Écrits* IV (Paris: Gallimard, 1994), 237; Michel Foucault, "Technologies of the Self," in ed. L.H Martin, H. Gutman and P. H. Hutton *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault* (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1988), 18.
[201] David Scott, *Refashioning Futures: Criticism After Postcoloniality* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999), 36-37.
[202] Ibid., 37-38.
[203] Arturo Escobar also defends the use of Foucault's work in terms of the "Third World" insofar as Western disciplinary and normalizing mechanisms have been extended to the Third World and Western discourses about the Third World are a means of "effecting domination" over the Third World. See Arturo Escobar, "Discourse and Power in Development: Michel Foucault and the Relevance of his Work to the Third World," *Alternatives*, 10:3 (1984/1985), 377.
[204] Melanie White, "The Liberal Character of Ethological Governance," *Economy and Society 34*:3 (2005); Scott, *Refashioning Futures;* Partha Chatterjee, *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World,* (Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1986/2004).

institutions, whereby their citizens are compelled to pacify, civilize and transform themselves into liberal subjects. These relations are not exclusive to peacebuilding, but are rather, an expression of peacebuilding as a modernizing rationality of power.

By way of comparison, I then touch briefly on colonialism as a practice of *indirect rule*, wherein colonial powers maintain power and authority "through preexisting native institutions and structures of authority."[205] Here I draw from Karuna Mantena who argues that on the ground challenges to empire in the late nineteenth century meant that the civilizing narratives which provided a "universalist alibi for empire" in the early nineteenth century gave way to "culturalist alibis" for empire that appealed to the intractable difference of native societies, which had been established in earlier stagial theories of development. Thus, strategies of aggressive modernization were replaced by practices of indirect rule in colonial Africa, justified by the threat that native societies would collapse without foreign rule. If Mantena is right, and this dynamic is internal to liberal imperialism, then it has significant implications for critiques of peacebuilding that seek to expand the practice to include a wider range and more "local" approaches to peacebuilding since the presence of discourses of cultural difference in late imperial ideology show that the rejection of universalist narratives does not constitute an irreconcilable contradiction within the theory of imperialism. In fact, modern empire easily incorporates such critiques in response to its failures, shifting the responsibility for ongoing colonial intervention onto colonial subjects.[206]

As I began to show in Chapter One, the ways that the "non-west" is viewed – in need of reform, progress, development, security and so on – serve to rationalize foreign interventions in the context of international peacebuilding. The violence wrapped up in "peace enforcement", nationbuilding and the protection of human rights (specifically the "Responsibility to Protect"), is obfuscated by the association between these projects and peace and by the notion that the alternative is necessarily worse. Peacebuilding defines the limits of possibility for what is considered peace, concealing the violence of the liberal state system by legitimating the state as a normative source of peace and security.

---

[205] Ibid., 12.
[206] Ibid.

Drawing on Jenny Edkins' *Trauma and the Memory of Politics,* the second section of this chapter elaborates on the ways that the state disavows the role it plays in the perpetuation of violence and argues that linear narratives of war and other mass violence are retold in terms of the state's heroism, perpetuating its role as protector instead of destroyer of peace.[207] Kevin Durrheim reiterates that the opposition of war and peace thus conceals ongoing violence, and adds the idea that it creates a very powerful discourse in which to be critical of the state is to imply that one seeks to inhibit progress towards peace.[208] Achille Mbembe reminds the reader that the violence that subordinates groups and individuals to systems of governance is not only exercised through the state. He argues that the notion of civil society is also and has always been tied to violence because it legitimates the pacification of individuals to "domination otherwise regarded as arbitrary."[209] What each of these theorists writes about the ways violence and relations of domination pervade everyday social life can be drawn together to bolster a more penetrating critique of peacebuilding than that offered by other contemporary critics of the field, such as those outlined in Chapter One. These observers recognize the inadequacies of some peacebuilding projects, but generally do not go far enough in drawing out the implications of the inequalities and conflicts inherent to the liberal international order itself. Arguing that the conditions under which postconflict countries are incorporated into the liberal international order are more complicated than peacebuilding literature implies, this chapter examines peacebuilding as a field of power relations, applying a historico-political analysis to this jurdico-philosophical discourse and proposing that insofar as liberal states, international institutions and humanitarian aid organizations set the limits of possibility for political community through international practices of peacebuilding, they elevate particular ideas of progress and reason, perpetuating colonial relations of governance and knowledge about the non-west, and legitimating the imposition of liberal political and economic order and its ideals.

---

[207] Jenny Edkins, *Trauma and the Memory of Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
[208] Kevin Durrheim, "Peace Talk and Violence: An Analysis of the Power of 'Peace'," in ed. A. Levett, A. Kottler, E. Burman, and I. Parker *Culture, Power and Difference: Discourse Analysis in South Africa,* (Cape Town: Cape Town University Press, 1997).
[209] Achille Mbembe, *On the Postcolony* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 38.

Peace as the Continuation of War by Other Means

In the 4 February 1976 lecture in *Society Must Be Defended,* Foucault describes the juridical model of sovereignty, which is a philosophical and juridical way of speaking about and conceiving of sovereignty and its legitimacy. Here, history tells the story of the sovereign's authority through recourse to Truth and Law, providing an assumption of "legitimacy that has to be respected."[210] Juridico-philosophical accounts tell the story of progress towards a civic peace in an enlightened state where power is located centrally, unified in and wielded by the sovereign, while all other institutions and mechanisms of power are derived from this single power.[211] By contrast, the historico-political discourse of war emerged at the end of the civil and political wars of the sixteenth century among the bourgeois, petit bourgeois and popular struggles against the monarchy and was used as "a tool for political organization."[212] It became quite prominent in England and posed a challenge to the legitimacy of the State.[213] This kind of historico-political discourse involves a view of power in the relations between groups or nations that is dispersed, functioning relationally through agents, in interactions, in institutions and various apparatuses and technologies of power. The law does not hold the irrefutable authority of Truth, but is understood to be a tool of the sovereign.[214] Historico-political discourse does not judge governments or acts of violence and crime by holding them up to any "ideal scheme (that of law, the will of God, basic principles, and so on)."[215] The historico-political discourse of war challenged the juridical model of sovereignty, "which had, until then, been the only way of thinking the relationship between people and monarch, or between people and those who govern."[216] Instead, historico-political discourse dictated

---

[210] Ibid.
[211] Ibid., 44.
[212] Ibid., 50.
[213] Ibid., 99.
[214] Ibid., 57.
[215] Ibid., 55.
[216] Ibid., 168.

that it was critical to elucidate the "secret war" that perpetually hides beneath the guise of peace, wherein,

> peace itself is a coded war. We are therefore at war with one another; a battlefront runs through the whole of society, continuously and permanently, and it is this battlefront that puts us all on one side or the other. There is no such thing as a neutral subject. We are all inevitably someone's adversary."[217]

The introduction of the non-neutrality of the subject, Foucault argues, undermines the place of the omniscient subject – previously the juror or the philosopher. While juridico-philosophical discourse depends on the assumption that the authority of the sovereign and the law are based on justice and what is right, in historico-political discourse knowledge is not merely contained in objective truths, but perpetually tied to power. This discourse is ultimately subjugated and disqualified because it threatens the universality of the truth-claims in juridico-philosophical discourse.[218]

Juridico-philosophical discourse conceals the struggle, defeats and relations of domination that enable the creation and maintenance of the civil peace, depending on the notion of a social contract through which individuals consent to their government in exchange for security. In this way, juridico-philosophical discourse dispels war and conquest, threat and disorder, which are relocated to the limits, the margins of the state.[219]

---

[217] Ibid., 50.

[218] What we are looking at here is a particular form of analysis, a way of viewing the world with its own paradoxes and claims to truth and right. But these are claims to "my rights," "my truth." Foucault, *Society Must Be Defend,* 268.

[219] In the 4 February 1976 lecture in *Society Must Be Defended,* Foucault presents Hobbes' *Leviathan* as an expression of the juridical model of sovereignty. Although Hobbes' analysis of sovereignty is usually represented as a theory of sovereignty established by consent, Foucault points out that the sovereign authority of the Leviathan is established by institutional agreement *or* by force. Hobbes distinguishes between the two as "sovereignty by institution" and "sovereignty by acquisition." Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended,* 93. According to Pasquale Pasquino's commentary on the lecture, Foucault's reading of Hobbes means that the foundation of sovereignty requires only that subjects "recognize themselves as the subjects of the same sovereign representative." Pasquale Pasquino, "Political Theory of War and Peace: Foucault and the History of Modern Political Theory," trans. Paula Wissing, in *Economy and Society* 22, no. 1 (1993), 81 Recognition of the sovereign representative can be based on institutions and common agreement or upon the decision of conquered people to choose to recognize the sovereign in order to live. Thus, the legitimacy of power does not come immediately from war, but from the recognition of the sovereign by the conquered in their fear of death. (Ibid., 70)

As a reflection on discourses of sovereignty, Foucault's account of Hobbes depicts social relations within the state as a condition of peace, established in opposition to conditions of war outside the protection of the Leviathan. While conventional interpretations have tended to emphasize the significance of the state of war and anarchy as the legacy of Hobbes, Foucault is arguing that Hobbes's account does not depend on war, but instead serves to purge it from the origin of sovereignty: "Hobbes turns war, the fact of war and

Historico-political discourse on the other hand, proposes that relations of war – while marginalized, contained and concealed to different extents – are never truly absent as they continue to function in the margins as the terms on which peace is possible:

> [historico-political discourse] is interested in defining and discovering, beneath the forms of justice that have been instituted, the order that has been imposed, the forgotten past of real struggles, actual victories, and defeats which may have been disguised but which remain profoundly inscribed.[220]

Thus, however repressed and subjugated, historico-political discourse accounts for the story of the vanquished. Their story functions as part of history: the dominance of the victor is dependent upon struggle against and resistance from another group.[221] In pointing to these negotiations and exclusions, historico-political reveals the conditions of possibility of peace which are concealed in juridico-philosophical discourse.

Foucault proposes that when the historico-political discourse of war challenged the juridical model of sovereignty it held a "disruptive" potential because it did not just account for the legitimacy of the ruling sovereign, but also spoke about decentred groups and of knowledges that are undervalued and disregarded. This "bellicose history" emerged as a particular type of discourse from below, but the unique feature of the approach is not simply that it tells the story of those that won the war as well as of those who lost, but that it tells of reversals and shifts in power. It is a view of history as "a calculation of forces." While this discourse is not always used to challenge the prevailing order in the name of any particularly oppressed group, Foucault does attribute the authors of this counterhistory, "with a decisive role in heralding a new form of social history that *could* perform a function critical of the established order."[222] This is because these first

---

relationship of force that is actually manifested in battle, into something that has nothing to do with the constitution of sovereignty." Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended,* 97.

[220] Ibid.

[221] Ibid., 99.

[222] Ibid., 355. The discourse of war says that power relations are established by the outcome of war or conquest, but also, and especially in Marxist theories of class struggle, that society has a binary structure in which each has an adversary and that an ongoing confrontation between two groups or categories of individuals divides society in two. This binary division between social groups becomes, in some cases, a troubling aspect of this sort of discourse, which Foucault says occurs in what he calls the "race war," in which, especially in the context of particular forms of socialism emphasizing oppositional struggle, can become a racist discourse used to rationalise killing one's enemy. (Ibid., 262) This "social war" highlights oppositional relations within groups, particularly within co-opted, biological-racist forms of this discourse of permanent war. He argues that certain mutations of this discourse have engendered discourses of degeneracy, defining

"social historians" introduce the idea that "relations of force and the play of power are the very stuff of history," casting into relief the coercion that makes possible the relationship between the governed and those who govern.[223] Thus, the persistence of subjugated historical accounts is multiply inscribed in *Society Must Be Defended,* as Foucault describes the dominance of juridico-philosophical discourse and the subjugation of historico-political discourse as well as uncovering, more generally, stories of struggle and other buried knowledges and the context of their disqualification.

Foucault reminds us that there is always a power-relation between what is qualified and what is disqualified. He proposes that this relation is precisely where one should begin an analysis of power. Accordingly, when Foucault engages in a historical analysis that begins with conflict, where perpetual war is the model of power and a tool of analysis for society, he is also doing a political analysis of discourse based on a strategic and relational model of power. In this archaeology, the productive effects of juridico-philosophical discourse are revealed to be a whole series of very real "functional arrangements" in which systematic organization normalizes relationships of power that are productive of and by state sovereignty and the law. The veneer of abstraction is evident in such arrangements, masking the confrontations and negotiations involved in relationships of governance.[224]

The order of domination inherent in relationships of governance must be actively maintained in a struggle against subversive threats that emerge from within these relationships as much as from outside opposition. Thus, the notion of an 'order' of domination should not be taken as an indication of an internally consistent and stable structure, but of dynamic relationships of power and force that are capable of adapting to change – the condition of possibility of their ongoing reinscription in discourse and practice. These adaptable relations make possible certain material conditions, systems of

---

the group that constitutes the norm "against those that deviate from that norm, against those who pose a threat to the biological heritage." (Ibid., 61) At this point, what was at first a tool in the struggles of the disposed and "decentered camps," is recentered and centralized, becoming the discourse of power. In its ultimate expression it justifies the genocidal State racism of Nazi Germany, but in other forms it also promotes the development of various social conservativisms and other biopolitical apparatuses and institutions of segregation and exclusion in "the normalizing society." (Ibid., 61-62)

[223] Ibid., 168-169. Here Foucault refers specifically to Boulainvilliers.

[224] Ibid., 7.

governance, and ways of acting and being in the world, while other possibilities are subordinated or foreclosed altogether through negotiations that are themselves obfuscated.

The Emergence of the Disciplines in Europe

In Foucault's work prior to *Society Must Be Defended* on the hospital and the prison, and afterwards, on sexuality, biopower and security, Foucault shows how the role of institutions in the European context was deeply entrenched in the production of complex webs of discipline and regulation. Foucault's analysis of the relation between the subject and power has influenced the other theorists in this chapter, and provokes some the arguments they put forward. In *Discipline and Punish,* for example, Foucault argues that institutions of education, medicine, psychology, public assistance and social work make up a network of "carceral" mechanisms that exercise, along with the actual prison system, a power of normalization.[225] That is, these institutions form a scientific and legal complex that provides rules and foundational justifications for the power to punish and constitutes the discursive and institutional basis for the production of a "political technology of the body."[226] In its varied and diffuse practices of surveillance and control, the political technology of the body does not replace other modalities of power, but it permeates the others such that the ideal of the penal justice system becomes "indefinite discipline" – the ongoing interrogation, investigation and observation of the disciplinary individual.[227] These mechanisms are not applied to "transgressions against a 'central' law, but to an apparatus of production – 'commerce' and 'industry' – to a whole multiplicity of illegalities."[228] In this way, the body is not only productive, but also subjected, "invested with relations of power and domination."[229] This corporeal technology involves both knowledge and mastery of the body. This latter concept is important later in the chapter when I elaborate more on the self-discipline entailed by ethological governance.

[225] Foucault, Michael, *Discipline and Punish* (New York: Vintage Book, 1979), 303.
[226] Ibid., 22-23.
[227] Ibid., 227.
[228] Ibid., 306-308.
[229] Ibid., 26

Knowledge – produced by the spectrum of institutions – supports the organization, calculation, and, ultimately, the subjection of the body. Mastery, on the other hand, involves a subtle force that requires no weapons and is different than the ability to conquer the forces of the body. The political technology of the body is not localizable in a particular institution or apparatus, but in mechanisms that allow for the operation of "a micro-physics of power" that functions in between the technology of power and the body.[230]

This type of discipline takes a form similar to the "Panopticon" – Foucault's now classic analogy for the techniques of the disciplinary society. Drawing on Jeremy Bentham's design, Foucault explains that the circular structure of the cells, the invisibility of the guard in the central tower and the inmates' awareness of their potentially continuous but unverifiable visibility guarantees the effective operation of power in the Panopticon. These power relations function irrespective of the identity, motivations and actions of the prison authorities. While this constraining force of power is exercised over bodies it is in the end a non-corporeal power because as individuals internalize these regulations, they become *docile bodies* that subject themselves.[231] The panoptic system "unlocks" the disciplines, allowing them to operate in a "diffused, multiple, polyvalent way throughout the whole social body."[232] In facilitating the play of power relations in and through various apparatuses of education, health care, production and punishment, the "panoptic mechanism" also makes these apparatuses of power more effective.

A schema of "generalized surveillance" meant to increase, multiply and develop social forces, the Panopticon is an analogy that renders visible and explicit the formation of the "disciplinary society."[233] In the end, no unitary institutional system of operation organizes these mechanisms. Instead they are dictated by the "rules of strategy" in an ongoing negotiation that is the result of complex power relations. The elements of this strategy, the "objects of discourse," are the bodies and forces subjected by the

---

[230] Ibid., 215.
[231] Ibid., 203.
[232] Ibid., 208.
[233] Ibid., 206-9.

mechanisms of the carceral system.[234] While subjected, these bodies are not entirely dominated. Rather, the bodies and objects of discourse are actively engaged in negotiations with the mechanisms of their subjection.

Colonial Governmentality: The Disciplines and Biopower

Despite the historical specificity of the development of the disciplinary society in France, as I began to explain in the introduction to this chapter, Foucault's analysis of internalized discipline does have something to say in a discussion of colonialism, because colonial rule is deeply imbued with practices of governing through character which compel colonial subjects to transform themselves. While building on Foucault's ideas about self-governance in the context of colonial governance, Scott supports Loomba's assertion that theories of colonialism must be built with an awareness of its heterogeneity, arguing that to consider "colonial power *at any given moment*, one has to understand the character of the political rationality that constituted it."[235] Political rationalities, colonial or postcolonial, shift and change and one must examine carefully the particular effects of those rationalities on conduct. He writes, "something called '*the* colonial state' cannot offer itself up as the iteration and reiteration of a single political rationality."[236] Rather, he proposes that different rationalities of politics and configurations of power emerged and "took the stage" during the project of colonialism and, in the nineteenth century in particular, that these discontinuous modalities changed what it meant to talk about race as a "classificatory signifier," pointing out the different discourses and power relations within which non-Europeans have been both conceived as and represented as "Other." He argues that "what is crucial to this problematic is historicizing European colonial rule in such a way as to distinguish different modes of organizing colonial power and the different political rationalities they depend upon."[237] Scott draws on Foucault in this

---

[234] Ibid., 308.
[235] Ania Loomba, *Colonialism-postcolonialism* (New York: Routledge, 1998), [electronic version], http://lib.myilibrary.com/browse/open.asp?id=32671&loc= (accessed April 6 2010), xvi.; David Scott, *Refashioning Futures*, 39.
[236] Ibid., 30.
[237] Ibid., 31.

regard, arguing that the "*kind* of investigation Foucault undertakes" encourages a historicization of European colonial rule in its various forms. That is, it reveals the political rationalities and, specifically, the means through which colonial power secured it target and used that target-object for particular ends.[238]

Scott examines the specific modern political rationality that Foucault has termed "governmentality."[239] Until this type of colonial power emerged at the end of the eighteenth century colonial politics was characterized by the problematic of sovereignty. That is, the increase of wealth and power of the sovereign (the prince or monarch) or the strengthening of the state. However, the development of modern colonialism saw "the emergence of 'population' as an object of political calculation," displacing the problematic of sovereignty with one of government.[240] While the political rationality of sovereignty commands obedience, the political rationality of government indirectly elicits particular behaviour. The rational principles of modern power do not merely strike the body; rather, their "point of application" is the conditions under which the body lives and is defined.[241] Then, as Scott suggests drawing on Jeremy Bentham, "people, following only their own self-interests, *will do as they ought.*"[242] He continues,

> And if with sovereignty, the relation between ruler and ruled is such that power reaches out like an extension of the arm of the prince himself, announcing itself periodically with unambiguous ceremony, with government, governor and governed are thrown into a new and different relation, one that is not merely the product of the expanded capacity of the state apparatus but of the emergence of a new field for producing effects of power—the new self-regulating field of the social.[243]

The latter form of relations of government was increasingly nuanced and opaque, leading to the internalization of social regulations in line with power.

The form of modern colonial power described here sought to uproot ignorant belief based on traditional superstitions and prejudices: first, "by means of a broad attack on the *conditions* that were understood to produce them, and second, their systematic

---

[238] Ibid., 39.
[239] Ibid., 36-37.
[240] Ibid., 37-38.
[241] Ibid., 32.
[242] Ibid., 38.
[243] Ibid.

replacement by the inducement of new conditions based on clear, sound, and rational principles."[244] What is crucial here are the distinctive features of modern power and modes of governance. Scott contends that this type of colonial power sought to disable conditions conducive to non-modern forms of life and replace them with new conditions that, above all else, "produce governing-effects on conduct."[245] These new conditions are meant to be such that they "oblige subjects to transform themselves in a certain, that is, *improving*, direction."[246] Scott describes the development of a modern political rationality where "colonial power came to depend not merely upon inserting English ideas here and there, but upon *the systemic redefinition and transformation of the terrain on which the life of the colonized was lived.*"[247] In this way, reforms prescribed by English liberal and Utilitarian political theorists such as Mill are representative of this political rationality wherein improving the character of individuals and society broadly became both possible and desirable.

Mill argues that the necessary conditions for any given political system, and by extension its economic policy, depend not only on the effectiveness of the system, but also upon the competencies of the people that are to facilitate the system. He is particularly concerned with the necessary conditions for representative government, which, for Mill, depend on the ability of a group of people to demonstrate strong character and make rational choices.[248] Specifically, the ideas of character formation described by Mill were the basis for the development of a set of practices Melanie White refers to as 'ethological governance'. Ethological governance, or "governing through character," functions as a standard of capacity for self-government and "serves as an index for the responsible exercise of freedom."[249] This liberal approach to government, which governs citizens through their freedom, employs "biopolitical" technologies of power through the measurement, normalization and general supervision of the

---

[244] Ibid., 33.
[245] Ibid., 34.
[246] Ibid.
[247] Ibid., 41.
[248] John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty and Other Essays* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 207-211.
[249] White, "The Liberal Character of Ethological Governance," 476.

population.[250] The notion of "biopower" was developed by Foucault to describe how certain modes of governance make biological life itself a political concern. Ethological governance is an acute example of how biopower works alongside the disciplines as it aims to effect "social and political reform," and, ultimately, "*individualizes* personal character through disciplined self-governance and *totalizes* it by standardizing conduct across populations."[251] We find here what Foucault referred to as governmentality, an ethos of rule based on self-transformation as opposed to "self-interest or natural right." [252]

A paradigmatic liberal, Mill holds that the liberty of the individual – including the freedom to express ones individuality – must be protected.[253] Mill extends the "protection of the individual" to the protection of groups; however, these arguments for non-interference only protect the fully mature member of society, trained in the ways and norms of that society. Thus, Mill does not reject intrusion upon "immature" or "uncivilized" societies.[254] As Eddy Souffrant notes, Mill's support of individuality involves a great deal of conformity in this regard as individuality "is best expressed when properly cultivated."[255] Relying on a developmental view of human capabilities, Mill writes,

> [n]obody denies that people should be so taught and trained in youth, as to know and benefit by the ascertained results of human experience. But it is the privilege and proper condition of a human being, arrived at the maturity of his faculties, to use and interpret experience in his own way.[256]

Despite adamantly rejecting it otherwise, Mill justifies and promotes intervention in certain cases by equating non-European peoples to children or youth, rather than capable, decision-making adults. Mill's paternalism is not uncommon, as he writes within European traditions where almost all non-Europeans are held, in varying degrees, as relatively inferior, immature, or less "civilized." Within these traditions, Souffrant writes, "concepts such as progress, civilization, and so on have positive value and are used as

---

[250] Ibid., 475.
[251] Ibid., 476.
[252] Foucault, "Technologies of the Self,"18; White, "The Liberal Character of Ethological Governance," 478.
[253] Mill, *On Liberty and Other Essays*, 222.
[254] Eddy Souffrant, *Formal Transgression: John Stuart Mill's Philosophy of International Affairs* (Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2000) 95-96.
[255] Ibid., 106.
[256] John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty and Other Essays*, 64.

universal barometers to gauge the place of nations and groups along the continuum of development."[257] Where people are deemed unfit to govern themselves, "civilized governments" may be obligated to be "a considerable degree despotic."[258] That is, in order to guide the uncivilized towards liberty and character, the more "civilized" may need to use "a great amount of forcible restraint upon their actions."[259]

Ethological governance justifies the imposition of liberal norms and standards of behaviour based on a "developmental view of human conduct."[260] Specifically, the absence of appropriate character is considered a justification for the paternalistic denial of rights and freedoms to individuals or groups, such as such as "the poor, indigenous peoples, children and colonial others," until they are able to demonstrate their ability to govern themselves rationally.[261] The basis of this thinking is that any rational individual or group will choose to exercise their self-determination in a way that resembles a European model of development.

White calls these discourses, including ways of thinking and acting produced and maintained by ethological governance, the *ethological imagination.* It operates at two levels: first, the ethological imagination is "organized by a system of meaning based on civilization or progress" that divides the civilized or mature individual and those that are barbarous, immature, "social problems," or ignored entirely.[262] Second, it operates at the level of the self by conditioning the ways that the subject comes to interpret possibilities for action and the expression of her/his freedom. Thus, the process of ethological governance produces what Foucault has termed *docile bodies*, or individuals that are explicitly "dedicated to the goal of self-improvement and to their ultimate self-transformation."[263] In Foucault's words, the docile body is "subjected, used, transformed and improved."[264] That is, as the logic of liberal character is internalized, people begin to

---

[257] Souffrant, *Formal Transgression*, 93.
[258] Mill, *On Liberty and Other Essays*, 209.
[259] Ibid.
[260] White, "The Liberal Character of Ethological Governance," 479.
[261] Ibid.
[262] Ibid., 489.
[263] Ibid., 480.
[264] Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 198.

monitor their own actions based on these norms of behaviour, becoming increasingly docile bodies, governed and shaped by biopower.

The persistence of alternative modes of being and thinking checks these processes. The ideological beliefs of the colonizer have never wholly determined the colonial subject. Yet, the ethological imagination powerfully "generates the ethical qualities of character as a condition of moral authority."[265] The ethological imagination praises the liberal citizen capable of self-governing as reasonable, independent, industrious, reliable, trustworthy, and autonomous. On the other hand, those individuals and groups considered a social problem ("barbarians" or "the uncivilized") require governance that is more comprehensive; they are considered lazy, dishonest, dependent, deprived. Claims about 'the good" tend to align with a belief in these labels as real attributes of non-Europeans and become the basis of practices of training and "protection" as colonized people are going through processes of "maturation." That is, colonial governance based on the sort of thinking in Mill's writing – and current modes of governance to the extent that people continue to rely on these ideas – reflects the belief that people at a lower level on a presumed continuum of development may have the capacity for self-government, but that they must first learn certain rationalities of nationhood and self-transformation. Thus, as tools for monitoring and normalizing behaviour, technologies of power and technologies of the self intersect at the point of character and its formation.

The institutional and political transformations peacebuilding entails are not simply pragmatic solutions for governments, but require complex transformations in political life and values in the postconflict society. Observers such as Ikenberry have pointed out that the exercise of hegemonic power in liberal imperialism involves more than the use of threats and promises based on material inducements and sanctions to ensure the cooperation of national leaders. It also involves the acceptance and internalization of norms laid out by the hegemon, leading to the implementation of policies in line with the hegemon's preferred international order.[266] The discourse of peacebuilding supports liberal international order by reinforcing a "universalist ethos" that promotes the

---

[265] White, "The Liberal Character of Ethological Governance," 489.
[266] Ikenberry, *Liberal Order and Imperial Ambition*, 51.

normalization of the subject of peacebuilding, wherein Heathershaw contends, this "other" of a conflict or postconflict zone must be transformed "to correspond to mythologised international standards."[267] This other is simultaneously constructed as potential "enemy" and potential "friend" because the subject can "choose" to be either the "spoiler" or an active participant in the peace process. In such a construction, the world of peacebuilding is divided into an "enemy-other" in opposition to an "ideal-other." Whereas the enemy-other is associated with an ethnic (or religious) identity located in the past, the ideal-other is positioned in the future as a rational citizen. In addition to reinforcing a temporal trajectory of progress towards peace, the ideal-other is "reproduced via the 'us'/'them' boundary where 'they' should become what 'we' imagine ourselves to be."[268] Although Heathershaw is careful to note that many Western aid workers involved with peacebuilding projects aim to rectify exploitative relations, but irrespective of intentions, their actions are wrapped up in the broader implications the discourses of progress and development wherein many inherit a dominant subject position. The conditions of a project wherein the intervener attempts to shape the postconflict other into their own ideal reflection, depends on the maintenance of the difference of the other. As postcolonial theorists have pointed out, this is one of the paradoxes of liberal imperialism and its legacy for postcolonial countries.

The Paradoxes of Colonial Power/Knowledge and the Notion of Progress in the Postcolonial Postwar State

As the case study in Angola demonstrates in Chapter Three, nationalist struggles have often had a paradoxical relation to colonial thinking and relations of governance. Many nationalist movements in colonial and postcolonial countries have adamantly rejected the bounded notion of political modernity inherent in the sort of thinking evident in Mill's work, which has been used to judge the social progress of different groups, deeming "less modern" groups as in need of a "period of preparation" before they could be fit for the political responsibility of self-government. Instead, movements for de-colonization

---

[267] Ibid., 602-603.
[268] Ibid., 603.

fought for autonomy and to defend the ability of colonial subjects to self-govern. Still, as observers such as Partha Chatterjee have pointed out, narratives of modernization and stage theories of development have plagued nationalist struggles. Despite rejecting the historicism of the colonizer by demanding self-rule, nationalist thinking retains a paradoxical relation to modernization frameworks because of their appeal to ideas of reason and the nation that perpetuate colonial rationalities of power.

What is at stake here is the sovereignty of a particular way of knowing. Chatterjee demonstrates that Enlightenment thinking is inextricably linked to the nation-state. He is responding to a debate between liberals and conservatives about the nationalist struggles of subaltern groups, and particularly within the context of nationalists struggles in India. As Chatterjee lays it out, one side of the debate conceives of non-Europeans as essentially and irreversibly irrational. The other argues that colonial subjects are capable of developing rationality and have the ability to self-govern effectively. In terms of Indian nationalism, Chatterjee proposes that liberals tend to adopt the position that India will be able to build an independent nation while conservatives argue that the nation is a European construct that Indians will always fail to achieve. For Chatterjee, this is a useless and intractable debate because it assumes that what is at stake in Indian independence is the nation-state, even though this state form itself has oppressed and subjected Indians.[269] Instead, Chatterjee proposes that it is more useful to consider how rationalist conceptions of knowledge established by post-Enlightenment thinkers constitute "a supposedly universal framework of thought which perpetuates, in a real and not merely metaphorical sense, a colonial domination."[270] This new theoretical problem is inconceivable "within the ambit of bourgeois-rationalist thought, whether conservative or liberal. For to pose it is to place thought itself, including thought that is supposedly rational and scientific, within a discourse of *power*."[271] One can not point to "reason" as such, and thus, Enlightenment thought is revealed to be a series of supposedly scientific methods and practices based on rational truth and knowledge while the condition of the

---

[269] Chatterjee, *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World*, 4-14.
[270] Ibid., 11.
[271] Ibid.

possibility of these "rational truths and methods" is the identification of the irrational practices of another. As Chatterjee demonstrates, these Enlightenment ideals truly need an 'Other'. More, this relation to the Other is one of power. Chatterjee argues that the very question of a culture having autonomy is deeply imbued with power relations.[272]

Nationalist discourses attempted to disprove colonial discourses claiming that the "backward" ways of the peoples in the colonies would make them "culturally incapable of ruling themselves in the conditions of the modern world."[273] Despite challenging colonial domination in this way, nationalist discourses accepted "the very intellectual premises of 'modernity' on which colonial domination was based."[274] That is, nationalism proposed that India could retain its cultural identity while adopting the rational processes of the modern nation-state and its version of nationhood, while the very episteme in which these conditions are demarcated continued to conceive of India as "irrational other." Chatterjee's point is to show that the conditions of Indian independence are not autonomous, and thereby reveal some of the binding paradoxes of nationalist thought.

Arguing that it is inextricably trapped within an Orientalist thematic, Chatterjee calls for an interruption of this nationalist discourse. "Thematic" describes a latent discourse, a justifying structure, the underlying conditions of possibility of the particular problematic of Indian nationalism.[275] Within this problematic the 'object' is still the Oriental in terms of her/his understanding of her/his relation to self and others. These relations have been formed by others, "by an objective scientific consciousness, by Knowledge, by Reason."[276] However, the subject of this discourse is also assumed to be, and generally believes that she/he is, "autonomous, active and sovereign." Thus, the discourse produces at once an object and a subject, nationalist thinking "reasons within a framework of knowledge whose representational structure corresponds to the very structure of power

---

[272] Ibid., 17.
[273] Ibid., 30.
[274] Ibid.
[275] Ibid., 38.
[276] Ibid.

nationalist thought seeks to repudiate."[277] The nature of the thematic that functions beneath the nationalist problematic maintains the objectifying processes of knowledge production within post-Enlightenment thinking, and particularly Western science.[278]

The contradiction of liberal thinking which Chatterjee lays out is evident in the ways the international community is able to set the limits of possibility for peacebuilding and specifically statebuilding. Within these fields 'Enlightenment' reason is of paramount value, setting out who is ruled by reason, and who is not. As the last chapter argued, those outside the limits of modern liberal governance are violently excluded, or incorporated by force. Specifically, the limits of possibility for nation(state)hood are demarcated in terms politically liberal ideas of rights, law and democracy (often limited to the election of government through a popular vote) and economically liberal organization of the market. Namely, the liberal international order, a system in which the "great" powers, Bretton woods institutions and the US military has a clear position of domination and through which it perpetuates the exploitation of post-conflict countries by way of their increased integration of into global capitalism.[279]

From Theoretical Contradictions to Political Consequences: Anticipating Cultural Difference in Modern Empire

Karuna Mantena argues that theorists such as Partha Chattterjee have done well to point out that the universalist projects of transformation placed limits on the development of colonial subjects, because of the way it objectified the colonial subject and produced the "truth of colonial difference" upon which the entire colonial projects depends.[280] However, Mantena does not believe that "these internal contradictions themselves can account for the disillusionment with the project of reform and the forms of culturalism

---

[277] Ibid.
[278] Ibid.
[279] Hunt, *History of Economic Thought,* 442-443. Drawing Rosa Luxemburg's theory of imperialism, Hunt argues that, in a capitalist economy, it is impossible for demand to keep up with growth in capacity to produce, therefore capitalists must sell their surplus to non-capitalist markets. Imperialism, then, is a probable outcome of capitalism as the industrialization of non-capitalist markets provides an investment opportunity for surplus capital as well as ongoing sources of human and natural resources to exploit. (Ibid)
[280] Ibid.

that emerged in the wake of the widespread sense of [liberal imperialism's] practical failure."[281] He asserts that European disappointment with the colonial project came from the failures of the project of liberal empire and quite significantly, from the resistance of colonial peoples. If the turn from liberal universalism to culturalism "is less a logically necessary one than a relation of political entailment," it is insufficient to limit one's analysis to the contradictory assumptions within liberalism.[282] While these contradictions may well contribute to crisis on the ground, they cannot determine "the field of unintended consequences,"[283] wherein the ideology of imperialism has proved to be malleable enough to respond to both criticism and crisis.

Although civilizing narratives played an important role in nineteenth century liberal imperialism, and continue to operate in different forms in the modernizing narratives of contemporary practices of peacebuilding, this is not the only colonial rationality of power with a lingering legacy. Mantena asserts that the notion of a progressive civilizing mission as a nineteenth century "alibi" for European empire has been emphasized in a way that elides the rise of social, cultural, and racial justifications for imperial domination. Mantena argues these alibis are underrepresented because studies of liberalism and empire have not paid enough attention to the way different moral and political discourses shifted in relation to the actual day to day practice of imperial rule in the colonies.[284] In other words, observers do not pay enough attention to the way liberal ideals "play themselves out in the contingent field of political action."[285] As I demonstrated earlier in Mill's work, theories of ethological governance anticipated that the colonizer may need to use a certain amount of force to compel the "immature" colonial subject to improve her or himself, the widespread resistance and popular uprisings of colonial peoples called into questions the possibility and practicality of the radical reconstruction (or "civilization") of native societies along Western lines. Specifically, Mantena points to the "Sepoy Mutiny" of 130,000 Indian soldiers on May

---

[281] Ibid.
[282] Ibid., 185.
[283] Ibid.
[284] Mantana, *Alibis of Empire*, 8.
[285] Ibid., 185.

10, 1857 as well as the Morant Bay Rebellion in Jamaica, and proposes that the "[p]erceived failures in a whole set of social and economic experiments, from abolitionism and conversion to models of economic development, induced similar crisis of expectations."[286] These political realities led to a rethinking of the nature and purpose of British imperial rule. Mantena characterizes the ensuing shift in imperial thinking as a "broad transition from a *universalist* to a *culturalist* stance."[287] That is, in order to account for widespread resistance from within colonized societies observers from the colonial states interpreted the "inability" of native Peoples to reform to deep and insurmountable cultural differences, differences that had been established through the racialization inherent in earlier imperial ideologies wherein "liberals like James Mill and evangelicals like Charles Grant built an argument for a "just rule" on a rhetorical strategy that denigrated Indian society in the name of future rejuvenation."[288] In the culturalist turn, strategies of aggressive modernization are modulated by practices of *indirect rule*, wherein the colonial powers continued to penetrate the political and economic systems of the colonies "through preexisting native institutions and structures of authority."[289] Although these practices no longer aimed for the complete transformation of native societies, colonial relations were maintained under the guise of a new imperial ideology which claimed that native societies would collapse without foreign rule. This displaced the sources of imperial legitimacy "from metropole to colony."[290] That is, responsibility for empire was placed the colonized Peoples themselves, not the actions of the colonizers.[291]

Unraveling the dynamic transformation of imperial rationalities in these moments of crisis is critically important because it calls into question the utility of attempts to rectify imperial relations that "gesture toward the revaluing of formally denigrated cultures and, at a more general level, call for a heightened recognition and respect for cultural

---

[286] Ibid., 187.
[287] Ibid., 2 (emphasis in original).
[288] Ibid., 186.
[289] Ibid., 12.
[290] Ibid.
[291] Ibid.

difference."[292] In identifying the discourses of cultural difference that underpinned late imperial ideology, Mantena shows that "there need be nothing contradictory about imperial self-justifications that speak in the name of cultural pluralism and cosmopolitan toleration."[293] Here Mantena turns again to the importance of emphasizing the political entailments of modern empire, namely, violence and racialization: "If we consider the problem of imperial politics as less a problem of moral intention, idealism, or universalism but more a question of political consequences then the revival of empire cannot be so straightforwardly cleansed of its more troubling associations and responsibility for its calamitous outcomes."[294] I do not claim that imperial politics is a problem of political consequences over universalism and idealism or that there is a clear temporal trajectory from direct to indirect rule in every imperial context that compares to Mantena's case in India. I draw from Mantena the dynamic transformation of imperial ideology and the importance of showing that the "field of unintended consequences" is not determined by ideology, maintaining that imperial ideology has significant impacts on political consequences while unintended entailments on the ground also shape the political rationality of imperialism, which has proven to shift in relation to both criticism and crisis.

The previous chapters have examined how international peacebuilding has been held up in the face of its most distressing flaws, often in a turn towards increased inclusion and local approaches. Mantena makes a similar link in his final chapter between his work on alibis of empire in the nineteenth century and contemporary nationbuilding projects, arguing that, "like their forebearers, what makes the contemporary argument for empire distinctly liberal is the contrast it draws between its benign agenda of promoting peace and commerce through temporary tutelage from empires of conquest, extraction, and subjugation driven only by a (self-defeating) desire for power and prestige."[295] Moreover, looking at the example of the US invasion and occupation of Iraq, he indentifies how the liberal justifications for military intervention in Iraq were initially based on universalist

---

[292] Ibid., 184.
[293] Ibid.
[294] Ibid., 187-188.
[295] Ibid.

notions of democracy promotion and human rights, but when "it became clear that the invading army would not be greeted as 'liberators,'" the aggressive moral rhetoric was followed by "growing doubts about the "readiness" of Iraqis for the boon of democracy."[296] The moral imperative to turn Iraq into a "'beacon of democracy' in the Middle East," had constituted the criteria for a "just intervention," and when the Iraqi resistance called into question the feasibility of attaining this goal, "the justification of continued U.S. presence had to be recalibrated."[297] The culturalist alibis for ongoing intervention in Iraq range from "ethnographic accounts of the salience of tribal systems of political patronage, histories of entrenched ethnic and sectarian conflicts among Kurds, Sunnis, and Shi'as, to the allegedly deep incompatibility between Islam and secular modernity."[298] The source of imperial legitimacy was thus retroactively attributed to the "pathologies of Iraqi society," and occupation has become a duty to protect the country against "impending civil war."[299] In this way, the war in Iraq followed the logical sequence of modern empire outlined by Mantena, wherein moral idealism based on universal ideas of progress are reformulated through culturalist explanations that defer and disavow responsibility for imperial rule.

Just as the direct methods of commanding obedience and extracting wealth that characterized the political rationality of sovereignty were not abandoned altogether when rationalities of government emerged in the late nineteenth century, the rationality of government that sought the "systematic redefinition and transformation" of colonial spaces did not disappear with the introduction of the practice of indirect rule. These older rationalities persist, redefined and in new forms, in the context of discourses of postcolonial development and international peacebuilding; the transition between them at different historical moments is "an important dynamic internal to the political logic of modern empire."[300]

---

[296] Ibid., 179.
[297] Ibid., 180.
[298] Ibid.
[299] Ibid.
[300] Ibid.

According to Mbembe, the postcolony, in its unique transformations and circulation of identities, is "made up of a series of corporate institutions and a political machinery that, once in place, constitute a distinctive regime of violence. In this sense, the postcolony is a particularly revealing, and rather dramatic, stage on which are played out the wider problems of subjection and its corollary, discipline."[301] In the next section I argue that the regimes of governance that constitute the postcolonial postwar state are a particularly revealing stage foregrounding the violent subjection and discipline of the liberal international order.

Considering the Violence of the Civil Peace

As a renegotiation of relations of domination, assimilation and conflict, the establishment of civil peace can constitute a continuation of war by other means. The political practices of postcolonial and postconflict development occur at the level of the state as well as above and below it, operating in diffuse and polyvalent apparatuses of power that involve the conduct of conduct in an explicit sense (in the rule of law, international organizations or the state's monopoly on the legitimate use of violence), and more subtly (through ethological governance and political technologies of the body that lead to particular forms of self-governance). If these are actually wars of assimilation, as opposed to pragmatic approaches to "conflict transformation," there are many questions to be asked about the means of this war: what are the impacts of the violence that underpins the law, the state and society? How do people experience, respond to and resist this violence? Jenny Edkins provides an example of the forms of critique that emerge from historico-political discourse and offers a starting point for thinking about peacebuilding, and particularly, statebuilding, as a field of power relations.

Within contemporary discourses of International Relations the state is produced as a central and overriding source of peace and stability, or at least, as a tool capable of limiting violence. Furthermore, if run properly, this account purports, the state provides security for its citizens. Such explanations of the state's role make possible narratives of

---

[301] Achille Mbembe, *On the Postcolony* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 102.

state glory and heroism. These narratives produce and reproduce the image of the state as homeland or "motherland," an explicitly feminized, passive and sometimes vulnerable territory and population to be protected by the heroic efforts of masculinized national armed forces. Of course, armies are orchestrated by and in the name of the nation-state.[302] Narratives of the state's heroism are particularly significant after war, often produced in the form of memorials, books, national holidays, speeches and other stories of national mourning and the need for unity in reconstruction. As Jenny Edkins aptly identifies, traumatic events, such as a war, genocide and famine are memorialized as linear narratives that reinforce the power of the modern nation-state. For Edkins, sovereign power works precisely by "concealing its involvement and claiming to be a provider not destroyer of security."[303] As I explain in this section, the state depends upon and often creates the trauma that such narratives depict, but "[b]y rewriting these traumas into a linear narrative of national heroism ... the state conceals the trauma that it has, necessarily, produced."[304]

The state is in a position to wage war – against both internal and external threats – in the name of its own preservation. Rather than the source of security they claim to be, Edkins argues that states are both, "produced and defined by organized violence." She asserts,

> States are founded on violence, whether it takes the form of war, revolution or civil conflict. And although once formed a state may appear peaceable enough, internally and externally, physical violence remains a tool that only the state is allowed to use.[305]

States utilize their prerogative to inflict violence in various ways, such as in punishing those who break laws or oppose the state. According to Edkins, this makes the nation-

---

[302] Nira Yuval-Davis, "Gender, the Nationalist Imagination, War, and Peace," in Ed. Wenona Giles and Jennifer Hyndman *Sites of Violence: Gender and Conflict Zones* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004), 182-183. The gendered construction of the nation has very real impacts in the form of gendered violence and persecution. For example, rape and other sexual violence in conflict zones disproportionately impacts women, who are targeted as "symbols of the nation and markers of national boundaries." Mirjana Morokvasic-Müller "From Pillars of Yugoslavism to Targets of Violence: Interethnic Marriages in the Former Yugoslavia and Thereafter," in Ed. Wenona Giles and Jennifer Hyndman *Sites of Violence: Gender and Conflict Zones* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004), 143.
[303] Edkins, *Trauma and the Memory of Politics*, xv.
[304] Ibid.
[305] Ibid., 6.

state a contradictory institution, which promises "safety, security and meaning alongside a reality of abuse, control and coercion."[306]

Drawing on the accounts of angry Vietnam War veterans, Edkins invokes a comparison made by feminists in the 1970s and 1980s between war and family relations. While First Wave feminists in the 1970s compared the trauma of rape, child sexual abuse and domestic violence to the trauma experienced by soldiers in Vietnam, drawing attention to patriarchal power and its exploitation by men, Edkins uses the analogy to examine the "treatment of populations in wartime with the treatment of women in families."[307] The important shift here is from the comparison of traumatized women to traumatized soldiers towards traumatized populations compared to traumatized women. Edkins writes,

> States abuse citizens on the battlefield, in captivity, in concentration camps. The modern state cannot be assumed to be a place of safety any more than the patriarchal family can be. Political abuse in one parallels sexual abuse in the other. Both give rise to what we call symptoms of trauma.[308]

Edkins' comparison is not simply rhetorical. After studying post-war trauma and healing in Mozambique and Angola, Alicinda Honwana argues that violence and trauma in post-conflict zones such as Angola and Mozambique "are not *post*, but rather current and very much part of everyday life."[309] The experience of trauma continues long after a war has ended and the state's status as a place of protection and stability for those who have been traumatized is radically shaken.

Trauma can disrupt or permanently alter one's trust in the social order with the potential to reveal the contingency of the various forms of social and political organization that constitute that order. This is because trauma results from a situation of powerlessness and a violent betrayal of trust. If we expect our family, fellow citizens and national leaders to provide us with protection and security and they become a source of danger we are betrayed and traumatized. This severely disrupts or destroys our

---

[306] Ibid., 6.
[307] Ibid., 7.
[308] Ibid., 7.
[309] Alicinda Honwana, "Healing and social reintegration in Mozambique and Angola," ed. Elin Skaar, Siri Gloppen and Astru Suhrke in *Roads to Reconciliation* (Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2005), 86.

understandings of what we consider "social reality."[310] Drawing on a psychoanalytic account, Edkins argues that,

> in the west both state and subject pretend to a security, a wholeness and a closure that is not possible. From this point of view, an event can be described as traumatic if it reveals this pretence. It is experienced as a betrayal.[311]

The social order and the subject are in fact "inherently incomplete and insecure."[312] Moreover, it is the assumption that there is a social order that produces the subject. Likewise, in assuming that the social exists, the subject produces the social order; "both in a continual process of becoming."[313] This becoming, this ongoing process of formation, means that "subjects only retrospectively become what they are – they *only ever will have been*. And the social order too shares this retrospective constitution."[314] Simplifying Edkins' argument slightly, but extracting the point most relevant to this study, one might say to another: "You and I will never understand each other fully. Meanwhile, and equally important, a fundamental condition of our subjectivity prevents us from even conceiving of who we are if not for one another." These relations are the paradox of individuation; despite our inescapable relationality, there remain irreconcilable incongruities in individual experiences of the world and the "social order." Nonetheless, the presumed coherence of the social order is ascribed a certain amount of trust and the state betrays this trust by allowing or perpetrating violence with traumatic consequences. Edkins cites the account of holocaust survivor Jean Amery who writes, "'nothing can again lull me into the slumber of security from which I awoke in 1935."[315] Responding to Emery's comment, Edkins asserts that traumatic events are experienced as a betrayal by the groups from which we draw our identity – political community, family and so on. Thus, Amery's experience as a Holocaust survivor reveals that "the appearance of fixity and security produced by the social order is just that: an appearance."[316] The social order depends upon citizens' acceptance of particular agendas

---

[310] Edkins, *Trauma and the Memory of Politics*, 4.
[311] Ibid., 11.
[312] Ibid., 11.
[313] Ibid., 13.
[314] Ibid., 13.
[315] Ibid., 8.
[316] Ibid., 8.

and frameworks. Then, once accepted, citizens engage in activities and institutions within this social 'reality', which we categorize as *politics*. Alternatively, when Edkins refers to *the political* she is speaking of that which reveals and acknowledges the negotiations and plays of power that constitute social reality; that which reveals that what we call social reality *is* constituted.[317]

In failing to analyze the forms of power on which the state and state violence depend, we continue to normalize and uncritically accept the liberal account of statehood. As Edkins writes, "The way we see the democratic state rests on not questioning that particular form of political community or the forms of individuality or personhood on which is it based."[318] Both the state and the autonomous liberal (citizen) subject are produced "at the traumatic intersection of peace and war, inside and outside."[319] Here the "supposedly peaceable" internal functioning of the state, secured by the state against the intrusion of conflict and other threats from outside of the state, is shown to depend upon that violence, which inevitably functions within and beneath contemporary frameworks of political community.

In assuming responsibility for the protection of the citizenry – through external legitimation as well as internal displays of authority and political rhetoric – discourses of the state produce a population as citizenry and simultaneously demarcate those who are non-citizens, both inside and outside the state, revealing the co-construction of the subject and the social order. In failing to follow through on its promise of protection, Edkins argues, the state betrays large portions of the population. I am not as concerned here about the possibility of building more reliable states as I am with trying to show that the state, like the subject, will never completely fill the place it claims to occupy, never providing complete security or peace, and never fully expressing the forms of power that underlie it. More, Edkins reminds us that the state will simultaneously always be in excess of that role. This reading of the state and subject is an application of psychoanalytic theory in which the social context where we are situated – where we

---

[317] Ibid., 12.
[318] Ibid., 10.
[319] Ibid.

become subjects, where we become who we are – is produced symbolically through language, which serves to divide up the world in certain ways that help to create what we call reality. [320] Edkins writes,

> In its birth into the symbolic or social order, into language, the subject is formed around, and through a veiling of, that which cannot be symbolised – the traumatic real. The real is traumatic, and has to be hidden or forgotten, because it is a threat to the imaginary completeness of the subject."[321]

The subject does not exist without having some place in the social or symbolic order, but the subject always also exceeds that place as it can never "fully express what that person is."[322] Completeness and closure are structural impossibilities, yet we act as if they were possible and ignore the traumatic, often violent, real that describes "the constituted and provisional nature of what we call social reality."[323] As I briefly explained above, the acknowledgement of this contingency is what is referred to by Edkins and other critical, often post-structuralist or psychoanalytic, theorists as 'the political'. This definition of the political "refers to events in which politics of the first sort ["politics that might be opposed to 'economics' or 'society'''] and its institutions are brought into being."[324] But in addition to any number of moments that reveal the contingency of the social order, Edkins proposes that the political,

> also takes place at moments when major upheavals occur that replace a proceeding social and legal system and set up a new order in its place. At such points, the symbolism and ideology that concealed the fragile and contingent nature of authority collapse altogether and there is a brief interregnum before the new order imposes a different form of concealment.[325]

A peace accord can contribute to establishing a new political order as well as new forms of concealment; however, the signing of a formal peace agreement itself is generally the "first sort" of politics in that the assumption of a liberal democratic state form has already

---

[320] Even without subscribing entirely to all psychoanalytic theory, one can perhaps see how categorizations such as public/private, male/female, worker/student have a role in helping us describe and feel situated in the world around us. Such categories often give a semblance of order and control which may be conceived of as security and legitimates the relations of power that order entails. (Ibid., 11).
[321] Ibid., 12.
[322] Ibid.
[323] Ibid.
[324] Ibid.
[325] Ibid.

been normalized as part of the path to peace, which will help to stabilize the country and secure it from the threat of war and chaos in the future. Precisely where Edkins' second sense of the political is evident in the context of a civil or interstate war is not a simple question; perhaps an entire war of this sort might be seen as a political event if it reveals the contingency of the social and legal order. The practice of postwar statebuilding, that the state explicitly needs to be constructed, could reveal of the state's radical contingency. In the case of those states created or reconstructed after a civil or interstate war, one sees more explicitly than usual the processes of active constitution that bring the state into being. However, efforts to normalize and conceal the radically constructed and contingent nature of the state are even more pronounced here, even amidst ongoing debate over how the state should be built.

This is to say, despite the highly political implications of war and the postwar zone, in defining war in opposition to the civil peace that is supposed to come from the establishment of that social and legal order, the disruption caused by the war is often depoliticised, serving to reinforce the image of the social and legal order as a source of security and stability needed to stave off the chaos and violence of war. Here, postwar peacebuilding can be understood in terms of the concealment of the trauma of war. Or, at least insofar as it involves building states to build peace, contemporary peacebuilding reinforces the centrality of the state in discourses of international security, discourses wherein the state disavows its own violence. The forward-looking narratives of peacebuilding – a series of tasks to move territories and people from a state of war towards organization within a peaceful future state – are integrally linked to the practices of memorializing war that concern Edkins. While these narratives take many forms, peacebuilding is deeply connected to accounts of national unity, reconstruction and security, which are deployed by the state in a way that can justify war and legitimizes the state's monopoly on the exercise of violence. That is, the state and institutions of governance are central to the normative political order for the maintenance of peace. While security is never possible in a true sense, the state retains the exclusive right to the legitimate use of violence in the name of minimizing violence within the population as a whole. The need for the security and freedom of citizens continually justifies the

existence of the state, legitimizing violence perpetrated in the name of security while rendering all other war 'irrational' and 'primitive'. The maintenance of the state and the international state system, then, depends on the management of international peace and security.

The bifurcation of peace and war helps to maintain the legitimacy of the state as well as its ability to retell accounts of war in a way that represent the state as source of peace and reconstruction, as opposed to a source of instability and violence. It also creates a very powerful discourse that conceals the continuation of violence and in which it becomes difficult to be critical of the state because it is associated with progress towards peace. Kevin Durrheim argues that reliance on the peace/war dichotomy has influenced the discourse surrounding peace talk in post-Apartheid South Africa by presenting the systematic state racism entailed by the apartheid system as an anomaly in the history of an otherwise united and peaceful society. According to Durrheim, the post-Apartheid environment was such that one had to fall in line with prominent and often government-sanctioned peace talk or else choose to be in favour of violence and against the state. In this case, 'peaceloving' became, essentially, a prerequisite for one's right to citizenship. In conflating peace with utopia, nationalism and a raceless and classless society, the discourse productively shapes which choices are available and attractive given the consequences of association with one discourse or another.[326]

The cessation of an armed conflict, like the end of apartheid, certainly implies significant reconfigurations of power and political spaces, but the consequences of such reconfigurations are more accurately identified *alongside* important contiguous relations. In dichotomizing war and peace, the discourse of peace and peace talk can be powerfully misleading because it obliges one to make a choice: choose peace and thereby accept the norms of international 'peacebuilding', or choose violence and with it despair and the plight of the rest of post-colonial Africa.[327] If, rather than perpetuating totalizing oppositions between war and peace, one looks at varying degrees of violence and in/security as contingent political consequences of relations that constitute both armed

[326] Durrheim, "Peace Talk and Violence: An Analysis of the Power of 'Peace'."
[327] Ibid.

conflict and the civil peace, one is in a better position to challenge the specific practices that allow for the replications of relations of violence and domination. More, as I elaborate in Chapter Three, if relations of war and peace are thought to coexist in both war and peace to varying degrees, depending on the experience of those concerned, it is possible to identify practices of peace that exist even during war and challenge the notion that war eradicates all remnants of peaceful social, political and economic life.

Although state institutions are central to the legitimation of violence in political modernity generally and discourses of peacebuilding specifically, the state is not the only source of peace in liberal discourse. As I outlined in the previous chapter, social action and organizations at the level of civil society are also meant to be a "driving force" for peace. Civil society entails spaces where individuals can resolve disputes in the public realm, in institutions and social coalitions "between state and society," that have the capacity to "*articulate, autonomously and publicly, an idea of the general interest.*"[328] However, civil society also emerged historically as means of legitimating the subordination of individuals to authority, or in other words, *pacification* as a normalized relation of subjugation to authority.[329] The notion of *civility* to which the term civil society refers, emerged in along with the development of civil law around the eighteenth century separating the affairs of individuals from both ecclesiastical and secular power. That is, civil law emerged to resolve the various violent conflicts between classes of men around property, status and feudal rights, "to put an end to the power of customs, traditions, and authorities perceived as unjust and tyrannical," and the "relations of subordination and violence" these entailed.[330] Civil law "managed" this violence. It secured certain private freedoms and distinguished them from the purview of the authorities. The laws themselves would be public, made by the people themselves, or at least publicly contestable. Thus Mbembe writes,

> it can be said that the origin of civil society is violence – or, at any event, the necessity of managing it to avoid situations where just anyone may be able to make war and

[328] Ibid., 39
[329] Mbembe, *On the Postcolony*, 38.
[330] Ibid., 36-37.

> raise taxes, arrogate to himself ownership of public authority, and exercise a relation of domination based on the pure law of arbitrariness.[331]

The rules of civility entailed the restriction of the means of violence and domination as well as the proper etiquette and ceremony of court society, which was adopted over time by bourgeois elites and the aristocracy. Combining each of these ideas, the notion of civil society refers to:

> a pacified and policed society where, with affects and passions controlled, self-control and the exchange of good manners gradually replace raw physical violence; subsequently, there would no longer be pressing need for vulgar brute force (the distinctive feature of, for example, the colonial regime) in the arrangements for maintaining domination and the means used to ensure subordination.[332]

In addition to protecting individual and public freedoms characteristic of liberal thinking, the notion of civil society has long been associated with the pacification of society in the context of a peace where the apparatuses of power are so secured they no longer appear to subordinate people to their rules, they no longer need to use force to exact the desired behaviour from their subjects.

A Critique of Peacebuilding

The theoretical considerations of imperialism and violence that I draw out in this chapter are useful in developing a more penetrating critique of the practices of international peacebuilding I outlined in Chapter One. Specifically, I argue that peacebuilding constitutes a juridico-philosophical discourse for at least three reasons. First, one of the main goals of peacebuilding is to establish a civil peace in a modern state. Second, peacebuilding demands major institutional reforms and normalizes this institutionalization. Third, peacebuilding involves an appeal to the inherent universal legitimacy of the political and economic order these forms of governance entail, and in a related way, involves a modernizing rationality wherein the establishment of these forms of governance is seen as progress. Colonial ethological governance operated through a

---

[331] Ibid., 36.
[332] Ibid., 38.

similar political rationality that demanded the increasing discipline and regulation of colonial subjects as a condition of their right to self-govern. Scott reminds us that colonial rationalities of power changed over time and space. Thus, it is not possible to directly apply these modes of governance to international peacebuilding. Nonetheless, this chapter shows that the narratives of peacebuilding are very much in line with older practices of ethological governance, including notably Millian ideas about the need for colonial subjects to improve themselves, or more precisely, for the "Third World" to modernize, in today's international imaginary. Drawing from an analysis articulated by Chatterjee and Scott, I argue that international peacebuilding elevates enlightenment reason and its particular ideas of progress as conditions of inclusion, perpetuating colonial relations of governance. However, even when these universalist narratives are replaced by discourses that acknowledge and respect cultural difference, the political rationalities of imperialism have proven malleable enough to incorporate these responses, attributing responsibility for ongoing foreign intervention to the features of the local society itself. Thus, a response to the problematic of imperialism that points to its contradictory ideals proves to be important but insufficient. Taking seriously Mantena's assertions, I point towards the political consequences of statebuilding and other imperial interventions, wherein, regardless of their alibis, there is room to critique the racialization and violence they entail.

This chapter proposes that ongoing violence and relations of domination are evident in the colonial state as well as the postcolonial state, and in the war state as well as the "post" war state, presenting a major challenge to contemporary approaches to peacebuilding because both civil society and statebuilding approaches work to manage violence by establishing a civil peace based on economic development and the subordination of society to the state and the law. As Edkins clearly articulates, by weaving particular narratives about the importance of the state in creating peace and security, narratives of the state conceal the trauma of war and the state's violent production of (in)security. The conditions of the civil peace are defined in opposition to the conditions of war, concealing the various ways that violence and relations of war pervade the conditions of everyday social life. Whereas juridico-philosophical discourses

maintain that political power is part of the systems of governance that maintain the civil peace, a peace that begins when the war ends, the above line of thinking prompts the historico-political hypothesis that peace is the continuation of war by other means.[333] In other words, "peace" can often describe the institutionalization, entrenchment and concealment of an ongoing war within or beneath society through which relations of governance and domination are established.

[333] Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended*, 50.

Chapter Three

This country has been at war for five hundred years, ever since the Portuguese came.[334]

While some observers describe Angola's civil war as a decisive and divisive rupture in Angolan society (writing that Angola was granted independence from Portugal and the political situation rapidly broke down into a civil war), these wars were fought primarily by the same military factions that fought in the preceding thirteen-year struggle for independence, with politics and affiliations that changed more substantially during the civil war than between the two wars. The colonial-postcolonial period, broadly speaking, can also be understood as an ongoing war of conquest and assimilation with a series of manifestations, including not just the various wars of conquest and rebellion that occurred during the colonization, but also the war for independence, civil wars for power and resources, and a post-war period in which the dominant discourses of post-conflict reconstruction have concealed and institutionalized ongoing violence, ushering in new conditions of exploitation. The epigraph to this chapter quotes an MPLA Commondante named Ndozi who holds such a view. Ndozi insists that Angola's wars were connected and unremitting for centuries before the war for independence.[335] In the first section of this chapter I describe a series of colonial wars – sometimes looking a specific moments of so called "proper" war, fought with guns and blood, as well as examining a more generalized struggle to subordinate the Angolan Peoples to colonial power through economic imperialism and elite political domination. This is what I consider to be a posture of war that constituted the whole colonial period and I propose that similar relations of war persist in Angola today.

---

[334] MPLA Commondante Ndozi to Polish journalist Ryszard Kapuściński. Ryszard Kapuściński, *Another Day of Life,* trans. William R. Brand and Katarzyna Mroczkowska-Brand (New York: Vintage Books, 2001/1976), 33.
[335] Kapuściński, *Another Day of Life*, 33.

The first section of the chapter provides a historical review of politics and society in the territory comprising present-day Angola, beginning with the significance of the precolonial kingdoms and ethnolinguistic groups and their relation to colonial expansion, followed by a discussion of some features of the colonial period, the independence insurgency, the civil wars and the present "post-war" state. Admittedly limited and necessarily incomplete, this history is meant to provide background on what has been said in the English literature about Angola, looking mainly at what has been written about colonization and the various wars and efforts to exploit and "pacify" the area over the last five centuries. I also describe some of the current conditions in Angola and what has happened in terms of peacebuilding since the signing of the 2002 Memorandum of Understanding. While it is difficult to say precisely what results peacebuilding will have in the Angolan case study I explore in this chapter, it is clear that the rhetoric of peacebuilding used by the Government of Angola, foreign aid organizations and multinational corporations conceals the continuity in unequal, violent and imperial relations of governance. I examine reports of the sort of peace that is being built as well as examples that point to how relations of violence and war entrenched in these earlier conflicts continue to trouble "post-war" Angola. These relations include the extension of relations of political domination and material exploitation by other states, foreign investors and Angolan elites; ongoing displacement and widespread poverty among the majority of the population; and physical violence and insecurity faced by many Angolans and women in particular.

The case study in Angola builds on the arguments I make about peacebuilding in the preceding chapters by demonstrating that peacebuilding emerges in the context of a long history of foreign efforts to establish various areas of influence over people and material resources in the region, by waging war and, in a sense, also by waging peace. Postcolonial conflicts and contemporary peacebuilding efforts are deeply connected to colonial legal, political and social structures as well as neocolonial efforts to extend a liberal international order. In light of the broader definition of war I have laid out in this thesis, these struggles are presented as a continuation of war by other means. In this view, contemporary peacebuilding efforts cannot be separated from questions about the

legitimation of violence, the subjugation of knowledges, histories of colonialism and the complex national and international plays of power. Each of these dynamics is wrapped up in both civil war and civil peace in Angola because ongoing colonialism or neo-imperialism is legitimized, as Said and others have argued, by the very real truth effects of the way the "non-west" is viewed.[336] This chapter looks specifically at the series of insufficiencies identified in the non-western subject in Angola over five centuries of colonialism and how the truth ascribed to categorizations such as uncivilized, barbarian, non-Christian, and more recently, illegitimate government and insufficient human rights, have helped to define the limits of political community in "the west" and justified the extension of political and economic relations beyond these limits.

The thrust of the chapter (and the thesis so far) is that peacebuilding is an extension of the pacification of the colony. Such an extension is made possible because writing on Angola predominantly produces knowledge about the country in terms of a lack of peace, development and other "civilized" conditions.[337] But, in my own experience visiting the country, Angola could certainly not be characterized mainly by war, "decay," "ferment" or any other offensive metaphor used by foreign observers to describe the country.[338] Despite pervasive evidence of war and inequality, Angolans often spoke of living in and making peace, and in the research I have done on the country I find accounts of Angolans, including active soldiers, engaged in seemingly peaceful relations even during the civil war. Thus, in the second section of the chapter I diverge from my analysis of peacebuilding as the continuation of war by other means to describe three short narrative

---

[336] Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1994); Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Towards a History of the Vanashing Present* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1999); Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe: postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008).

[337] While I am commenting on the English literature about Angola, others have made this claim more broadly about discourses about Africa emerging from "the west" which reproduce the category of the western subject in relation to Africa as "the dark continent." Recent academic literature perpetuates the idea of sub-Saharan Africa as an impenetrable "black hole of reason," characterized by chaos and war. Achille Mbembe, *On the Postcolony* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 8.

[338] Karl Maier, an American journalist, describes Angola as one of many "decaying African nations," asserting that in each of the vast range of examples of violence, corruption and homelessness around the globe, "there is a little whiff of Angola." Karl Maier, *Angola: Promises and Lies* (London: Serif, 2007), 15. Also, Thomas Okuma, a missionary from Hawaii, wrote about his years in Angola in a book called *Angola in Ferment,* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1962).

accounts of how Angolans have confronted violence and conflict. These accounts imply that as much as war does not end with a declaration of peace, peaceful relations are not necessarily eradicated by war. I pause on these vignettes because they seem true to my impression of many Angolans pursuing their own vision of peace, and because they reiterate but also extend beyond the problematization of the peace/war dichotomy that I have provoked throughout this thesis, gesturing towards possibilities for different understandings of peace. These accounts interrupt my own analysis, but they also trouble a characterization of Angola that is common to academic literature and popular media (and which the first section may seem to evoke), wherein the country is represented as though entirely permeated by war and violence. The peacemaking practices I describe reiterate that liberal approaches to peacebuilding have never represented a true consensus on how to build peace. However, I include these accounts with certain reservations, elaborated further below. In brief, while the vignettes point to possibilities for further research, in the context of this thesis they do not demonstrate that Angolan practices lead to a "truer" peace than other approaches, and they do not lead to an argument for expanding or replacing international peacebuilding practice with local peacebuilding practices.

Section One: Ongoing War and Colonial Traditions

Despite pervasive efforts to consolidate Portuguese authority within the borders of the colony, the territory comprising present-day Angola was not controlled by a central government until the end of the First World War. Until this time, Angola was divided geographically into relatively distinct cultural and political regions with boundaries carved out by rivers and the political borders of the various kingdoms that spanned the region.[339] Portuguese colonization began at the end of the fifteenth century in the kingdom of the Kongo in the north (see map below), where they established relations

[339] Malyn Newitt, "Angola in Historical Context," in ed. Patrick Chabal and Nuno Vidal *Angola: The Weight of History* (London, Hurst Publishers, 2007); David Birmingham, *The Portuguese Conquest of Angola* (London, Oxford University Press, 1965).

with the king, giving local elites significant new authority.[340] The colonial boundaries which the Portuguese would eventually claim divided the traditional boundaries of many kingdoms, including the Kongo kingdom. If mapped onto today's political borders, the Kongo kingdom would overlap Angola, the Republic of Congo and the Democratic Republic of Congo. Many of the Bakongo people in this region continue to have more commonalities across these state borders then with Angolans in the south.[341] When traders from São Tomé threatened the Portuguese Crown's monopoly on trade by establishing contact with Kimbundu-speaking chiefs further south in Kongo territory, the Portuguese began their own negotiations in the south with the king of the kingdom of Ndongo whose name – "Ngola" – is the etymological root of Angola, which the Portuguese eventually began to call the entire region south of the Congo River and eventually all of Portuguese West Africa.[342] Many of the children of Portuguese traders and African women, referred to in the English literature on Angola as the Afro-Portuguese[343], eventually established themselves in a separate sovereign territory settled through the conquests of Paulo Dias in the lower Kwanza Valley, the area where he would found the city of Luanda.[344] In its slow expansion south from the Kongo Kingdom

---

[340] Newitt, "Angola in Historical Context," 22-23.

[341] Ibid. Some of these connections were reinforced as Angolan northerners fled to Zaire (now the Democratic Republic of Congo), after the 1961 independence rebellion. While most of these refugees returned after independence, additional Bakongo refugees went to DRC at various times throughout the civil war. (Ibid)

[342] Ibid., 24; Birmingham, *The Portuguese Conquest of Angola*, 8.

[343] David Birmingham and others use the more general term *mestiços* to describe this group, and some contemporary accounts refer to the *nomenklatura* (political elite) or the Luanda Creole community. David Birmingham, *Portugal and Africa* (London: MacMillan Press, 1999); Messiant, "The Mutation of Hegemonic Domination"; Patrick Chabal, "*E Pluribus Unum*: Transitions in Angola," in ed. Patrick Chabal and Nuno Vidal *Angola: The Weight of History* (London: Hurst Publishers, 2007).

[344] Newitt, "Angola in Historical Context," 26. I stress that this account of Angolan history is drawn from English literature on Angola, mainly written by foreign-born researchers, journalists and missionaries. No matter how careful the researcher, these accounts are highly problematic as they can not account for the complexity of Angolan life and contribute to the reification of our understanding of Angolan Peoples and politics in English academic worlds. The term 'Mbundu', for example, was developed in the twentieth century to fuse all the local Peoples who the broadly share the Kimbundu language into a single ethnic identity. (Ibid., 36-37) I am concerned about the knowledge I (re)produce in this section of my thesis, especially given the limited reference material available to me as an English speaker, but also as a foreigner producing another account of Angola that is bound to make problematic generalizations, conceal the biases held by myself and the authors I cite, and reproduce the very relations of power/knowledge that make possible ongoing relations of colonial dominance.

I include this historical material with the intention to undertake a genealogy of the various pacifications and wars in the region during and after the colonial period, showing that contemporary relations among foreigners,

and east into the interior regions, Portuguese colonialism began to contribute to alliances among local authorities, including the emergence and then decline of the Afro-Portuguese as a ruling class, and later, as leaders in the MPLA during and after the twentieth century wars.[345]

The Portuguese wars of assimilation contributed to the increasing rigidity of local ethnolinguistic distinctions and the decline in the use of local languages.[346] Portuguese settlement in Luanda, for example, and its development as the capital caused a decrease in the use of the Kimbundu language, spoken by the local Mbundu people.[347] In 2002 almost half of Angolan children spoke Portuguese as a first language. Promoted by the government as "an instrument of national unity," Portuguese is the sole official language in Angola, spoken in schools for many generations and in the military, which has had a considerable influence during almost forty years of militarized armed conflict. According to Tony Hodges, compared to Angola and especially Luanda, there is nowhere else in Sub-Saharan Africa where so many young people speak no African languages at all.[348]

---

local elites, and the rest of the population constitute a reorganization and redefinition of these relations, but not a clear break with these colonial wars of exploitation and assimilation. In the context of my thesis, the aim of the case study is to critique peacebuilding, and to produce knowledge about what happens in foreign interventions such as those in Angola, not to produce knowledge about Angola per say. However, in describing what has happened in Angola, I do of course make the country an object of study with problematic implications. In sum, it is a questionable position, the one I write from, and I intend to question it. But, given my experience studying peace and reconciliation in the country and my family's missionary and peacebuilding work there, I am in a better position from which to question foreign intervention in Angola, as opposed to another intervention (such as Iraq or Afghanistan) more in the spotlight of the Canadian and U.S. governments, international news media and other international organizations.

[345] Hodges, *Angola,* 26. The Afro-Portuguese had a major influence in the central strip of Angola among the Mbundu Peoples living inland from Luanda, but before UNITA territories in the east. Despite the decline of the Afro-Portuguese influence in the early twentieth century, they played a significant role in attempts to colonize the interior, especially in the late nineteenth century. The loyalties evident in the independence movement and the civil wars would reflect these relations, as they "assumed the character of a conflict between the old Afro-Portuguese coastal states and the inland peoples." Newitt, "*Angola in Historical Context*," 36. The inland peoples Newitt refers to were primarily in the rural areas further east beyond the Mbundu areas that eventually made up the "natural constituency of the Afro-Portuguese political leaders. . . when they formed the MPLA in the 1950s." (Ibid., 36-37)

[346] Like elsewhere in Africa, the strength of affiliation within many African kingdoms and ethno-political groups was relatively fluid, often corresponding to the groups' economic and kinship alliances. Material wealth was frequently turned into or measured in people, including dependent kin, clients and slaves. Ibid., 24.

[347] Ibid., 23. A 1996 survey found that only fifteen per cent of Angolans spoke Kimbundu as a first language, compared to twenty-three percent in the 1960 census. The Kikongo language of the Bakongo people was spoken by 8.5 percent of Angolans in 1996, compared to 13.5 percent in the 1960 census. Hodges, *Angola,* 24.

[348] Ibid., 25.

Thus, despite the ongoing importance and widespread use of Angolan languages, Portuguese colonialism had dramatic impacts on language, culture and ethnicity that persist within the post-colonial Angolan state.

This case study does not include sufficient evidence to show that late imperial ideology in Angola was transformed in response to "imperial dilemmas" according to the causal dynamic identified by Mantena – from universalist alibis for empire to retrospective culturalist alibis. Although it does not make this causal link, it does demonstrate very well that colonialism in Angola involved, at different times, universalist political rationalities, local resistance to these attempts to penetrate and organize local political and social life as well as culturalist political rationalities that sought to define and entrench the essential difference of Angolans and Portuguese subjects.[349] This discussion of political rationalities of colonialism in Angola begins with earlier political attempts by European countries to extract resources from and subjugate the region. These political rationalities were characterized by the international slave trade and supplanted by indentured labour in the rubber and ivory trades. In the eighteenth century, new visions of modernization and civilization emerged in the Lusophone colonial imaginary and universalist alibis for empire promoted 'peace through work'. Later, the perceived threat of African and Portuguese miscegenation and Africans with Portuguese education and cultural influences constituted a challenge to the civilizational difference on which the civilizing project depended and led to the emergence of culturalist discourses wherein the Afro-Portuguese, once considered the "principle defenders of the worldwide Portuguese empire," were seen as "diluting Portuguese blood."[350] In this context, the Portuguese initiated systematic efforts to entrench and secure these differences in legal categories.

The opening of sugar plantations in Brazil at the end of the sixteenth century led to the development of an international slave trade from Angola. As the slave trade expanded, the Afro-Portuguese gained a particularly powerful position by organizing caravans

---

[349] Karuna Mantena, *Alibis of Empire: Henry Maine and the Ends of Liberal Imperialism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 180.
[350] Newitt, "Angola in Historical Context," 51.

inland to the main slaving fairs in the chieftancies of Kasanje and Matamba, beyond the effective control of the Portuguese. Some Afro-Portuguese also established a second port at Benguela, three hundred miles south of Luanda. Benguela provided much easier access to the interior kingdoms of the southern highlands.[351] Slaves were acquired and brought to the slave fairs from throughout the entire region that later became Angola. By 1600, about 4,500 slaves were being exported from Angola's ports annually, with numbers rising to 8,000 slaves per year by 1650 and 11,000 by 1700. By 1840, approximately two million slaves had been sent overseas from Angola and the slave trade had come to dominate the commercial economy of the entire region of central Africa.[352] At this time Portugal officially abolished the international slave trade. However, instead of eradicating slavery in Angola, the decline of the international slave trade simply increased the internal slave trade among elites as well as the trade in slaves to the Indian Ocean markets and to the Portuguese plantations of São Tomé.[353] Moreover, the subsequent compulsory labour laws for "all those who could not prove their civilised status," meant that many former slaves were "forcibly contracted to their former masters," leading to riots and protests in some areas.[354]

The development of the compulsory labour laws put the Portuguese in a good position to profit from emerging markets for palm oil and ivory, and later rubber.[355] In order to apply the laws, the Portuguese were "[t]rue to the spirit and practice of indirect rule," and vied for the support of local authorities whose power had been eroded by the growing wealth and influence of new social groups in the rubber and palm oil trade who dealt directly with European merchants.[356] The Portuguese established new relationships with the local chiefs through the revival of the Catholic and Baptist missions. As Newitt writes, "[t]he arrival of both Baptist and Catholic missions was welcomed by the Kongo king and by some other chiefs for much the same reasons as the original mission had been received in 1491. The outsiders were seen as useful allies in the struggle to reinforce

---

[351] Ibid., 36; 26.
[352] Ibid., 28.
[353] Ibid., 30.
[354] Ibid., 45-46.
[355] Ibid., 31.
[356] Ibid., 43.

steadily weakening authority."[357] In exchange for the support of these outside allies, the local chiefs were willing "to enlist carriers and supply other forms of labour."[358]

Increased competition in the caravan trade eventually threatened the commercial dominance of the Afro-Portuguese in the interior. As a result, they "began to rely increasingly on the wealth to be derived from direct control of land and population," and where they could, particularly in the kingdoms of the plateau, the Afro-Portuguese elite subjected local inhabitants to a "more exacting regime of tribute payment and labour service, which frequently caused opposition and resistance."[359] The labour fuelling these new economies was not called 'slavery' as such, but in practice the conditions were quite similar. The effective reorganization of relations of exploitation, the abolition of slavery would prove to have less to do with questions of freedom and quality of life for the average Angolan and more to do with power struggles amongst foreign and local authorities.

In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, amid the scramble for Africa and increasing pressure on Portugal to prove it could emulate the civilizing missions of Britain and Germany, the Portuguese administration attempted to establish their direct control over the entire territory in a series of wars of "pacification," and attempted to undermine the influence of the Afro-Portuguese political elite through a settlement policy that aimed to replace the Afro-Portuguese with a European population, but without much success.[360] Henrique de Paiva Couceiro, governor of Angola from 1907 to 1909, advocated for the pacification of Angola, which he described as, "'peace and civilisation through work' and 'occupying the country by force and thereafter opening the roads,

---

[357] Ibid., 42-43.
[358] Ibid., 43.
[359] Ibid., 32.
[360] Newitt, "*Angola in Historical Context*," 50. In 1900, there were just under 10,000 white settlers in Angola and, in 1920, there were just over 20,000. Even in 1970, nearing the height of Portuguese settlement before independence, there was a white settler population of 290,000 out of a total population of about 5.6 million. Kaplan, Irving, ed. *Angola: A Country Study* (Washington, D.C.: Foreign Area Studies, The American University), xii (source notes that census of 1970 had "obstacles to accurate count," xii). High death rates among settlers was a major deterrent, as was the reputation gained by the colony through Lisbon's ongoing use of Angola as a place to exile criminals. Newitt explains that this practice had the "predictable consequence" of producing a rather large criminal class. Newitt, "*Angola in Historical Context*," 50.

establishing relations with the people, and by advice, example and agricultural instruction little by little introducing new moral horizons and better ways of life.'"[361] In this discourse, peace was conflated with civilization to rationalize Portuguese conquest, colonial domination and ethological governance in Angola. Governor de Paiva Couceiro explicitly acknowledged that modernisation and the rule of law would be achieved in Angola through the use of force. While colonial officials spoke about creating peace through work, the relationship they hoped to establish with the people would fundamentally depend on violence, which they saw as necessary for economic and moral advancement. This "co-ordinated drive for modernisation" was intensified when the Portuguese Monarch was replaced by a Republic in 1910, as the Republicans aimed for the universal application of the labour laws.[362] The Republic was overthrown in 1926 and was replaced by the 'New State' in which António Salazar was given control over the Portuguese government, initiating another phase of the bloody expansion of the Portuguese occupation of Angola.[363] In the early twentieth century the other European colonial powers began to give up their colonies and saw themselves as more civilized and progressive, politically and culturally superior to the Portuguese, who were ruled by a dictator in Europe and unwilling to adapt to the times in line with international pressure to decolonize.[364]

While other Western European states had a discourse of cultural superiority in relation to Portugal, Lisbon's colonial policies in were accompanied by their own discourse of cultural and racial superiority during the Monarch, the Republic and the New State. Newitt writes,

> The Afro-Portuguese who has for so long sustained the economic and political life of the coastal cities, and who had at one time been lauded as the principal defenders of the worldwide Portuguese empire, were now denounced as degenerates. In a paper published in 1902, F.X. da Silva Teles maintained (as summarized by Rosa Williams) that 'secure racial superiority is disrupted by the silent, implicit threat of African

---

[361] Ibid., 44.
[362] Ibid., 45; 53.

[364] K. Madhu Panikhar, *Angola in Flames* (Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1962), 2-3.

> women diluting Portuguese blood and the explicit threat of pollution from an African physical and cultural environment.'[365]

This was a new ideological rationalization for Portugal's imperialist project in Angola in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, but a familiar discourse in Europe and other European colonies. Racist ideology gained prominence in Angola alongside increased efforts to more directly control the colony and promote "civilisation in darkest Africa."[366] At this time, "all Portuguese governments had as their central objective the creation of a modern state with an economy tuned to the needs of the mother country."[367] Railway building was one of the most effective methods used in these pursuits. "As the line advanced, the colonisation of the interior proceeded apace."[368] The economic imperialism that drove these colonial pursuits was naturalized as a path to civilization, but perceived threats to the hierarchical ranking of Peoples (established through these stagial theories of modernization) through miscegenation, education and accumulation, led to efforts to entrench the essential difference of the Portuguese, Afro-Portuguese, *assimilados* and the rest of the Peoples in the colony, establishing in Chatterjee's words, "the truth of colonial difference."[369]

Colonial officials attempted to secure racial distinctions in law, introducing distinct statuses for *indígena* and *não indígena* (native and non-native), where "the *não indígena* would be treated as a civilized Portuguese citizen."[370] Nearly all Afro-Portuguese were assigned this status, but Newitt continues:

> The government needed to have a workable system for deciding when an African could be included in this category and, as a result, adopted the French practice of assimilation. To become an *assimilado* a person had to display stipulated levels of education, Portuguese culture and economic independence, criteria that could be raised or lowered to regulate admission into the colonial elite.[371]

---

[365] Newitt, "*Angola in Historical Context*," 51-52.
[366] Ibid., 50.
[367] Ibid., 47.
[368] Ibid., 49.
[369] Partha Chatterjee, *The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories,* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007), 20.
[370] Ibid., 53.
[371] Ibid..

By 1960 around 50,000 Africans had been classified as *assimilados*, constituting an elite "clearly separated by upbringing, legal status and opportunity from the majority of the population."[372] The presumed superiority of this political elite was reified by the racial categorization of the colonial assimilation policy, with extensive consequences for future events in Angola, "[a]s many commentators have pointed out, the leadership of the nationalist movements came overwhelmingly from this group, so that the colonial social distinctions were perpetuated in the post-colonial social formation of the country."[373] Education, culture and economic status thus emerged as categories on which Angolans would be considered 'European' enough to earn privileges one would not deserve as a non-European subject. The colonial imaginary naturalized these privileges on the basis of racial superiority and a particular valuation of material wealth and civilization. While contemporary discourses of peace- and state-building differ in important ways from these racist colonial discourses – rejecting racial superiority as an obstacle to development – as the discussion of peacebuilding in this thesis shows, peacebuilding in Angola and elsewhere retains elements of earlier attempts to define and measure the transformation and improvement of colonial subjects and continues to use such rhetoric to rationalize economic imperialism.

Colonial rule in Angola was always challenged by local resistance and eventually a large-scale war for independence was initiated by a series of rebellions in the capital and northern regions of Angola between 1960 and 1961. Clearly preparing for the possibility of an African rebellion in 1960, the Portuguese stocked their arsenals for war, importing nearly 1000 tons of arms and ammunition compared to 156 tons in 1959. An uprising in the cotton growing district east of Malanje was the first armed uprising in this period and a notable example of the events to follow. The local population around Malanje were obliged to cultivate cotton and sell the entire crop to the government at fixed prices far below world market rates, leaving the average *indígena* family with an annual income of $20-$30 at the time of the rebellion.[374] Cotton producers began to

---

[372] Ibid.
[373] Ibid.
[374] Ibid., 174

refuse to work or pay taxes in November 1960. The Portuguese responded with intimidation tactics and the African nationalists attacked Portuguese shops, an administrative post and a Catholic mission armed with *catanas* (bushknives for clearing thick vegetation) and *canhangulos* (homemade guns).[375]

This uprising had already been quelled before the date in MPLA's official record of the "the national revolution," begining February 4, 1961. This was the date of another significant uprising in Luanda. On the night of February 3-4, 80 to 180 Africans attacked a police patrol, a prison, and military detention center, police barracks and the radio station in Luanda. The following day an official funeral was held for the seven police officers and soldiers killed in the attacks and as they left the funeral, attendees began to slaughter African onlookers and then proceeded to the shantytowns surrounding Luanda where the police helped to organize white civilian vigilantes carrying out nightly slaughters of an unknown number of local people, rounding up nationalists and other Angolans for mass executions.[376] On March 15th, 1961, a series of armed revolts began in the coffee growing regions in northern Angola, expanding over to next four months to almost all of the Portuguese trading centers, administrative posts, and coffee plantations in the north from the Atlantic to the Kwango River. The Portuguese army was quickly reinforced by thousands of troops from Portugal and, together with local white settlers, killed thousands of Africans in summary executions and napalm attacks.[377] By the end of 1961, the rebellion had essentially collapsed with the guerrilla groups short of food and ammunition. The Portuguese had recaptured their plantations and occupied posts, thousands of Angolans had fled to the Congo, hundreds of thousands had surrendered and many others died while hiding in the forests. Some estimates of the African dead at the end of 1961 are as low as 8,000 and others between 25,000 and 50,000. The estimated dead among the Portuguese was around 400.[378]

---

[375] Ibid.
[376] Lawrence W. Henderson, *Angola: Five Centuries of Conflict* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1979), 176.
[377] Newitt, "Angola in Historical Context," 78; Douglas L Wheeler and René Pélissier, *Angola* (London: Pall Mall Press, 1971), 189.
[378] Ibid., 187-191. Writing from London in 1961, António de Figueiredo reflected on the anti-colonial movement in Angola and the events leading to and following the armed revolt of 1961. Figueiredo states,

Although most observers do not consider the Angolan movements to be a direct catalyst for independence, these insurrections were significant because they committed the nationalist movements to an armed struggle that would continue for the next thirteen years.[379] Nationalist movements in Guiné and Moçambique are thought to have precipitated the April 25, 1974 military coup in Lisbon by the Movimento das Forças Armadas (MFA), after which time the Portuguese army in Angola, backed by the MFA, refused to keep fighting against the local resistance. At the end of 1974, the MFA convened negotiations for a transfer of power in Angola. The Alvor Accord was signed in January 1975, outlining a plan for an interim government formed by all three nationalist movements and the Portuguese, which would hold elections before the Portuguese withdrawal the following November. Despite this agreement on paper, no efforts were made to pass responsibility over to Angolans prior to independence, leaving no leaders or institutions prepared to take over in the context of an armed struggle that was being waged as much between the independence movements as against the Portuguese, and which would inevitably continue following the departure of the Portuguese.[380]

In the months leading up to Angola's Independence Day, November 11, 1975, more than 300,000 European settlers left Angola precipitating a collapse in local industry.[381] The sudden abandonment of large Portuguese farms and plantations, for example, caused food production to plummet and contributed to food supply issues compounded by the armed conflict, limited transportation, poverty, displacement and the risk created by land mines. Angolans could not easily take over the Portuguese plantations because colonial policy had systematically denied education to Angolans, particularly for managerial positions and trades. Moreover, a third of the country's population was internally displaced by the end of the war. The vast majority of displaced people left rural areas seeking safety and employment in the coastal cities, while fields and agricultural

---

"The history of the modern revolutionary process in Angola will never be accurately written—most of it is hidden in administrative and police records and not everything is even written here." Quoted in Wheeler and Pélissier, *Angola,* 60.

[379] Ibid., 78.

[380] Ibid., 78-86.

[381] Ibid., 21.

equipment were neglected and sometimes destroyed or mined.[382] In 1984 just three percent of Angola's total arable land – 124,670,000 hectors or twenty-four percent of the country – was being used for agriculture, forcing most Angolans to depend on increasingly scarce and expensive food and grain imports, and inevitably food aid. [383]

Although Portugal would retain little neo-colonial power, the next section will show that the departure of Portuguese colonial officials and settlers would not be the end of foreign intervention in Angolan politics. As much as the other European colonial powers had criticised Portugal for clinging to their colonies, the Portuguese were also criticised for their hasty departure, which was seen as leaving the newly independent colony vulnerable to the influence of communism. Granted independence in the midst of the Cold War, Angola was quickly thrust into the Superpower proxy wars, with the West pouring in aid to support an "anti-Communist" military operation while the Soviet Block and Castro's Cuba pursued their own Enlightenment project, sending extensive financial and military resources in the hope of advancing Third World liberation.[384] The geo-politics of the Cold War as well as the conflicts in neighbouring Namibia and Zaire meant that outside forces would continue to make concerted efforts to influence the outcome of the Angolan civil wars, to extract resources from the country (particularly oil and diamonds), and to influence the ideology of the Angolan government.

The three major anti-colonial movements at the time of Angolan independence were *União Nacional para a Independência Total de Angola* (UNITA), *Frente Nacional para a Libertação de Angola* (FNLA) and *Movimento Popular de Libertação de Angola,* (MPLA). MPLA was the military victor and is the current governing party of Angola. A fourth party, relatively smaller but with ongoing influence, was the separatist movement

---

[382] João Gomes Porto, Chris Alden and Imogen Parsons, *From Soldiers to Citizens: Demilitarization of Conflict and Society* (Aldershot, England: Ashgate Publishing, 2007), 36; Mai et al., *Towards and Angola Strategy* (2007), 18.

[383] B.J. Oliver, *The Strategic Significance of Angola* (Pretoria: Institute for *Strategic* Studies, 1984), 23; 27.

[384] The US claimed that its support for FNLA and later UNITA was a reaction to Soviet interference: "[Secretary of State Henry] Kissinger railed against Soviet 'hegemonic aspirations'," emphasizing that American aid to the Angolan parties began "long after massive Soviet involvement became evident." Arthur Jay Klinghoffer, *The Angolan War: A Study in Soviet Policy in the Third World* (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1980), 89. On Cuban and Soviet intervention in the "Third World" as an Enlightenment project, see W. B. Gallie, *Philosophers of Peace and War: Kant, Clausewitz, Marx, Engels and Tolstoy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 67.

Frente de Libertação do Enclave de Cabinda (FLEC) in the Angolan exclave of Cabinda, north of the Congo River on the coast between the borders of Congo and DRC. Leading up to independence, UNITA, MPLA and FNLA fought an intense battle to gain control of the state with the Marxist MPLA eventually taking over Luanda and the central government.[385]

UNITA was historically based in Angola's southeast, controlling the majority of the country's diamond resources and having strong ethno-regional ties amongst the Ovimbundu people of this region. [386] UNITA received Chinese and Moroccan training and had support at various times from Namibia's independence movement, South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), South Africa and the United States.[387] In 1964 UNITA's founder and leader, Jonas Savimbi, went to Moscow to ask for Soviet support, but they requested he join MPLA. Savimbi refused, turning instead to China for military training and subsequently introduced official UNITA support for Maoism.[388]

From 1965 to 1975, UNITA and SWAPO worked closely together, supplying each other with shelter, food and other resources. However, frantically trying to compete with MPLA in the lead up to Independence, UNITA's leader, Jonas Savimbi, eventually began to vie for South African support, the very forces SWAPO was fighting for independence, giving the South African Defence Force (SADF) the location of SWAPO bases in exchange for arms, instructors and commanders.[389] Julius Nyerere, Tanzania's iconic

---

[385] Marcum, "UNITA," 8; Marcum, "United States Options in Angola," 39-40. According to Marcum, had there been an election in mid-1975, UNITA's strong support amongst Angola's approximately seven million Ovimbundu gave them the strongest bid for power. John A. Marcum, "United States Options in Angola," in Helen Kutchen *Angola, Mozambique and the West,* (New York: Praeger, with the Center for Strategic and International Studies), 38. However, as MPLA troops poured into the capital it became increasingly clear that a military victory securing control of Luanda would determine who would step into the national leadership. John A. Marcum, "UNITA: The Politics of Survival," in Helen Kutchen *Angola, Mozambique and the West,* (New York: Praeger, with the Center for Strategic and International Studies), 14.

[386] Hodges, *Angola*, 26.

[387] Marcum, "UNITA," 8, 13-14; 16.

[388] Ibid., 15.

[389] Ibid; Marcum, "United States Options in Angola," 40. According to UNITA accounts recorded by Marcum, when Cuban forces arrived in SWAPO's operating areas in Angola in 1975, SWAPO's political ties to the Soviets obliged them to assist the Cubans in finding UNITA camps and from that time SWAPO switched allegiances from UNITA to MPLA. However, Marcum notes that other sources propose that by the end of 1974 UNITA was already trying to distance itself from SWAPO. Notably, a 1974 interview with UNITA representatives in Luanda with Johannesburg's *The Star* called for SWAPO to "fight for their own

teacher, anti-colonial activist and first post-colonial President, portrayed Savimbi's decision to align UNITA with South Africa's apartheid government as a betrayal of all of Africa.[390] Marcum argues that this is typical of the strategic approach Savimbi had always taken to his politics and rhetoric, showing himself "to be a spellbinding orator," who carefully adapted his remarks to each audience he addressed, promising the Americans to rid Africa of communism, assuring Portuguese Angolans that he considered all settlers and their children born in Angola to be fully Angolan, while declaring his commitment to democratic African socialism to black Angolans, claiming that he would create a state "under majority rule, free from domination by Portuguese-educated whites and *mestiços*."[391]

FNLA had a strong Angolan support-base in the north, formed primarily by what was once the *União das Populações do Norte de Angola* (UPNA), or The Union of Peoples of Northern Angola, the organization responsible for the first rebellions in 1961.[392] The US supported FNLA from 1962-1976, paying FNLA leader Holden Roberto a $10,000 US retainer and giving FNLA $300,000 in covert funding in January 1975 alone.[393] At this time FNLA was the strongest military power in Angola, with an estimated 15,000 troops compared to the MPLA's estimated 10,000 troops at this time.[394] However, an influx of military support from the Soviet and Cuban governments – responding to UNITA's turn to South Africa – quickly overtook FNLA and shifted the balance of power towards MPLA. In July 1975, the US authorized funds and arms for both UNITA and FNLA.[395] FNLA troops were largely defeated by Cuban troops by the end of 1975 and retreated to Zaire (now DRC).[396]

---

independence." Marcum, "UNITA," 14. Precisely which party initially betrayed the alliance between SWAPO and UNITA is unclear.

[390] Ibid., 4.

[391] Ibid., 7; 11.

[392] Wheeler and Pélissier, *Angola*, 174.

[393] Klinghoffer, *The Angolan War,* 88; Marcum, "UNITA," 7.

[394] Comerford, *The Peaceful Face of Angola*, 4.

[395] Klinghoffer, *The Angolan War*, 89.

[396] Marcum, "United States Options in Angola," 39-40. A 1979 agreement between MPLA leader Agostinho Neto and Zaire's President Mobutu Sese Seko, forced FNLA's leader Holden Roberto into exile in Europe. The agreement was meant to curb the efforts of Katangan rebels based in Angola. In exchange, Mobuto agreed to take care of Neto's troublesome opposition in Zaire, expelling Roberto and closing

Although secretary of State Henry Kissinger announced US support for South African intervention in the civil war alongside UNITA in 1975, shortly thereafter a congressional decision cut funding to all covert operations in Angola. South Africa expected US approval to be backed financially or militarily and when it became clear that material support was not forthcoming they withdrew their forces to Namibia, forcing UNITA to retreat to their strongholds in the southeast.[397] After withdrawing from direct battle with MPLA in 1976, as in other times of retreat, UNITA troops killed many MPLA officials and supporters in guerrilla massacres.[398] With FNLA dismantled and UNITA in retreat, MPLA effectively won the ability to form the government.[399] By 1976, MPLA had gained control of the central government, proclaiming the formation of the People's Republic of Angola, and, recognized by the UN and the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the party was eventually accepted internationally as the legitimate government of Angola.[400]

During the period of anticolonial insurgency in the 1960s and early 1970s, MPLA was not explicitly communist, but it was founded by and maintained a Marxist intellectual leadership mainly drawn from the Luanda Afro-Portuguese elite, including its founding leader and first African head of state, Agustino Neto, a Marxist poet and teacher. MPLA policy tended to emphasize egalitarianism and anti-imperialism, drawing support across

---

FNLA bases in Zaire. Amidst already waning confidence in FNLA's military leadership, top officials defected to MPLA and the party ceased to be a significant player in the armed conflict. Marcum, "A Quarter Century of War," 22.

[397] Marcum, "A Quarter Century of War," 22.

[398] Ibid.

[399] The three parties jointly negotiated independence from Portugal after the 1974 Lisbon coup and signed the Alvor Accord in January 1975. These negotiations notably excluded the Cabindan nationalist movement, FLEC, as the Accord declared that Cabinda was "an inalienable component part of Angola." Comerford, *The Peaceful Face of Angola,* 4. Aware of the wealth in their local resources and angered by their perceived exploitation by outsiders, a "low-intensity" war continues in Cabinda between the government and the Cabindan separatists despite the 2002 peace agreement. Hodges, *Angola,* 28. Although the government signed a peace agreement with FLEC in 2006 a Human Rights Watch publication from February 2009 reports that the agreement "has not been fully effective, with sporadic attacks from remaining FLEC forces continuing in the north of Cabinda." Human Rights Watch, "Democracy or Monopoly?" *February 23, 2009, 6.* In fact, the peace agreement was signed only by FLEC-*Renovada*, while another faction, FLEC-*Forças Armadas de Cabinda* (Armed Forces of Cabinda) continues in separatist struggle. Frank G. Wisner and Vincent A. Mai, *Toward an Angola Strategy: Prioritizing U.S. – Angola Relations* (Council on Foreign Relations Press, 2007), 26.

[400] Marcum, "UNITA," 8; Marcum, "United States Options in Angola," 39-40.

racial and ethnic lines, with large constituencies in Luanda and the other cities and among the Mbundu peoples in the central strip of Angola.[401] In December 1977, MPLA became an officially Marxist-Leninist party, renamed MPLA-*Partido do Trabalho,* garnered support from the Soviet Union, Cuba and the rest of the Soviet Bloc, including East Germany.[402] As of December 1985, there were a reported 3,000 Eastern Bloc and Yugoslav advisors and technicians working with the government of Angola.[403]

By the end of the Cold War, MPLA had begun to shed the communist rhetoric and ideals of its famous teacher and founder, beginning to adopt neoliberal economic policies around 1985, while initially retaining a one-party "socialist" political system. Communist or socialist, Neto and his successor Eduardo dos Santos also proved to be pragmatic in their policy, promoting a discourse of egalitarianism that may never have amounted to more than rhetoric as Christine Messiant asserts that party membership was the only avenue for accessing resources and influence in the Republic of Angola. Market liberalisation facilitated the continuation of a quasi-dictatorship alongside the mutation of the political system wherein the political elite in Luanda had new opportunities to invest massively in the illegal market while being protected by a government that still officially controlled production and accumulation.[404] In the post-Cold War context, the MPLA government's efforts towards neoliberalization and "democratization" would prove beneficial in terms of garnering international support after the Cold War. Although, as I will show later, the government has been highly criticised for its lack of democratic accountability, transparency, freedom of the press and human rights. Nonetheless, gestures towards "good" governance and economic policy would render its economic and political activities relatively legitimate amongst other governments and international organizations while UNITA, dependent on guerrilla tactics and "blood diamonds," never had much legitimacy internationally and was increasingly marginalized and exhausted of its resources.

---

[401] Marcum, "A Quarter Century of War," 18. Newitt, "*Angola in Historical Context*," 36-37.
[402] Ibid., 20; Hodges, *Angola*, 41.
[403] Ibid., 57.
[404] Christine Messiant, "The Mutation of Hegemonic Domination," ed. Patrick Chabal and Nuno Vidal in *Angola: The Weight of History* (London, Hurst Publishers, 2007), 96-97.

Despite the opposition between war and economic development in peacebuilding theory, local and international actors undertook extensive economic development in Angola throughout the war for independence and civil wars.[405] Oil production in Angola began in 1955 onshore in the Kwanza basin south of Luanda. Offshore oil fields off the coast of Cabinda were discovered in 1960 and production began in 1968 with the petroleum sector expanding throughout the 1970s and accounting for over eighty percent of Angola's official export earnings since the early 1980s, it became clear that Angola was to be the bastion of natural resources the Portuguese had dreamed of, even though the crude oil beneath the ocean floor was far removed from the legendary silver mines the Portuguese fought hopelessly to conquer for so many years.[406] Oil has inevitably outshone all of Angola's other industries and natural resources – real or mythical. International and local competition to control these resources, including international efforts to promote neo-liberal economic policies and local efforts to secure the state and its control over these resources, enabled and motivated decades of civil war in Angola and continues to drive power struggles among national and international elites.[407]

In 1978, MPLA passed the Petroleum Law (law 13/78), making the Angolan state owner of all oil deposits in the country and giving Sonangol, the state oil company, the exclusive right to oil exploration and development.[408] Foreign governments and conglomerates have generously provided MPLA and Sonangol with assistance in opening up the oil fields for development and have shared generously in the profits. The Canadian

---

[405] Paul Collier, *The Bottom Billion: Why the Poorest Countries Are Failing and What Can Be Done About It* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 27.

[406] Hodges, *Angola*,143.

[407] While oil profits, like diamond profits, are difficult to trace, most observers contend that oil profits have funded the purchase of arms and companies with known ties to arms trading and little or no experience in oil exploration and development, including Prodev, Falcon Oil and Naptha, were reportedly given equity stakes in some of Angola's ultra-deepwater blocks which was presumed to be payment in kind for arms deals. (Ibid., 161)

[408] Law 13/78 also gave Sonangol the right to set up joint oil ventures with other companies. Under these arrangements, oil companies bid on various oil blocks that section-off the continental shelf, signing PSAs with Sonangol, and/or setting up joint ventures with Sonangol as a direct stakeholder and contributor as an equity partner. In most cases where PSAs have been signed, foreign companies finance the investment and operating costs, recouping these funds through 'cost oil'. When the investment has been returned they then share 'profit oil' with Sonangol. Where Sonangol is an equity partner in the PSA, or in a joint venture, it recoups a share of production relative to its shareholdings. Generally Sonangol has to raise its share of the capital. Although, under the PSAs, Sonangol's share of the initial investment may be covered by its partners and repaid after production begins. (Ibid., 147)

company, Ranger Oil, for example, gave Sonangol technical assistance in some smaller blocks where Sonangol is the formal operator.[409]

While there is generally little information released publicly about government oil revenue and concession agreements, a Washington-based consultancy, PFC Energy, estimated that between 2002 and 2019, the Angolan government would receive $94 billion in off-shore oil profits alone.[410] This projection is subject to huge variability depending on actual production and oil prices and the government's income from oil could easily be much higher. Oil-backed loans and other quiet trade arrangements are thought to constitute a significant amount of unreported income.[411] Human Rights Watch Reported in 2004 that over $4 billion in oil revenue disappeared from Angolan government financial records from 1997-2002, while the government spent about the same amount on addressing social issues and running social programs during that period.[412] Angola's abundance of oil has been a major factor in the power plays between local and international elites since the 1960s, funding the continuation of war for many years, and contributing to economic development that has had few "trickle down" effects and unknown future social and environmental repercussions.

A low-intensity war between MPLA and UNITA continued relatively uninterrupted from 1976 until the signing of the Bicesse Peace Accords in 1991.[413] For the MPLA Government of Angola, the Bicesse Accords were a catalyst for further market liberalization and the beginning of an official transition to "democracy." Following the signing of this agreement MPLA officials claimed that UNITA members were to be integrated into MPLA and Savimbi was to 'retire' from Angola. Meanwhile, UNITA officials claimed that these accords were just a first stage in negotiating a peace process. Although many observers initially expected the Bicesse Accords to bring a conclusive end to the war, the parties returned to hostilities after UNITA disputed 1992

---

[409] Ibid., 148.
[410] Ibid.
[411] Ibid., 142; 147. Oil-backed loans are used to ensure continued international financing despite Angola's low international credit rating. (Ibid)
[412] Jill Shankleman, *Oil, Profits, and Peace: Does Business Have a Role in Peacemaking?* (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace, 2006), 101.
[413] Sometimes the Bicesse Peace Accords are referred to as the Estoril Peace Accord, or simply Bicesse.

parliamentary election results in favour of MPLA. According to most national and international accounts, UNITA refused to accept that they lost a "free and fair" election.[414] However, accusations of electoral fraud were launched by many groups, beginning with the FNLA on October 2, 1992, then by a coalition of fourteen political parties, including UNITA, on October 5, 1992.[415] A prominent Catholic Church coalition and other local organizations publicly called for an investigation into the alleged fraud, but none took place.[416]

Two days before the elections the government made an official declaration stating that the parties had demobilised, but the swift resumption of fighting made it clear that UNITA in particular had not demobilised but "had rearmed and hidden its army in the bush away from international observers," enabling UNITA to take several large cities in the early fighting after the elections.[417] Although the rapid return to war may have been unanticipated by peacebuilding agencies in Angola, Comerford reports that many local people and local organizations expressed concern about what might come after the elections.[418] According to Catholic Church organization Conferência Episcopal de *Angola* e São Tomé (CEAST), displaced populations were reluctant to return to their homes before the elections "fearing that war would resume...based on accusations that both sides were hiding weapons" and believing that whoever lost the election would use them.[419] The churches issued public statements regarding their concerns about inadequate voter education (ultimately over half a million paper ballets were blank or spoiled, 10-12 per cent of the votes), about the lack of progress towards demobilization, and questioning the motivation for the movement of military equipment throughout the country "if

---

[414] See Hodges, *Angola*, 13. Also, see Roland Paris, "Peacebuilding and the Limits of Liberal Internationalism," *International Security* 22, no. 2 (1997), 70.
[415] Comerford, *The Peaceful Face of Angola*, 64, endnote 14. By October 12, UNITA generals had withdrawn from participating in the Angolan military, *Forças Armadas Angolanas* (FAA). (Ibid)
[416] Ibid., 38.
[417] Ibid., 35-36; Hodges, *Angola*, 14.
[418] Roland Paris, for example, claims that Savimbi's rejection of the first-round results came from his fear of defeat in a runoff election and thus concludes that "political liberalisation had a negative effect on Angola's peace process, and this effect was not clearly anticipated by the peacebuilding agencies." Roland Paris, "Peacebuilding and the Limits of Liberal Internationalism," 70.
[419] Comerford, *The Peaceful Face of Angola*, 36.

neither side was preparing to launch an attack."[420] Overall, Comerford writes, "[m]uch of the communication from the churches during these sixteen months after Bicesse reveals serious reservations about the extent of the political commitment to the democratic process."[421] Comerford writes of the ongoing use of aggressive and provocative propaganda by both sides in media campaigns prior to the elections, again citing public statements by CEAST: "[t]he provocative language that the two major parties continue to use in the media does not convince listeners they are seeking peace."[422] Both MPLA and UNITA were sustaining the war and when fighting resumed in 1992, the MPLA government purchased US $3.5 million in arms and ammunition, distributing weapons to the civilian population, including as many as one million AK-47s in Luanda alone.[423] Thus the agreement made possible and simultaneously concealed one among a series of mutations of MPLA's power, without necessarily contributing to a non-violent (or less-violent) political order.

Amongst international pressure for a peace agreement and the consolidation of MPLA power as a military and police state, UNITA's position was significantly compromised. Their 1992 advances were lost quickly and UNITA was effectively forced to sign the second of three peace agreements in the 1990s, the 1994 Lusaka Accords. The agreement outlined a power-sharing deal under a framework called the Government of Unity and National Reconciliation (GURN). While the declaration of peace at Lusaka was a means of reducing some of the most bloody forms of violence, it also served the reorganization and consolidation of MPLA power, concealing ongoing hostilities between both sides and the continuation of war by other means. Neither party made any significant steps to honour the agreement, each acting to fulfil the other's suspicions: UNITA was clear in its actions that it had no intention of demobilizing before gaining political power. Savimbi did not attend the signing of the Lusaka Protocol and refused to move to Luanda during the four years of the implementation of the Lusaka Protocol.[424] In turn, MPLA ensured

---

[420] Ibid., 34-37.
[421] Ibid., 34.
[422] CEAST, 1992, cited in Comerford, *The Peaceful Face of Angola,* 35.
[423] Porto et al, *From Soldiers to Citizens*, 45.
[424] Hodges, *Angola*, 19.

that UNITA members and deputies in the GURN had no influence on policy-making or within the media.[425]

MPLA's leverage remained high in the mid-1990s and the party effectively petitioned international bodies to place more sanctions on UNITA, leaving them with depleting supplies and increasing costs.[426] According to Christine Messiant, UNITA's violations of the Lusaka Accords were more visible then Angolan government's, and international agreed to restrict humanitarian aid to areas known to support MPLA and to support renewed efforts to defeat UNITA militarily though all-out war, thus ending the so-called "quasipeace" or "armed peace" of the 1994-1998 post-Lusaka period.[427] In December 1998, President Eduardo Dos Santos declared at an MPLA conference that a military solution was the only way to peace, expelling the UN troops and ending both the UN Observer Mission in Angola (MONUA) and the Lusaka peace process.[428]

By the end of the 1990s, with the recovery of oil prices in global markets and profits rising from off-shore production, MPLA's financial resources steadily increased. In 1999 alone, for example, MPLA received $900 million in signature payments for production-sharing agreements (PSA) on three new off-shore blocks.[429] Meanwhile, UNITA was struggling to survive in the face of UN sanctions and the loss of all their main airfields and the diamond-mining regions over the previous two years. In late 1998 UNITA officials had started to defect and between 1999 and 2000, thousands of UNITA soldiers surrendered or deserted.[430] MPLA troops were closing in on Savimbi hiding in Moxico early 2002, by which time many UNITA soldiers were literally starving.[431] On February

---

[425] Ibid.
[426] UN sanctions in 1997 placed a travel ban on UNITA officials, called for the closure of UNITA offices abroad and banned all aircraft from flying to or from UNITA territory. UN Resolution 1127: August 1997. Then, in June 1998, Security Council Resolution 1173 prohibited the purchase of Angolan diamonds without a government issued certificate of origin and ordered a freeze on UNITA's foreign bank accounts. According to Tony Hodges, these 1997 and 1998 sanctions were instigated by "international frustration with UNITA's foot-dragging" concerning the extension of state administration to about 60 localities, including Savimbi's headquarters in the Central Highlands. Hodges, *Angola*, 15.
[427] Messiant, "The Mutation of Hegemonic Domination," 101-104; Comerford, *The Peaceful Face of Angola,* 44.
[428] Hodges, *Angola*, 15.
[429] Ibid.
[430] Ibid., 16-17. Some ex-UNITA personelle formed another party, UNITA-*Renovada.* Ibid.
[431] Ibid.

22, 2002, MPLA forces killed Savimbi in an ambush, terminating UNITA's crumbling opposition. The party's charismatic leader was dead, and overall morale was broken. UNITA officials accepted defeat within days and began peace talks in Luena with MPLA representatives. The Luena Memorandum of Understanding was signed on April 4, 2002, outlining the completion of outstanding tasks from the Lusaka Protocol, though with certain modifications wherein the government was to oversee the peace process rather than the UN.[432]

The theories, institutions and practices of peacebuilding depend upon the differentiation between a present time of peace and a discrete time of war left behind. This is not to say that peacebuilding theorists depend on a peace/war dichotomy all of the time, in fact, most peacebuilding theory often proposes that peacebuilding is about a 'transition' to peace, a peacebuilding process that can begin even before the war ends. However, the signing of a peace accord continues to be regarded as a turning point, marking an evolution towards peace and initiation of comprehensive peacebuilding efforts. According to Ali and Matthews, peacebuilding constitutes "the last phase in the cycle of conflict, beginning when a ceasefire has brought an end to fighting and efforts are initiated to revive a country's economy, to rebuild its society and to restore its polity."[433] Moreover, there is a widespread assumption in the peacebuilding literature that we will recognize when peace is being built and that we can break this down to certain achievements that mark the progress of post-war reconstruction and the development of a new peaceful social order, often involving the increased integration of the postwar country into the liberal international order and global capitalist markets. The assumption that a ceasefire is the initiation of new national trajectory towards peace can serve to obfuscate ongoing violence. This is because violence and insecurity are expected to decrease with the end of armed conflict. "Unfortunately," Michael Commerford asserts, "this expectation is sometimes unfounded as peace agreements inadvertently usher in

---

[432] Ibid.

[433] Taisier M. Ali and Robert O. Matthews, *Durable Peace: Challenges for Peacebuilding in Africa* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), 6.

new forms of violence."[434] Notwithstanding the declaration of peace, very significant struggles continue in Angola.

At the end of Nigeria's civil war, Chinua Achebe wrote one of his classic works of fiction, a short story called *Civil Peace* about the conditions of post-war reconstruction in Nigeria and the startling similarities between the civil war and the "civil peace."[435] Such accounts are not rare. There are documented reports of the perpetuation of related, but initially less-visible forms of violence after formal peace processes in Haiti, Guatemala, South Africa and El Salvador.[436] Parkhurst and Pearce argue that the peace process in El Salvador was concluded with a widely held understanding that it was a "successful mediation"; however, poverty and human rights violations were "persistent as ever," many aggravated and intensified by the conflict.[437] Describing the "weakness" of formal peace processes, feminist political theorist Haleh Afshar contends that structural issues are left unresolved generating "frustrations in the form of increased criminality," and that peace agreements generally conceal ongoing violence at the "micro-level," including domestic and other forms of violence perpetrated by ex-combatants.[438]

Writing before the 2002 MOU, Comerford examines Angola's experience after the Bicesse Accords, which "suggests a similar reality to that identified in other countries, where conflict may have ended but violence and criminality threatened security and stability in new ways."[439] In the months following the Bicesse Accords, Angolan church organizations made public statements describing "levels of criminality and violence not seen previously in Angola."[440] The Angolan Evangelical church organization, AEA, explicitly highlighted a rise in crime following the Bicesse Accords, which they believed to be perpetuated by the severe limitations of the justice system, which made citizens feel they had no choice but to resolve conflicts on their own. Sometimes these conflicts were

---

[434] Michael Comerford, *The Peaceful Face of Angola: Biography of a Peace Process (1991-2002)* (Windheok, Namibia: John Meinert Printing, 2005), 163.
[435] Chinua Achebe, "Civil Peace," in ed. Chinua Achebe and C.L. Innes *African Short Stories* (London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1985).
[436] Comerford, *The Peaceful Face of Angola*, 163.
[437] Parkhurst and Pearce, 1998, cited in Comerford, *The Peaceful Face of Angola,* 163-165.
[438] Haleh Afshar 1998, cited in Comerford, *The Peaceful Face of Angola,* 165.
[439] Ibid., 165.
[440] Ibid.

resolved through violence and crime, and other times through non-violent conflict resolution practices.[441]

The current conditions in Angola reflect a situation of violent and traumatic displacement, widespread extreme poverty, negotiations of power between the state, traditional authorities and foreign governments and organizations, the exploitation of diamond miners, ongoing displacement and conflict between Angola and Congo, armed conflict in Cabinda and forced evictions and demolitions in Luanda. While peacebuilding efforts are attempting to address some of these concerns, the overall dynamics of international peacebuilding and the Angolan state reflect the continuation of relations of war and widespread structural and direct physical violence.

Over the course of the civil war approximately 1.5 million people were killed, 465 000 Angolans became refugees in neighbouring countries and a total of approximately 4.3 million people were internally displaced – constituting over thirty per cent of the national population.[442] In the immediate post-war period, Porto et al report that Angola faced a "humanitarian catastrophe of unseen proportions."[443] While certainly attributable to the civil war, the troubling conditions faced by the majority of Angolans were not simply caused by the recent wars – the independence insurgency itself was initiated in the context of troubling conditions of exploitation, dispossession and poverty and the exacerbated conditions of poverty at the end of the civil war are a continuation of these conditions. The humanitarian operation initiated in 2002 involved 130 UN and NGO projects totalling US $233 million. These initiatives involved ten different UN agencies, several hundred international and national NGOs and CBOs as well as eleven Angolan ministries and government departments, and all of the provincial governments.[444]

The number of IDPs registered with the UN for humanitarian assistance as of May 2002 was only 1.5 million, but this figure excludes those displaced before 1991 and those integrated into host communities. Much of this displacement resulted from the severe tactics of both UNITA and MPLA armed forces from 1998 to 2002, during which time

---

[441] Ibid.
[442] Comerford, *The Peaceful Face of Angola*, xviii.
[443] Porto et al, *From Soldiers to Citizens,* 33.
[444] Ibid.

the government pursued a vigilant "Peace through War" strategy and the Angolan Armed Forces (FAA) forcibly displaced civilians in rural areas in order to cut off UNITA's access to civilian sources of food. Overall, around three million people were displaced during this period, compared to an estimated 800,000 displaced in 1991 at the time of the Bicesse Peace Accords, and between 1.3 and 2 million displaced between 1992 and 1994 following the Lusaka Peace Process. In the first years after the signing of the MOU an unforeseen movement of people began across the country with many coming from previously inaccessible areas to settle in the cities.[445]

The urban settlement of people displaced by the war, know as *dislocados*, as well as the birth of their children in urban areas, has complemented the other processes of urbanization usually associated with 'modernization', constituting a dramatic population shift from 89 per cent in rural areas in 1960 and 86 percent in the last national census in 1970, to less than 50 percent of the population living in rural areas according to current estimates.[446] Most of the urban population lives in informal settlements around the cities where there are nearly no services or infrastructure, including electricity, piped water, sewage systems or garbage collection. The poorest then have to pay much higher prices for water from private vendors compared to those with piped water.[447] More, in 2006, Maier writes that "Angola returned to the familiar rhythm of a preventable slaughter, this time due to the worst outbreak of cholera in the country's history, " which, "spread like fire through the slums of Luanda."[448] In a 2000/2001 survey, 68 percent of the population was below the poverty line (living on less than US $1.68 per day) and 25 percent of households surveyed were below the extreme poverty line (living on less than US $0.75 per day).[449] According to a 2009 estimate, 54.3 percent of the population lives on less than US $1 per day.[450]

---

[445] Porto et al, *From Soldiers to Citizens,* 36.
[446] Hodges, *Angola*, 22
[447] Ibid., 29-30.
[448] Maier, *Angola*, ix.
[449] Hodges, *Angola*, 35.
[450] United Nations, "Country Level Data: Angola," *Millennium Development Goals Indicators*, 14 July 2009, http://unstats.un.org/unsd/mdg/Data.aspx (accessed December 1, 2009).

The housing situation in Angola has been worsened for some of the poorest of the poor due to recent actions in the name of postwar "development." Allegedly planning to help alleviate housing issues in Luanda, in 2008 President Dos Santos made an election promise to build one million new homes by 2012. After the election it turned out that people would need to build and pay for these houses themselves under government direction.[451] Furthermore, in order to fulfill this promise, the government has forcibly evicted thousands of Luanda residents without providing compensation or alternative accommodation. In 2009 alone, 3,000 homes were demolished in Luanda, affecting 15,000 people.[452] Many of those evicted are now living in temporary camps with no electricity, running water, garbage collection or sewage system.[453] IRIN Africa reports that many of these residents had title to the land and that according to Angolan land laws, "even owners of the land who are without title, they are believed to occupy it in good faith and have rights."[454] On March 8, 2010, *Operation Combat and Demolition of Shacks and Anarchic Constructions in the Municipality of Lubango* was initiated by the Government of Angola to make way for the reconstruction of the Moçâmedes Railway (CFM).[455] Riot police killed seven people while enforcing the first phase of evictions in Lubongo, including four children between 4 and 12 years old.[456] 3000 families have already lost their homes and protests against the demolitions have been banned.[457] Twelve people were arrested during an earlier succession of forced evictions in 2005

---

[451] Sylvia Croese, "Rebuilding By Demolishing - The Politics of National Reconstruction," *Pambazuka News*, March 25, 2010, http://www.africafiles.org/article.asp?ID=23231 (accessed March 30, 2010).
[452] Ibid.
[453] "Internal Evictions," *Angola Monitor* No. 3, 2009, http://www.actsa.org/Pictures/UpImages/Angola/Angola_Monitor_Autumn_09.pdf, 6 (accessed January 19, 2010).
[454] "Angola: Peace Raises Fear of Increased Land Conflict," *IRIN Africa*, December 19, 2005), http://www.irinnews.org/report.aspx?reportid=57618 (accessed January 19, 2010). According to the IRIN article, many people evicted had lived in these neighbourhoods for over thirty years and many had been told they could settle there. For most of the residents, losing their homes meant losing every material thing they had: "In the capital's musseques, or shanty towns, many people live in make-shift accommodation cobbled together out of tin sheets. Others, however, have invested their life savings in making small improvements, replacing the sheets with bricks or adding a simple roof. 'In the Cambamba case, the typical value of a house was $1,500 to $2,000 - this is a family's life savings, their insurance, the basis for their social and economic existence - all completely destroyed.'" (Ibid).
[455] Croese, "Rebuilding By Demolishing."
[456] Ibid.
[457] Ibid.

when the Director of the Angolan NGO SOS Habitat, Luis Araujo, and a group of local residents tried to resist the evictions. Although some residents possessed legal documents for the land, they were reportedly ignored by the police and developers who came into the neighbourhood "shooting and shouting" to make way for the demolitions.[458]

The legacy of extensive land mines used widely throughout the war has killed or severely disabled millions and continues to be a great source of post-war violence. A study by the Angolan government's demining commission reported that 106 people were killed by landmines in Angola between 2006 to 2008 and several hundred more were injured by landmines in this period.[459] In 2009, Angola's social welfare minister Joao Baptista Kussuma asked for international assistance in clearing the millions of landmines that remain scattered throughout the country, arguing that the other nations that participated in the conflict should help clear the landmines and asserted that 11 or 12 different armies mined the country.[460] In the immediate post-war period many villages were partially de-mined to provide safe land on which returnees could build homes; however, some of these villages are now running out of safe space as people continue to return from out of country or other parts of Angola to resettle. Belita Cahilo, the Chief of a rural Angolan village, told *Angola Monitor* that "people have been expanding into land which has not been de-mined and building homes where they know it is not safe. Yet, safety competes with an urgent need to resettle thousands of families returning to Angola."[461]

Resettlement poses a great challenge as returning refugees, ex-soldiers and war-affected communities negotiate the way they will live together in the post-civil war context. Efforts towards demilitarization began in April 2002 with the establishment of 27 quartering areas throughout the country (later expanded to 35). The Angolan government decided that the FAA would retain complete practical and financial

---

[458] "Angola: Peace Raises Fear of Increased Land Conflict."
[459] Henrique Almeida, "Angola Asks for Help in Clearing Landmines," *Reuters,* May 14 2009, http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSLE866661 (accessed May 20, 2010).
[460] Ibid.
[461] "Landmines restrict developing villages*," Angola Monitor* No. 3, 2009, http://www.actsa.org/Pictures/UpImages/Angola/Angola_Monitor_Autumn_09.pdf (accessed January 19, 2010), 6.

responsibility for the demilitarization outlined in the MOU for the completion of the Lusaka Peace Process. Portugal, Russia, the United States and the UN were all invited as observers, but were given no formal monitoring role.[462] While the FAA undertook DDR programs after the 2002 MOU, World Food Program and other international and local NGOs distributed food, seeds, tools and other non-food items to combatants' family members and were involved in family tracing and reunification.[463]

The post-2002 DDR processes built on the institutions of the two previous incomplete efforts after Bicesse and Lusaka, as well as facilitating the reintegration of an additional estimated 100 000 former soldiers.[464] By July 2002, 85 585 former FMU (UNITA Military Forces) combatants and 280 261 of their family members had gathered in the quartering areas.[465] According to Porto et al., DDR programs represent "evidence of the end of war" both internally and externally. As such, the Angolan government had good reasons to want the process to be, or at least appear to be, completed quickly. After four months, the Joint Military Commission responsible for overseeing the DDR process announced that demobilization and disarmament was complete and that approximately 5,000 ex-FMU had been integrated into the FAA. Despite government claims that the FMU was "extinct", the DDR process was not complete and the quartering areas were not closed. Several thousand combatants and their families would arrive at the quartering areas in the following months. By February 2003, only five of the quartering areas had been closed and in April 2003 there were eleven still open. Of the 98,252 ex-combatants registered at the provincial Ministry for Assistance and Social Reintegration (MINARS) offices, "45,065 had received the emergency reinsertion subsidy (*subsídio de contingência*), while 5, 775 has been employed in the formal and informal sectors, and

---

[462] Porto et al., *From Soldiers to Citizens,* 37. Strictly national leadership in this regard is very different than current Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR) programs elsewhere in Africa. However, a similar process was outlined in the Bicesse Accords, in which the Portugal-Russia-US "Troika" and the UN did not take part in DRR, but were given observer roles. In the Lusaka Process, however, UN Peacekeepers were responsible for troop registration and disarmament as well as the coordination of the assembly camps. Ibid., 44.
[463] Ibid. 40.
[464] Ibid., 40-41.
[465] Ibid., 37.

3,007 had received training through government efforts."[466] These numbers indicate widespread unemployment amongst ex-combatants. Moreover, funding and institutional capacity issues have limited the continuation of these socio-economic reintegration programs since 2004. However, in 2003 the Angolan government, the World Bank and the European Commission agreed to jointly fund the Angola Demobilization and Reintegration Program (ADRP), intended to assist approximately 100,000 ex-FMU and 33,000 FAA personnel.[467]

Perhaps more significantly than failing to complete the DDR process, leaving demobilized soldiers and their families to desperate poverty, the government also failed to acknowledge or address the special needs of child soldiers and disabled veterans.[468] In this way, demobilization and reintegration efforts involved concealing and reimagining the role of the state as discussed in Jenny Edkins' work in the first chapter. In taking on the demobilization processes itself the Angolan government sought to assert its authority. Overall, efforts towards "normalization" in the immediate post-war period were largely concerned with the extension of state administration throughout the country, especially in rural areas previously controlled by UNITA.[469] Despite allowing and perpetuating immense violence against its citizenry, MPLA promoted a nationalist narrative in which it is a source of security and peace, forced to resort to violence in order to protect the nation. The population is betrayed and traumatized and the state is peddling war stories of its own glory.[470] In the Vignettes in Section Two of this chapter I highlight Angolan

---

[466] Ibid., 40.
[467] Ibid.
[468] On the lack of support for Angola's disabled ex-combatants, see Marcus Power, "War Veterans, Disability, and Postcolonial Citizenship" In ed. Deborah Cowen and Emily Gilbert *War, Citizenship, Territory,* (New York: Routledge, 2008). On the exclusion of child soldiers from the demobalisation processes, see Human Rights Watch, *Forgotten Fighters: Child Soldiers in Angola* (New York: Human Rights Watch, 2003), http://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/reports/Angola0403.pdf (accessed February 5, 2010).
[469] Porto et al., *From Soldiers to Citizens*, 33-34.
[470] The state owned and operated newspaper, *Jornal de Angola*, provides a good example of such accounts of the government's actions: "In the exercise of its constitutional prerogatives, it fell to the Angolan government to take the difficult decision, to reduce and dismantle the war machinery of Jonas Savimbi. The government had no other choice: either it made war, or it passively watched the ruin of the nation...[It was] to guarantee freedom and democracy that the decision was taken to disarm the illegal forces threatening the country." Translation by Michael Comerford. Comerford, *The Peaceful Face of Angola,* 58-59.

approaches to reintegration that contrast the Government of Angola and UN approaches described here.

Since 2002, top regional and local administrative positions have been appointed and exclusively accountable to the President, the government has violently repressed almost any political opposition or protest (anyone opposing MPLA is labeled a "dissident"), and no non-state media has been able to gain access to funding and licenses. Christine Messiant argues that the conditions of MPLA's victory,

> effectively gave the regime licence to shape the post-war political transition as it chose … Concretely, this meant that the government was able to monopolise power, organise demobilisation in the way that suited it best, interpret the Lusaka Accord to fit its interest and in this way consolidate further its political hegemony.[471]

The government has made efforts to strictly censor civil society actors by creating and generously funding governmental NGOs and selectively distributing contracts, consultancies and essential services to large numbers of people. Christine Messiant writes that this practice "has extended clientelistic dependence to the bulk of the population, ensuring thereby support for the ruling party."[472] The regime depends on clientism and, as such, political and social rights only exist insofar as Angolans have the opportunity to be part of patrimonial networks. The recent move to "multi-party politics" has been lauded by the international media, international organizations and other states. Thus, despite a winning a vast majority of the votes in the 2009 elections – the first since 1992 – observers argue that MPLA maintains its hegemony through "its ability to exclude competitors from acquiring any real power" alongside an extensive and strongly established system of clientelistic networks and the widespread view that the health and social services needed for better conditions, or at least the prevention of worse conditions, is tied to support for the current regime.[473]

The order imposed during the war is retained because MPLA won, on the battlefields of the civil war, and in the battle for external legitimation. The outcomes of these power struggles remain deeply inscribed, but are masked by the expectation that liberal

---

[471] Messiant, "The Mutation of Hegemonic Domination," 106.
[472] Ibid., 111-114; 121.
[473] Ibid., 114-115.

economic policies and elections mark progress towards democracy, and ultimately, peace. These structures and apparatuses of power are not simply maintained as they were, but survive in new forms and on new terms. In their association with the legitimating orders of the state system, the language and practices of peacebuilding and democratisation serve to obfuscate the continuation of war by other means through the reorganization and maintenance of elite and state power.

However, like Bicesse and Lusaka before, the 2002 declaration of peace facilitated new opportunities for public domestic companies to partner with international firms offering capital and technological capabilities.[474] After the signing of the MOU, the President's clients gained more access to oil and diamond rents as business sinecures and government contracts for new development in large sectors of the economy were allocated to government supporters, making possible "the emergence of a wholly unaccountable but powerful oligarchy, which controls both the political levers and the main areas of the economy."[475]

In an attempt to regain control over the diamond mines in the Northern provinces – UNITA-controlled territory during the civil war – President Dos Santos's government has been deporting illegal Congolese immigrants from the region since 2004.[476] In 2009, the government launched operation "cleansing," targeting undocumented immigrants in places with large immigrant populations, such as public markets, and sending them back to their home countries entirely unprepared, some facing up to 1000 kilometers journey on foot. Others have reportedly been loaded into trucks in which several Congolese have died of suffocation.[477] According to the Special Representative of the UN Secretary General in DRC, security forces posted at the borders between the two countries have been accused of physical violence and rape.[478] Congolese radio stations have reported that Congolese working in border towns in Angola have faced violent attacks by security forces and civilian Angolans. In the words of a deported DRC citizen, they have been

---

[474] Ibid., 107.
[475] Ibid., 108-109.
[476] René Dassié, "Angola, DRC and Congo deport illegal immigrants" *Afrik.com* 30 September 2009, http://en.afrik.com/article16228.html (accessed December 3 2009).
[477] Ibid.
[478] Ibid.

"breaking into our homes, making off with our goods and beating us. Some people are seriously wounded; people have been killed by machete, with guns."[479] Although officials from Angola and DRC agreed to stop the wave of expulsions in an October 2009 meeting, 20,000 Angolans had already been deported in the Congo's operation "reciprocity" and are now gathered in border towns in Angola without accommodation or food at the start of the rainy season.[480]

Peacebuilding theorists studying Angola tend to emphasize that Angola is now in "peacetime," often conceived as being on the way to peace, but currently in a transitional phase of post-war reconstruction during which time peace is being built. The belief that peace is being built is reflected in what is known in some peacebuilding theory as a "peace dividend," which most observers claim "is very much present [in Angola], even if it has yet to manifest itself in improved standards of living."[481] For many commentators, those things standing in the way of peace are matters of security, development and good governance. More specifically, however, one of the main obstacles to peace in Angola is thought to be corrupt and inefficient government, including the Angolan government's disregard for the efforts of foreign aid agencies and their recommendations for transitional justice and governance. Economic development is emphasised in peacebuilding, but many observers express concerns that, "[d]espite extremely high economic growth rates, poverty rates in Angola remain high and key social indicator performances are low." All of this reflects standard international development policy analysis and peacebuilding approaches identified in Chapter One which increasingly emphasize partner country ownership and claim to utilize local capacities, Ferreira notes, "in the Angolan case the lack of aid dependency and the government's capacity to "say no" is not regarded as positive – even if in practice it might provide an opportunity for the donor community to fulfill its proclaimed goals."[482] The government has been resistant to outside pressure in post-conflict reconstruction processes, "choosing the

---

[479] "Internal Evictions."
[480] René Dassié, "Angola, DRC and Congo deport illegal immigrants" *Afrik.com* 30 September 2009, http://en.afrik.com/article16228.html (accessed 3 December 2009).
[481] Patrícia Magalhães Ferreira, *State-Society Relations in Angola*, (Initiative for Peacebuilding, 2009), 7.
[482] Ibid., 31.

assistance it values and rejecting other programmes or proposals according to its interests and priorities."[483] While there has been few avenues for international aid organizations to influence development and political processes in Angola, recent changes in Angola are improving relations between the Government of Angola and foreign aid organizations revealing "new entry points for development partners to contribute in a more effective way to development, political participation and democratisation in the country."[484] The Angolan government's selective acceptance of foreign aid is criticised by peacebuilding theorists and recent possibilities for foreign intervention are praised, revealing that there are actually specific conditions under which local decision-making is genuinely valued.

These are not accolades for the Angolan government or an argument for ending foreign aid to Angola, but an attempt to point out the superficiality of discourses of local consent and ownership through which policy-makers seek to overcome criticisms of foreign imposition, while continuing to push forward their own agenda for peace. Peacebuilding theorists tell us that we should be able to assess the progress of the country towards peace. This progress, or lack thereof, is identified in a particular series of achievements that are representative of a peacebuilding agenda that involves addressing violent and troubling conditions facing the population, but is notably defined by external sources and framed in a discourse of human rights and increasing political and economic liberalisation. These discourses of peace obscure the ways that violence and relations of war are contiguous with histories of colonialism, the creation of the state, and the subjugation of local knowledges. In Angola the extension of state power after the civil war has perpetuated social exclusion and inequality, often through the reorganization of colonial structures. State authorities have used physical violence to increase their power, demolishing homes, repressing resistance and forcibly expelling Congolese immigrants. While these warlike relations persist, they are often reorganized, functioning insidiously in discourses that conflate modernization and development with peace and perpetuate the binaric opposition of war and peace.

---

[483] Ibid., 32.
[484] Ibid., 31.

Section Two: Angolan Peacemaking Traditions

As much as the current conditions in Angola need not be described simply as a state of peace, a state of war did not entirely define the forty years of war that ended in 2002. The following three accounts reveal that Angolans have many practices of "peacebuilding" that were pursued even during the war, which indicate possibilities for different understandings of peace. These accounts press on two problematic narratives that deserve brief articulation. First, many accounts of Angola describe the country only terms of its need for pacification and development. This is typical of social theory on African politics, economics and social life, which is overwhelmingly represented as self-destructive, "pathological," "proceeding from anything but rational calculation," and overwhelmingly, "as the sign of a lack."[485] Political science and development economics, Mbembe writes, "has become that of a quest for the causes of that lack."[486] Presenting an argument that war is inescapable in light of a case study in Angola, I recognize the risk that my own work might perpetuate this dynamic. Thus, I want to emphasize that I am proposing that war is "all-pervasive" in Angola and use these accounts to point towards the rich complexities of Angolan society.[487] Second, these accounts trouble the idea that the liberal approach represents a consensus on how to make peace. Angolan peace making practices address conflict and post conflict reintegration in different ways then, for example, the UN-style approaches which drop soldiers off at their place of origin as a final step in the DDR process.[488] The first vignette shows that in some views, this moment is just the beginning of reintegration. While theorists such as Lederach, whose approach to reconciliation and healing through truth telling was described in Chapter One, the Angolan practices of healing in the first vignette reveal an approach that contrasts Western psychology on healing.

Although I do not draw conclusions on the effectiveness of international peacebuilding practices in relation to these local approaches or make any claims regarding the reform of peacebuilding practice, I provide some reflections on the vignettes below, pointing out

---

[485] Mbembe, *On the Postcolony*, 8
[486] Ibid.
[487] Ibid.
[488] Porto et al., *From Soldiers to Citizens*, 38.

that there are approaches to making peace that are deeply embedded in Angolan culture and traditional institutions which are entirely different then those used by the state or by outsiders in Angola.

Vignette One

Various rituals are involved in the healing and reintegration of former soldiers in Angola, often involving the *Kimbanda,* the primary practitioner of traditional healing methods. Michael Comerford writes that,

> [t]raditional communities expected that all soldiers returning from war would receive treatment from the *Kimbanda* … Usually this involves meeting first with the *soba* (chief or other traditional authority) and then withdrawing from the village for a period of time together with the *Kimbanda* to talk through one's war experiences and explain what happened in order to "*tirar a Guerra"* ('remove the war') – a Portuguese phrase used extensively in naming the therapeutic process engaged in.[489]

After a one month preparation period, according to one tradition, the former soldier washes in a local river to 'remove the war'. After washing in the river the soldier symbolically puts on new clothes and is no longer allowed to "look back" or talk about what happened during the war.[490] Before the returnee can even enter the village a basin of water must be broken at his feet and he must walk over the pieces of the broken basin. All the members of the village must put out their fires and then prepare and light new fires. Afterwards, food is prepared on the new fires and everyone in the village eats with the person who has returned.[491] Here we find an expectation that returning soldiers will be received by their community and that through ritual healing will be able "to move beyond their experiences of war and distance themselves from the past."[492]

These rituals have a very different meaning than the processes of demobilisation organized by the government and the UN, which involve giving up one's weapons,

---

[489] Comerford, *The Peaceful Face of Angola*, 192
[490] Ibid., 192.
[491] Ibid., 192-193.
[492] Ibid.

receiving civilian clothes, blankets, some money and tools, the granting of a document to certify that demobilisation had taken place, and a ride to one's community of origin. Here, arrival home marked the end of the process. Traditional knowledge, by contrast, understands the demobilisation process to commence at this point."[493] Upon arrival, soldiers receive the *conselho* (advice) of the Kimbanda and – in contrast to the analytic methodology of Western psychotherapeutic models – must leave behind of the memory of war.[494]

The account described in this vignette reflects one ritual approach to dealing with the trauma of sudden displacement and the return of soldiers who may have killed in other communities. Andrade et al. of Canadian-Angolan NGO, Development Workshop describes how these traumas are compounded when those fleeing are unable to take the time to bury and mourn the dead:

> [t]he people who left their places of origin under fire were completely disoriented – they had faced death in the most immediate sense possible… A factor that weighed heavily psychologically and caused grief was 'leaving the dead without even burying them'. Older people showed the greatest anguish about this, since they have a particular respect for ancestors and for death rituals.[495]

Proper burial is important in some Angolan customs in order to release the spirits of those killed in war "into the world of the ancestors" in order to "prevent the 'migration of the soul' with its potential to exact revenge and harm."[496] Burial rights prevent the haunting of the dead and are thus a necessary condition for peace for some Angolans. It is possible to have a collective ritual to gather the bones lying in towns and bushes for collective burial, but attempts by traditional authorities and healers to do this in 1998 in the Kuito area prior to the resumption of war in 1998 were not given government approval.[497]

---

[493] Ibid., 199.
[494] Ibid., 193.
[495] Ibid., 195.
[496] Ibid.
[497] Ibid., 200.

Vignette Two

In addition to violence in everyday public contexts where women face the threat of intimidation, theft and assault, there were a reported 1,772 cases of domestic violence in Cazenga, Luanda's most populous *bairro* neighbourhood*,* during the first six months of 2002 alone.[498] In an interesting case in Benguela in 1997, a Catholic women's organization, *Promaica,* "took it upon itself to challenge military and police personnel in Benguela regarding their threatening behaviour and the stealing of goods and money, primarily from local women as they returned home from their fields or traded in the town market."[499] Government attempts at an 'anti—banditry' campaign had been abandoned earlier that year as the government security forces contributed significantly to general criminal activity and the authorities who organized the campaign admitted that they did not have control over their own security personnel.[500] *Promaica* members gained permission from the appropriate commanding officers and groups of six to eight women went to visit the local army barracks and police stations, while smaller groups visited checkpoints and private security personnel. Comerford describes what happened:

> In their meetings the women got to know the personnel in question by engaging them in conversation about where they had come from originally, whether they received news from their families, whether their families knew where they were and what their families did for a living. They also enquired as to how the war has affected their families, whether their families had been displaced, whether they had access to food and land, and so on. Building on this information, they asked how these men would feel if somebody were to steal food and money from their mothers and fathers, and assault them if they did not cooperate. The police and military accepted that such things should not happen, which enabled the women to ask why similar things were being done to the men and women of Benguela who, in the cultural context, were also their 'mothers' and 'fathers'."[501]

These actions precipitated apologies from some of the military and police who said "they had not understood what they were doing," and others, "wrote letters conveying regret about what had happened and thanking the women for their visit and their 'message'."[502] If the words of these officers are a reflection of what they actually do, then presumably,

---

[498] Journal de Angola, cited in Comerford, *The Peaceful Face of Angola*, 203.
[499] Ibid., 181.
[500] Ibid., 181.
[501] Ibid., 183.
[502] Ibid.

the outcome of reminding the military and police of a pre-existing relationship – specifically based on a cultural understanding that these women were their mothers – contributed to reducing the daily threat of violence faced by local women and men.

Vignette Three

In Angolan society, the reconciliation of major conflicts traditionally requires rituals of food and drink. The parties 'sign' peace through participation in a meal, the 'peace-signing ceremony'. Sharing gifts and establishing new relationships are important parts of these processes, as peaceful relationships are established through intermarriage among different communities and at times through gifts of cash or livestock to the offended party in a conflict.[503] Gift-giving is part of the traditional Angolan welcome, which is also connected to the maintenance of peaceful relations as gifts have important symbolic meanings. Michael Comerford emphasises the careful thought that goes into what gifts are given. Margaret Anstee, UN Secretary General's Special Representative to Angola from 1992-1993, has recounted her experience arriving in local communities in Angola where she was greeted with gifts of food and, on one occasion, a locally constructed instrument. According to Comerford, the gifts given to Anstee contained a message about the peace process. However, Anstee was hesitant to ask about the gift, and says that she never really understood the meaning of the instrument or how to use it.

While these Angolan traditions involve making peace through a meal and the exchange of gifts, by comparison, the public ritual of western peace agreements is most often a televised exchange of signed and legally binding written documents. No traditional Angolan peace-making rituals were incorporated into the peace processes in Angola: "[a]fter the signing of the Bicesse, both sides apparently went back to their respective hotels."[504] Jones Savimbi, leader of UNITA, did not even attend of the signing of the Lusaka Protocol and imprisoned the representative he had sent to sign for UNITA – UNITA secretary general Eugénio Manuvakola – upon Manuvakola's return to

---

[503] Michael Comerford, *The Peaceful Face of Angola*, 221.

[504] Ibid., 222.

Angola.[505] Comerford proposes that if there had been a peace meal or oaths taken at the burial sites of their respective ancestors according to tradition, particularly for UNITA with its strong roots in the central highlands, this could have bolstered public confidence in the arrangements and given the agreements a recognition that made them binding at a cultural level, presumably making it more difficult for Savimbi to remobilize his troops.[506]

There were, and are, local practices for establishing peace in Angola. Yet, western norms entrenched in international conventions set the limits of possibility for the structure and ceremony of the various peace accords signed during the Angolan civil war. What I want to highlight in the third vignette is that a peace agreement in Angola could have looked otherwise.[507] In subtle and sometimes violent ways, liberal norms of

---

[505] Hodges, *Angola*, 19.
[506] Comerford, *The Peaceful Face of Angola*, 224.
[507] The significance of the gift exchange as a potential alternative to liberal approaches to peacemaking is also present within Western traditions, such as in the work of Marcel Mauss, *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies* trans. W.D. Halls (London: Routledge, 1990), 13. In *The Gift,* Mauss gives a comparative ethnological account of the exchange-gift in various societies, suggesting a way of thinking about the relationship between people and the things they give, exchange or keep in terms of establishing peaceful relations. To give, in Mauss's sense, does not imply that one passes something to another in a simple way. One's identity is formed in the process of exchange, as a part of oneself is literally given away along with the gift. In giving gifts one gains prestige and authority, a sense of self, one's place and one's name. But, in engaging in reciprocal gift-giving (the counter exchange-gift) one fulfills what Mauss compares to a literal contractual obligation entered into by both parties when the recipient accepts the first gift. Gift-giving in this sense involves an exchange through the obligation to reciprocate; a promise is made to return the gift with another. At stake here is the formation of society insofar as it depends on the fundamental co-operation of different groups, which, in this Maussian view, is symbolized and realized through the gift-exchange. Mauss writes, "To refuse to give, to fail to invite, just as to refuse to accept, is tantamount to declaring war; it is to reject the bond of alliance and commonality."[507] Fulfilling the obligation to return the gift preserves one's name. The consequence of not committing to the exchange is a declaration of war.

The gift is an acknowledgment of one's subjective position in the world as inexplicably implicated in a network of relations and exchanges, a worldview that begins with collective life, with a "we" that feels "they are everything to one another." (Ibid., 33) In this regard, Mauss uses the example of the Trobriand Islanders, for whom persons and things literally merge in the exchange-gift. All things have a spirit (*hau*) – the spirit of the thing, of the dead, of the land or of the one who gave it away is given along with the gift: "by giving one is giving *oneself,* and if one gives *oneself,* it is because one owes *oneself* – one's person and one's goods – to others." (Ibid., 46, *emphasis in original*) What one has is never entirely one's own, as any gift received has part of the giver in it. Thus, Mauss begins to elaborate the relational understanding of property wrapped up in the gift, as exchanging gifts is the symbolic representation of a view of life in which the members and groups of society are "constantly enmeshed with one another." (Ibid., 33) The gift-exchange, as presented by Mauss, is a potential alternative to the capitalist free market system wrapped up in the liberal peace because it is a mode of establishing peace between conflicting groups through unalienated forms of exchange. That is, the gift-exchange is not commodified; the debt does not come from

peacebuilding define the limits of possibility for how to respond to violence and conflict and normalize certain approaches to making peace.

This section begins to complicate my own analysis, opening up questions which go beyond the scope necessary to explain the specific problematic of peacebuilding that concerns this thesis. Namely, the legacy of Foucault and others demands that we understand that the play of power, violence and force relations is inescapable. In short, war always exists from someone's perspective. Yet, if we are to talk about transforming relations of violence in qualitatively different ways – perhaps overcoming the forms of violence which are most troubling to those concerned – then we must acknowledge the limits of this analysis and view of war as a perpetual relation permeating and describing all politics and community. I do not address these questions in this thesis, and only gesture to them in reflecting on these Angolan accounts. If we are to think of peace in terms of how it is understood by the local people involved, then it is significant that we recognize the subjugated local practices and knowledges of peaceful co-existence, ideas which are often avoided, trivialized or dismissed in peacebuilding literature and practice because they do not perfectly reflect liberal ways of being. This is what we miss when we talk about making peace in terms of ending violence and relations of war in a normative and universal way. For this reason, I defend the importance of these accounts, but I reserve three qualifications as to their applicability to this thesis.

First, while the peace that emerges from these practices should surely be subjected to the same critique which I impress upon liberal peacebuidling practices, I do not attempt to assess the qualities of peace and/or war that may emerge from these Angolan practices. Even if I were able to do extensive field work and research on these approaches, I would question the ethical and empirical basis of whatever conclusions I could produce as an outsider regarding these various conditions or experiences that Angolans may define as peace. On the other hand, I argue that I am in a good position to study and identify continuities in practices of liberal imperialism and peacebuilding that materialize

---

barter or a price set in money. Rather, Mauss conceives of the gift as a permanent contractual morality, in which the law of things is linked to (the law of) persons. (Ibid., 20)

relentlessly in the country, institutions, agencies and discourses in which I find myself deeply embedded.

Second, I do not want to use these vignettes to demonstrate how "different" Africans are, thus explaining why liberal approaches are not able to create "true" peace. That is, I do not make an argument for the inclusion of more "difference" in peacebuilding practice for ethical and political reasons, including in particular, the dynamic Mantena identifies in studies of liberal imperialism wherein universalist explanations for empire are challenged and replaced culturalist "alibis." Since imperial rationalities easily accommodate arguments for "cultural pluralism and cosmopolitan toleration," I focus my analysis on the political entailments of different peacebuilding practices.[508]

Third, I am not arguing that foreign peacebuilding projects should promote these projects instead of current practices of peacebuilding. While African, Angolan or even more precisely local approaches *may* be more appropriate than international approaches, that is not the point of these examples in this thesis. Here, I only seek to show that Angolans are already engaged in such practices and that the hegemony of the liberal vision of peace has never been complete. Thus, I remind the reader that such alternative practices exist without thoroughly assessing or analyzing the value of the Angolan peacemaking practices on my own terms.

---

[508] Mantena, *Alibis of Empire*,184.

Conclusion

The historico-political mode of analysis I appeal to in the greater part of this thesis begins with a theoretical presumption that a permanent war runs through all social relations and political community. Approaching history as a field of power relations, I unravel a story drawn from Foucault's *Society Must be Defended*, which Chris Philo aptly reads as an account of the bloodly, deceitful and spiteful origins of the domination of Reason over Unreason. Foucault's bellicose history reveals the continuity between what is supposedly rational ("cool, calm, truth-based") and what is supposedly irrational ("low cunning, wickedness and spiteful passions").[509] This account implies that,

> the rational calculus of modern institutions, including the machinations of disciplinary power, should not be regarded as the expression of enlightened 'truth' – as the working of some anonymous 'law' moored in a rightfully constituted ruling force – but rather as an outgrowth of murk and blood.[510]

Histories and societies are constituted by victories and defeats. Where people are positioned in relation to these struggles becomes the "web of bodies" on which the victor builds new orders. [511] The orders of modernity, its technical procedures, calculations and strategies are built upon violent struggles that are normalized and concealed by the organization of social relations in the state, institutions, cities and global markets. Responsibility for the violent means of assimilation, exclusion and exploitation on which these orders depend is deferred and denied. The need for foreign intervention is attributed to the insufficiencies of postconflict countries, the "post-conflict other" in need of peace, economic development, protection, human rights, and good government, legitimizing violence perpetrated in the name of security while rendering all other war irrational. Laying out a historical discourse of war and recovering "subjugated" knowledges,

---

[509] Chris Philo. "'Bellicose History' and 'Local Discursivities': An archaeological Reading of Michel Foucault's S*ociety Must be Defended,"* in *Space, Knowledge and Power: Foucault and Geography,* ed. Jeremy Crampton and Stuart Eldon (Hampshire, England: Ashgate Publishing, 2007), 345, note 7.
[510] Ibid., 345.
[511] Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended*, 54-55.

Foucault provides an alternative account of the formation of the nation, a critique of modernity, and a challenge to the supposed unity of peace. This critique provides a fitting mode of theoretical analysis for tracing the historical context and political implications of peacebuilding.

Within dominant discourses of international peacebuilding, the "civil peace" is conflated with particular ideas of progress and order, and opposed to war defined as chaos outside the control of a "legitimate" state. Yet, similar features of domination, violence and displacement common to war are used to maintain the civil peace. The state's assertion of sovereignty in struggles against subversive threats (not only from outside the state but also inside the civil peace) is normalized in practices of international peacebuilding based on an abstract universal ideal of peace in a community of states. Critics of statebuilding and top-level peacebuilding agendas seek locally applicable or "locally owned" approaches in order to build a peace that addresses not only the means of war but also relations of war. However, they seek to transform conflictual relationships through recourse to liberal discourses of human rights and development that compliment and reinforce the liberal peacebuilding project. The construction of liberal social, political, legal and economic orders, and their imposition through foreign interventions, precipitates a great deal of violence. Practices of international peacebuilding perpetuate western domination and normalize the subordination of individuals to state authority but, masked in a powerful discourse of peace, they are depoliticized and conceal the trauma of war as well as the continuation of war by other means.

Once again, the definitions of 'peace' as well as 'war' are fundamental here, if one is to demarcate any condition or action as 'war' or 'peace.' The concept of peace taken up in international peacebuilding privileges political and economic liberalization and modernization as the necessary conditions for the creation of peace. Hidden in the concept of peace in practices of international peacebuilding are certain normative expectations about what is supposed to transpire when a country transitions from war to peace. My argument is that this mentality conceals ongoing violence that occurs after the "peace", that peacebuilding can become another ideological justification for foreign intervention, and that this sort of neo-colonialism takes various and changing forms, and

comes down to the imposition of a certain vision of progress and civilization on the war torn society. These violent relations constitute a particular form of war – an organized social project that involves the imposition of one will over another to achieve political goals – operating at every level of society, state and international system. In making this claim I appeal to a definition of war that goes beyond armed conflict on a battle field, to include economic wars and other wars of assimilation and exploitation. My view of war considers a larger historical context than most peacebuilding literature, as well as legitimations of violence and the productive power of the way the non-west is viewed. My aim is to illustrate how peacebuilding emerges from specific rationalities of power based on subordination to certain kinds of authority in a liberal state, to capitalist markets and to exploitation and dispossession.

This discussion of war and peace is not just about conflict and foreign intervention in Angola. It is about how these terms are defined and taken up in practices that emerge from institutions, published works and organizations in my own cultural context in Canada. Although nationalist discourses in Canada set up the nation-state as a source of peace and security, one finds in the Canadian media and in certain circles, among anti-poverty activists, feminists, anarchists, artists, academics and many others, the frequent use of the term war. Many use it to describe the wars Leonard Cohen sang about, between the men and the women, the rich and the poor, as well as between the government and the people. Such oppositions may be misleading and limiting, but they point to serious struggles. Here war is used as a way of analyzing power relations, but it is not only a metaphor. It describes struggles against exploitation, assimilation and subordination to particular kinds of authority with political consequences that cannot be separated from those of "real war."

Bibliography

Abiew, Kofi, and Tom Keating. "Defining a Role for Civil Society: Humanitarian NGOs and Peacebuilding Operations." In *Building Sustainable Peace*. Edited by Tom Keating and W. Andy Knight. Edmonton, Alberta: The University of Alberta Press and United Nations Press, 2004.

Achebe, Chinua. "Civil Peace." In *African Short Stories.* Edited by Chinua Achebe and C.L. Innes. London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1985.

Adorno, Theodor. *Minima Moralia: Reflections on a Damaged Life.* Translated by E.F.N. Jephcott. London: Verso, 2006.

Ali, Taisier M. and Robert O. Matthews. *Durable Peace: Challenges for Peacebuilding in Africa*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004.

Almeida, Henrique. "Angola Asks for Help in Clearing Landmines." *Reuters,* May 14 2009, http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSLE866661 (accessed May 20, 2010).

"Angola: Peace Raises Fear of Increased Land Conflict," IRIN Africa, December 19, 2005), http://www.irinnews.org/report.aspx?reportid=57618 (accessed January 19, 2010).

Birmingham, David. *The Portuguese Conquest of Angola.* London, Oxford University Press, 1965.

-------. *Portugal and Africa.* London: MacMillan Press, 1999.

Boutros-Ghali, Boutros. *An Agenda for Peace: Preventative Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peace-keeping.* June 17, 1992. A/47/277-S/24111. http://www.un.org/Docs/SG/agpeace.html (accessed December 1, 2009).

Call, Charles T., and Vanessa Wyeth, ed. *Building States to Build Peace*. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2008.

Call, Charles T. "Building States to Build Peace?" In *Building States to Build Peace*, edited by Charles T. Call and Vanessa Wyeth. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2008.

Chabal, Patrick. "*E Pluribus Unum*: Transitions in Angola." In *Angola: The Weight of History* ed. Patrick Chabal and Nuno Vidal. London: Hurst Publishers, 2007.

Chakrabarty, Dipesh. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008/2000.

Chatterjee, Partha. *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse.* Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 2004.

-------. *The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007.

Clausewitz, Carl von. *On War.* Translated and edited by Michael Howard and Peter Paret. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1976.

Cockburn, Cynthia. "The Continuum of Violence: A Gender Perspective on War and Peace." In *Sites of Violence: Gender and Conflict Zones.* Edited by Wenona Giles and Jennifer Hyndman. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.

Collier Paul and others, *Breaking the Conflict Trap: Civil War and Development Policy.* Washington, D.C.: World Bank and Oxford University Press, 2003.

-------. *The Bottom Billion: Why the Poorest Countries Are Failing and What Can Be Done About It.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Comerford, Michael. *The Peaceful Face of Angola: Biography of a Peace Process (1991-2002)*. Windheok, Namibia: John Meinert Printing, 2005.

Connolly, William E. *The Terms of Political Discourse,* 2nd Edition. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.

Cramer, Christopher. "Trajectories of Accumulation through War and Peace." In *The Dilemmas of Statebuilding: Confronting the Contradictions of Postwar Peace Operations,* edited by Roland Paris and Timothy D. Sisk. New York: Routledge, 2009.

Crampton Jeremy W., and Stuart Eldon, ed. *Space, Knowledge and Power: Foucault and Geography*. Hampshire, England: Ashgate Publishing, 2007.

Croese, Sylvia. "Rebuilding By Demolishing - The Politics of National Reconstruction." *Pambazuka News*, March 25, 2010, http://www.africafiles.org/article.asp?ID=23231 (accessed March 30, 2010).

Dahl, Robert A. *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971.

Dassié, René. "Angola, DRC and Congo deport illegal immigrants." *Afrik.com* 30 September 2009, http://en.afrik.com/article16228.html (accessed 3 December 2009).

del Castillo, Graciana. *Rebuilding War-Torn States: The Challenge of Post-Conflict Economic Reconstruction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Derrida, Jacques. "*Force of Law: The 'Mystical Foundations of Authority'."* In *Deconstruction and the Possibility of Justice,* edited by Drucilla Cornell. New York: Routledge, 1992.

Dillon, Michael, and Andrew W. Neal. "Introduction." In *Foucault on Politics, Security and War,* edited by Michael Dillon and Andrew W. Neal. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008.

Doyle, Michael W. and Nicholas Sambanis. *Making War and Building Peace: United Nations Peace Operations.* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2006.

Duffield, Mark. *Global Governance and the New Wars.* New York: Zed Books, 2001.

Durrheim, Kevin. "Peace Talk and Violence: An Analysis of the Power of 'Peace'." In *Culture, Power and Difference: Discourse Analysis in South Africa,* edited by A. Levett, A. Kottler, E. Burman, and I. Parker. Cape Town: Cape Town University Press, 1997.

Edkins, Jenny. *Trauma and the Memory of Politics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Elden, Stuart. "Foucault Collaborateur: Health, Habitat and Security." In *Foucault on Politics, Security and War,* edited by Michael Dillon and Andrew W. Neal. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008.

Engler, Yves. *The Black Book of Canadian Foreign Policy.* Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing, 2009.

Escobar, Arturo. "Discourse and Power in Development: Michel Foucault and the Relevance of his Work to the Third World." *Alternatives*, 10:3 (1984/1985).

Fearon, James D., and David D. Laitin. "Ethnicity, Insurgency and Civil War." *American Political Science Review* 97, no. 1 (2003): 75-90.

Ferreira, Patrícia Magalhães. *State-Society Relations in Angola*. Initiative for Peacebuilding, 2009.

Foucault, Michel. "Technologies of the Self." In *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault,* edited by L.H Martin, H. Gutman, and P. H. Hutton. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1988.

-------. *Society Must Be Defended.* Edited by François Ewals, Alessandro Fontana and Mauro Bertani. Translated by David Macey. New York: Picador, 2003.

-------. *Dits et Écrits* IV. Paris: Gallimard, 1994.

Gallie, W.B. "Essentially Contested Concepts." *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, New Series 56, (1955 - 1956).

-------. *Philosophers of Peace and War: Kant, Clausewitz, Marx, Engels and Tolstoy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

Gandhi, Mahatma. *The Essential Writings.* Edited by Judith M. Brown. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Goodhand, Jonathan and Mark Sedra. "Who Owns the Peace? Aid, Reconstruction, and Peacebuilding in Afghanistan." *Disasters* 34, Supplement 1 (2010): 78-102.

Heathershaw, John. "Unpacking the Liberal Peace: The Dividing and Merging of Peacebuilding Discourses." *Millennium – Journal of International Relations* 36 (2008): 599-601.

Heidegger, Martin. *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays.* Translated by William Lovitt. New York: Harper & Row, 1977.

Henderson, Lawrence W. *Angola: Five Centuries of Conflict.* Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1979.

Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan* Revised Student Edition*.* Edited by Richard Tuck. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press*.*

Hodges, Tony. *Angola: Anatomy of an Oil State.* Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2004.

Hogan, Michael J. *The Marshall Plan: America, Britain, and the Reconstruction of Western Europe, 1947-1952*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/heb.00258.0001.001 (accessed March 29, 2010).

Honwana, Alicinda. "Healing and social reintegration in Mozambique and Angola." In *Roads to Reconciliation,* edited by Elin Skaar, Siri Gloppen and Astru Suhrke. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2005.

Horkheimer, Max, and Theodor W. Adorno. *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments.* Translated by Edmund Jephcott. Edited by Gunzelin Schmid Noerr. Palo Alto, California: Standford University Press, 2002.

Human Rights Watch. *Forgotten Fighters: Child Soldiers in Angola.* New York: Human Rights Watch, 2003. http://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/reports/Angola0403.pdf (accessed February 5, 2010).

Ikenberry, G. John. *Liberal Order and Imperial Ambition: Essays on American Power and World Politics.* Cambridge, Polity Press, 2006.

International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS). *The Responsibility to Protect.* http://responsibilitytoprotect.org/ICISS%20Report.pdf (accessed January 18, 2010).

"Internal Evictions." *Angola Monitor* No. 3, 2009, http://www.actsa.org/Pictures/UpImages/Angola/Angola_Monitor_Autumn_09.pdf, 6 (accessed January 19, 2010).

Irving Kaplan, ed. *Angola: A Country Study.* Washington, D.C.: Foreign Area Studies, The American University.

Jacoby, Tim, and Eric James. "Emerging Patterns in the Reconstruction of Conflict-affected Countries." *Disasters* 34, Supplement 1 (2010): 1-14.

Junne, Gerd, and Willemijn Verkoren. "Seeking the Best Way Forward." In *Postconflict Development: Meeting New Challenges*, edited by Gerd Junne and Willemijn Verkoren. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2005.

Kaldor, Mary. *Human Security: Reflections on Globalization and Intervention.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 2008.

Klinghoffer, Arthur Jay. *The Angolan War: A Study in Soviet Policy in the Third World.* Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1980.

Kapuściński, Ryszard. *Another Day of Life.* Translated by William R. Brand and Katarzyna Mroczkowska-Brand. New York: Vintage Books, 2001/1976.

Kent, John. "The United States and the Decolonization of Black Africa, 1945-63." In *The United States and Decolonization*, edited by David Ryan and Victor Pungong. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000. http://www.palgraveconnect.com/pc/polintstud2001/browse/inside/9780333977958.html (accessed March 31, 2010).

Kant, Immanuel, *Perpetual Peace, and Other Essays on Politics, History, and Morals*. Indianapolis, Indiana: Hackett Publishing Company, 1983.

"Landmines Restrict Developing Villages.*" Angola Monitor* No. 3, 2009, http://www.actsa.org/Pictures/UpImages/Angola/Angola_Monitor_Autumn_09.pdf (accessed January 19, 2010).

Latham, Robert. *The Liberal Moment: Modernity, Security, and the Making of Postwar International Order.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.

Layne, Christopher. "Kant or Cant: The Myth of the Democratic Peace." *International Security* 19, no. 2 (Autumn, 1994): 5-49.

Lederach, John Paul. *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies.* Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1997.

Loomba, Ania. *Colonialism-postcolonialism.* New York: Routledge, 1998. [electronic version] http://lib.myilibrary.com/browse/open.asp?id=32671&loc= (accessed April 6 2010).

MacGinty, Roger. *No War, No Peace: The Rejuvenation of Stalled Peace Processes and Peace Accords.* New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2006.

Maier, Karl. *Angola: Promises and Lies.* London: Serif, 2007.

Malan, Mark. "Africa: Building Institutions on the Run." In *Peace Operations: Trends, Progress, and Prospects*, edited by Donald Charles Daniel, Patricia Taft, and Sharon Wiharta. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2008.

Mantena, Karuna. *Alibis of Empire: Henry Maine and the Ends of Liberal Imperialism.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Marcum, John A. "UNITA: The Politics of Survival." In *Angola, Mozambique and the West,* edited by Helen Kutchen. New York: Praeger, with the Center for Strategic and International Studies.

-------., "United States Options in Angola." In *Angola, Mozambique and the West,* edited by Helen Kutchen. New York: Praeger, with the Center for Strategic and International Studies.

-------., "A Quarter Century of War." In *Angola, Mozambique and the West,* edited by Helen Kutchen. New York: Praeger, with the Center for Strategic and International Studies.

Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. *The Communist Manifesto.* London: Penguin Books, 1888/1985.

Mbembe, Achille. *On the Postcolony.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.

Messiant, Christine. "The Mutation of Hegemonic Domination." In *Angola: The Weight of History,* edited by Patrick Chabal and Nuno Vidal. London, Hurst Publishers, 2007.

Mill, John Stuart. *On Liberty and Other Essays.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Morokvasic-Müller, Mirjana. "From Pillars of Yugoslavism to Targets of Violence: Interethnic Marriages in the Former Yugoslavia and Thereafter." In *Sites of Violence: Gender and Conflict Zones,* edited by Wenona Giles and Jennifer Hyndman. Berkeley: University of California Press).

Newitt, Malyn. "Angola in Historical Context." In *Angola: The Weight of History,* edited by Patrick Chabal and Nuno Vidal. London, Hurst Publishers, 2007.

Oliver, B.J. *The Strategic Significance of Angola,* Pretoria: Institute for *Strategic* Studies, 1984.

Osman, Abdulahi A. "Poverty and Democratic Consolidation in Sub-Saharan Africa." In *Democratic Peace in Theory and Practice*, edited by Steven W. Hook. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 2010.

Owens, Patricia. *Between War and Politics: International Relations and the Thought of Hannah Arendt.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Panikhar, K. Madhu. *Angola in Flames.* Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1962.

Paris, Roland. "Peacebuilding and the Limits of Liberal Internationalism." *International Security* 22, no. 2 (1997).

--------, and Timothy D. Sisk. "Conclusion: Confronting the Contradictions." In *The Dilemmas of Statebuilding: Confronting the Contradictions of Postwar Peace Operations,* edited by Roland Paris and Timothy D. Sisk. New York: Routledge, 2009.

Pasquino, Pasquale. "Political Theory of War and Peace: Foucault and the History of Modern Political Theory." Translated by Paula Wissing. *Economy and Society* 22, no. 1 (1993).

Philo, Chris. "'Bellicose History' and 'Local Discursivities': An Archaeological Reading of Michel Foucault's S*ociety Must be Defended."* In *Space, Knowledge and Power: Foucault and Geography,* edited by Jeremy Crampton and Stuart Eldon. Hampshire, England: Ashgate Publishing, 2007.

Poko, Nana K. "Context and Security in Africa." In *Peace and Conflict in Africa,* edited by David J. Francis. London: Zed Books, 2008.

Porto, João Gomes, Chris Alden and Imogen Parsons. *From Soldiers to Citizens: Demilitarization of Conflict and Society.* Aldershot, England: Ashgate Publishing, 2007.

Power, Marcus. "War Veterans, Disability, and Postcolonial Citizenship." In *War, Citizenship, Territory,* edited by Deborah Cowen and Emily Gilbert. New York: Routledge, 2008.

Province of BC and First Nations Leadership Council. *The New Relationship Progress Report* 1, no. 1. April 2006. http://www.newrelationshiptrust.ca/downloads/august-06-progress-report.pdf/ (accessed December 11, 2009).

Robinson, William I. *Promoting Polyarchy: Globalization, US Intervention and Hegemony.* Cambridge: Combridge University Press, 1996.

Richards, Paul. "New War: An Ethnographic Approach." In *No War, No Peace: An Anthropology of Contemporary Armed Conflict,* edited by Paul Richards. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 2005.

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

Russett, Bruce, Christopher Layne, David E. Spiro, and Michael W. Doyle. "Correspondence: The Democratic Peace." *International Security* 19, no. 4 (Spring 1995): 164-184.

Said, Edward, *Orientalism.* New York: Vintage Books, 1994/1979.

Scott, David. *Refashioning Futures: Criticism After Postcoloniality.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999.

Shankleman, Jill. *Oil, Profits, and Peace: Does Business Have a Role in Peacemaking?* Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace, 2006.

Shapiro, Michael J. *Methods and Nations: Cultural Governance and the Indigenous Subject.* New York: Routledge, 2004.

Souffrant, Eddy. *Formal Transgression: John Stuart Mill's Philosophy of International Affairs.* Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2000.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty, *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Towards a History of the Vanishing Present.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Travers, Patrick, and Taylor Owen. "Between Metaphor and Strategy Canada's Integrated Approach to Peacebuilding in Afghanistan." *International Journal* 63, no. 3 (2008).

United Nations. "Country Level Data: Angola." *Millennium Development Goals Indicators.* 14 July 2009, http://unstats.un.org/unsd/mdg/Data.aspx (accessed December 1, 2009).

Voorhoeve, Joris. *From War to the Rule of Law: Peacebuilding after Violent Conflicts.* Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2007.

Weber, Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism.* Tanslated by Talcott Parsons. New York, Scribner, 2003.

Wheeler, Douglas L and René Pélissier, *Angola.* London: Pall Mall Press, 1971.

White, Melanie. "The Liberal Character of Ethological Governance." *Economy and Society 34*:3 (2005).

Wisner, Frank G. and Vincent A. Mai. *Toward an Angola Strategy: Prioritizing U.S. – Angola Relations.* Council on Foreign Relations Press, 2007.

Yuval-Davis, Nira. "Gender, the Nationalist Imagination, War, and Peace." In *Sites of Violence: Gender and Conflict Zones,* edited by Wenona Giles and Jennifer Hyndman. Berkeley: University of California Press).

Zafar, Ali. "The Growing Relationship Between China and Sub-Saharan Africa: Macroeconomic, Trade, Investment, and Aid Links." *The World Bank Research Observer* 22, no. 1 (2007).

Zucher, Michael and Christoph Barnett, "The Peacebuilder's Contract." In *The Dilemmas of Statebuilding: Confronting the Contradictions of Postwar Peace Operations,* edited by Roland Paris and Timothy D. Sisk. New York: Routledge, 2009.