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Abstract

The purpose of this thesis is to look into the differences between the theoretical frameworks of Realism and Feminism in general as well as their differences with regards to security and referent objects to security. With the differences noted applied upon the Humanitarian Intervention that took place in Kosovo 1999. That is how a shift in the referent objects could change outcome and success or failure in the case studied.

This is done by a theory testing study based upon literature within the topics of Realism and Feminism, by mainly Morgenthau (1993) with regards to Realism and Tickner (1992) with regards to Feminism. The reason for these authors in particular is due to their importance in the field and the fact that they are found liberally quoted in academic articles and other literature.

By shifting the referent object of security from e.g. territory (state), that Realism uses, to the individuals in general and the women in particular within the territory (state), like Feminism does, there is bound to be a change in outcome and success. The result of this thesis is that a different referent object offers a new perspective.
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“We can no longer afford to minimize or ignore the contributions of women and girls to all stages of conflict resolution, peacemaking, peace-building, and reconstruction processes. Sustainable peace will not be achieved without the full and equal participation of women and men.”

-Kofi Annan, Secretary-General United Nation

1 Introduction

Since the end of the Cold War we have seen a shift in the international environment. Unfortunately the theoretical frameworks that ought to help us in understanding this new environment have not changed significantly since then. During the Cold War, Realism could be said to be ‘king of all theories’, including the military based concept ‘balance of power’ applied to the relationship between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. Interventions on the notion of ‘humanitarian’ were rare.

In these times, the focus on threats, use, and control of military force was considered of utmost importance, hence all the studies assuming a critical role of the state. According to these studies, the state through the act of military force would and should be secured, a primary concern. In other words the state was the referent object of security, this with the notion that security was equal to military security.  

Can it be assumed that if the state is secure the people within it are also secure? Since the end of the Cold War we have in fact seen cases where the state have been secure but the people within the state have been oppressed by their state, fractions of the people have been ignored by their state, or the states have lacked the possibility to provide their people with security from harm. Therefore one might consider a reformulation or re-evaluation of what ought to be the referent object, i.e. the primary concern to secure.

The discussion of shift in referent object is one of the building stones in so called, Critical Security Studies, an approach to security that is based on a desire to move away from the strictures of security as it was studied and practiced during the Cold War and more so make that move by specific means forms of critique. It could in a way also be seen as an umbrella label for several critical approaches to the state-centric theories, and it is here one could find Feminism were a more gender driven approach is presented. An additional edge to the feministic and gender driven approach apart from the fact that it would entitle another referent object is that in many ways Realism is or at least could be regarded as not only state-centric but male-centric as well.

As we since the end of the Cold War have seen cases were a ‘secure’ state have not been able to provide security for its people, where the people within the nation have at least in part been subject to oppression and discrimination. That is a wider case ethnical and internal conflicts. Therefore this following period have given room for Humanitarian Interventions to – in such a way to intervene were the state is not able to provide for the needs of the people. Therefore what a Humanitarian Intervention could be explained as:

“…threat or use of force across borders by a state (or groups of states) aimed at preventing or ending widespread and grave violations of the fundamental human

---

2 Collins (ed.) (2007)
3 Ibid.
4 Ibid.
5 Tickner (1992)
rights of individuals other than its own citizens, without the permission of the state within whose territory force is applied”

By looking into the events and conflict in Kosovo 1999, where Humanitarian Interventions was carried out since the ‘secure’ state failed to provide security for its people, the motive becomes clearer whether the referent objects here are the states or their inhabitants.

1.1 Purpose

Through the theoretical frameworks of Feminism and Realism this thesis will examine the Humanitarian Intervention that took place in Kosovo 1999 and its outcome, by shifting referent object.

1.2 Problem Formulation

In this thesis, the Kosovo case has been selected as a suitable case to look at through a theoretical lens. By reading parts of Collins (2007) among others, it is clear to see that Realism has shaped the world of Security Studies and International Relations. This is done with a somewhat inward-looking approach where the state is the primary focus.

Today we see scholars of various approaches e.g. Feminisms, Critical Theory, and Constructivism which are sharing similar critiques of orthodox security studies. They provide us with an alternative intention to change the worldview from a focus on Security to another “fresher” approach. This thesis will criticise the traditional Realism by means of what I would like to call feministic studies and critiques.

The end of the Cold War could be seen as a starting point in the “new” way of thinking. This thesis questions humanitarian intervention in a post-Cold War era from two separate theoretical frameworks’, Realism and Feminism. By comparing two separate theoretical frameworks way of looking into humanitarian intervention would we be able to reach different conclusions to what a success is? In order to examine this question I have studied the humanitarian intervention in Kosovo 1999 as a case. The following questions serve as the framework in this thesis:

In what way does the theoretical framework of Realism differ from that of Feminism?

What is a Humanitarian Intervention and when is it needed?

By changing the referent object, from e.g. territory (state) to people within a territory (state), how could the success or outcome from a Humanitarian Intervention differ?

6 Holzgrefe & Keohane (2003) p. 18
1.3 Method and Material

This thesis will use **explanatory studies** and thus **theory testing studies** to test the differences between the theoretical frameworks of Realism and Feminism, on the examples of where humanitarian interventions took place. Note here however that this thesis in some sense also includes a degree of **conceptual investigation**, as Esiasson et al. (2005) concludes ‘all scientific studies do’. The difference here is that a mere **conceptual investigation** ‘ends’ before applying the reached idea onto an empirical arena, that is not to apply it onto ‘the real world’.8

The main literatures used to define the theories are Morgenthau (1993) with regards to Realism and Tickner (1992) with regards to Feminism. The reason for these theories and this literature is that I have come across them in previous coursework and have found them liberally quoted in political articles.

**Explanatory studies** attempt to answer why-questions. Although this thesis could be seen as applying different methods during different sections the utter challenged I am trying to solve is to find out whether a shift in the referent object would provide a different outcome and thus why. The difference between **descriptive** and **explanatory studies** lies in that the **explanatory studies** are said to be on a deeper level through the additional question of: why? That is the addition to the questions that are posed under the **descriptive studies** that are; “where”, “how many?”, “how much?”, “how often?” etc.

An explanatory examination does also have a descriptive element; however the theoretical framework will be included in a more vital way in the thesis than it would when conducting a descriptive analysis. This is due to the fact that in the former case, **explanatory studies**, the theoretical description is used more as a tool or framework for the explanation of what in due course will be tested.9 In this thesis the different approaches of Realism and Feminism as the providers of framework to be applied on the example that here is Kosovo in 1999.

**Theory testing studies** are explained as being conducted on the bases of one or more theories that in shape of concrete hypotheses are tested on empirical material. Conclusions from such testing are most likely to be found somewhere along the lines that the theory is strengthened or weakened, perhaps even the case that one theory could be found more ‘successful’ than another.10

The analysis in this thesis will be done through **qualitative text analysis**, that is, rather than reading everything there is to take the most essential parts. **Qualitative text analysis** is a very common tool in social science and some say that it is used by all researchers and scholars who base their research on the work of previous research. The material this thesis will be based upon is a selection of authors’ contributions that have a connection to and writes from the international relations. The thesis intend to provide a theoretical framework that holds and with regards to the theories used, Feminism and Realism I have chosen key figures within these topics.

---

7 Esiasson et al. (2005)
8 Ibid.
9 Andersen (1990)
10 Esiasson et al. (2005)
When defining and discussing Realism it is useful to exploit “Politics among nations” by Hans Morgenthau (1993), this since he at times have been mentioned as one of the founding fathers in modern Realism. From Collins (ed.) “Contemporary Security Studies” I get more of a background to Realism and a more general view. Also used are Donelly’s “Realism and International Relations”, among others, and in order to reach more of a critical voice in the analysis of Realism I have chosen to use Tickner (1992) and her “Gender in International Relations” since she provides a discussion between Realism and Feminism, but also accounts for aspects of Realism.

Tickner is mentioned in various writings on Feminism and International Relations and what makes her the key figure in both Feminism and the discussion between Feminism and Realism is that she puts the theories head to head in a way that prior to her was not done in such a graphic way. But with regards to Feminism there is more material the difficulty is just to establish whether they in fact provides enough framework to the discussion. However all remaining sources used does in one way or another provide frameworks, authors such as Skjelsbaek’s “Gender Peace and conflict” (2001) and Kouvo (2004) to name a few.

With regards to Humanitarian Intervention and the examples of when interventions were carried out in Kosovo 1999, the literature used is more based on sources such as the United Nations and NATO. However in the section that explains Humanitarian Intervention, is based in large upon the writings of Holzgrefe & Keohane (2003) and Garrett (1999) since they provide a good base of what humanitarian interventions entitle. With regards to the case that the theoretical frameworks are to be tested the idea was to provide an as unbiased introduction as possible and therefore the major sources are the U.N. and NATO, but authors such as Hawk (2002) and Talentino (2006) have written upon these conflicts and provide useful information as well.

The selection of material on which this thesis is based has all gone through my own thorough scans. Books and articles have been found, primarily in old course books and suggested readings from them. Others have been found by using the library resources of this school such as LIBRIS. By typing key words such as ‘Humanitarian Interventions’, ‘Feminism’, and ‘Conflicts’ to name a few I have found a variety of material to go through. I would also like to point out that there exists a lot of material on the topic per se, however the difficulty have been in to establish what is needed in this thesis to provide sufficient material to do so.

1.4 Selection and Delimitation

The delimitation that is of importance here is that the differences in the referent objects of the theoretical frameworks are mainly significant on the humanitarian intervention that occurred in Kosovo in 1999. Other humanitarian interventions will only be mentioned when describing interventions as such and to prove that there are similar conflicts that could be discussed instead. That is the analysis will be based only on the Kosovo conflict and not humanitarian interventions in general.

The reason why Kosovo was selected as the case to be explored here was the fact that the land was torn with internal conflict and fear of the conflict spreading and also a humanitarian concern that in fact called for foreign military action and intervention. Kosovo was at
the time suffering from ethnic/clan warfare and of political leaders manipulating conflict for personal gain. What differentiate the intervention in Kosovo from other previous interventions is the fact that the main intervening actor, at least initially was through the work of NATO, Northern Atlantic Treaty Organization, and not the UN. Another reason or aspect is that it is still highly debated and might set standard for interventions in the future.

1.5 Structure of the Thesis

The disposition of this thesis is based around the questions asked in a previous section, and in order to reach an analysis of these. Therefore after this introduction chapter a chapter on Humanitarian Intervention will follow, defining what it is and what difficulties are associated with it.

After that is done the idea is to present and define Realism and Feminism, with a chapter following these to put them head to head and compare them. In order to reach the analysis/discussion segment and finally a conclusion, chapter 7 have been intended to present an example of when a humanitarian intervention have been carried out.

Thus this chapter touches upon what happened in Kosovo 1999, the reasons for the intervention and its outcome. Subsequently chapters to follow that are an analysis and a discussion of my findings, and a brief conclusion.

---

11 Hawk (2002)
2 Humanitarian Interventions

Since the end of the Cold War, intervention targets have been weaker states with internal intercommunal power struggles, such as Somalia in 1990, the previous global ideological and military ‘balance of power’ that repeatedly underscored cold war intervention was less evident. Among intervening actors we can see the UN, regional organisations and even in groups of states genially concerned with humanitarian in general internal conflicts. 12

2.1 Definition and Problems

As a base for this thesis, it is crucial to establish what Humanitarian Intervention is and how we can test it through different “schools”. Here by “schools” I mean the theoretical frameworks of Realism and Feminism, but in order to reach that my intention is to establish a definition of Humanitarian Interventions. To start this section I find it useful to use the words of former UN’s Secretary-General Kofi Annan.

“The genocide in Rwanda showed us how terrible the consequences of inaction can be in the face of mass murder. But the conflict in Kosovo raised equally important questions about the consequences of action without international consensus and clear legal authority. On the one hand, is it legitimate for a regional organization to use force without a UN mandate? On the other, is it permissible to let gross and systematic violations of human rights, with grave humanitarian consequences, continue unchecked?” 13

The complex dilemma Humanitarian Interventions face on a “day to day” basis, a constant struggle for legitimacy, something that in further depth will be discussed later in this thesis.

One of the key problems while discussing Humanitarian Intervention is the fact that it seems fairly hard to interpret a military means to intervene in conflict as ever “humanitarian”. To further that line of thought, the complexity lies also in the matter of defining such a powerful act, mainly since it is in fact two folded built on the words “humanitarian” and “intervention”, both carrying emotional baggage and individual interpretations. 14 Thus you could perhaps see how emotionally biases this matter fairly easy can get, before even scratching the surface we might already have a conflict of interest.

By definition, taken from Holzgrefe et al 2003, Humanitarian Intervention is the:

“…threat or use of force across borders by a state (or groups of states) aimed at preventing or ending widespread and grave violations of the fundamental human rights

12 Newman (2001), p. 139

13 Holzgrefe & Keohane (2003), preface

14 Garret (1999), p. 15
of individuals other than its own citizens, without the permission of the state within whose territory force is applied.”

This definition is however deliberately excluding two types of behaviour that often is associated with the term; these are no forcible interventions such as the threat or use of economic, diplomatic, or sanctions among those lines. The second one is the forcible interventions aimed at protecting or rescuing the intervening state’s own nationals. The reason for these two to be excluding is according to Holzgrefe that the use of force to protect human rights of individuals other than a nation’s “own” is far more controversial and “complex”. Another way to interpret why these two should perhaps not be under the interpretation is reached through the words of Walzer.

“Diplomatic pressure and economic sanctions, for example, are useful means of engagement with tyrannical regimes. The sanctions might be imposed by some freewill coalition of interested states. Or perhaps we should work toward a more established regional or global authority that could regulate the imposition, carefully matching the severity of the sanctions to the severity of the oppression. But these are still external acts; they are efforts to prompt but not to preempt an internal response.”

Hence the reason to include them would be in the same sense as it would be discussing human interventions when it comes to e.g. natural disasters. Since even though humanitarian interventions are being performed it is not what is interesting in this particular thesis and thus not of importance in my analysis. Still claiming it is important and also in such “conflicts” would the outcome perhaps differ depending on which theoretical ground you start from.

When discussing humanitarian intervention and as stated in the title of this chapter there is not a simple way to put it as if humanitarian interventions are problem free. A question that is crucial thus is of course whether “to intervene or not?”, and as Walzer (2004) concludes that should always be hard to answer. This of course due to the fact that even in the case of e.g. a massacre of local minority or a brutal civil war the use of force on foreign turf should always generate anxiety and hesitation.

More and more common, according to Walzer (2004), is that there is an easy way in answering the question of whether to intervene or not and this easy way is to say not. Instead of acting with forces to “solve” the problems within the country but rather to perhaps help with resources to the people, by supplying food or medicine. This will be clearer when looking into and discussing what have been and is going on in Kosovo. Walzer (2004) puts the strength of intervening despite conflict in interest,

“…”humanitarian intervention” much abused, no doubt, but morally necessary whenever cruelty and suffering are extreme and no local forces seem capable of putting an end to them. Humanitarian interventions are not justified for the sake of democracy or free enterprise or economic justice or voluntary association or any other

15 Holzgrefe & Keohane. (2003), p. 18
16 http://them.polylog.org/5/awm-en.htm
17 Walzer (2004)
18 Ibid.
of the social practices and arrangements that we might hope for or even call for in other people’s countries. Their aim is profoundly negative in character: to put a stop to actions that, to use an old-fashioned but accurate phrase, “shock the conscience” of humankind.” 19

Yet it is important to say and stress that intervention should always be the last resource.

The best guidance of criteria from assessing why and when intervention using force is justified, might be said to be found in the 2001 report of ICISS, the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, named “The responsibility to protect”. That presents the argument that state sovereignty implies that the primary responsibility for the protection of people from serious violent harm lies with the state itself. This is along the lines of what has been discussed in previous parts. The inability of a state to protect its people the principle of non-intervention yields to the international responsibility to protect.

The responsibility to protect: principles for military intervention

(1) THE JUST CAUSE THRESHOLD

Military intervention for human protection purposes is an exceptional and extraordinary measure. To be warranted, there must be serious and irreparable harm occurring to human beings, or immediately likely to occur, of the following kind:

A. Large-scale loss of life, actual or apprehended, with genocidal intent or not, which is the product of either deliberate state action, or state neglect or inability to act, or a failed state situation; or

B. Large-scale ‘ethnic cleansing’, actual or apprehended, whether it is carried out by killing, forced expulsion, acts of terror or rape.

(2) THE PRECAUTIONARY PRINCIPLES

A. Right intention: the primary purpose of the intervention, whatever other motives intervening states may have, must be to halt or avert human suffering. Right intention is better assured with multiple operations, clearly supported by regional opinion and the victims concerned

B. Last resort: military intervention can only be justified when every non-military option for the prevention or peaceful resolution of the crisis has been explored, with reasonable grounds for believing lesser measures would not have succeeded.

C. Proportional means: the scale, duration and intensity of the planned military intervention should be the minimum necessary to secure the defined human protection objective.

19 Walzer (2004), p. 69
D. Reasonable prospects: there must be reasonable chance of success in halting or averting the suffering which has justified the intervention, with the consequences of action not likely to be worse than the consequences of inaction.


The report establishes criteria for military intervention and puts a lot of emphasis on the U.N. and other regional organisations as key actors. Nevertheless regardless of these promising guidelines offered in this report, external use of force for protecting human security of others remains a contested and questioned ethical issue.\(^{20}\)

In order to sum up this vast section, here is an attempt to answer the question stated in the introduction considering this particular area of what a humanitarian intervention is and when it is needed,

“...threat or use of force across borders by a state (or groups of states) aimed at preventing or ending widespread and grave violations of the fundamental human rights of individuals other than its own citizens, without the permission of the state within whose territory force is applied”\(^{21}\).

Note that although this quote have been used before it serves here merely as a summary of what the humanitarian intervention entitles.

### 2.2 International Law and Legality

By entering another nation’s territory and engaging in a conflict that is not by definition yours, you are bound to conflict with international law. Clear is also, according to Newman (2001), that international law is challenged in the way that it has commitment both with human rights and state sovereignty. What international law sets out to do is to protect individuals; it at the same time “...rejects ‘outside’ solutions to human rights violations.”\(^{22}\)

Historically the case has been that the sovereign rights have a genuine tendency to ‘win’ over human rights on the international relations arena. Yet as is continuously discussed in the same book is that recent, before 2001, examples of foreign intervention in ethnic conflicts such as Somalia or the Balkans, supported by a vast spectrum of regional and international organisations and conducted by them among others, have in fact challenged the notion that sovereign rights continue to prevail over human rights. Another very important and interesting point this book brings forward is the concept of ‘failed states’, “...the notion

---

\(^{20}\) Collins (2007)

\(^{21}\) Holzgrefe & Keohane, (2003), p. 18

\(^{22}\) Newman (2001), p. 140
that states forfeit their sovereign rights if they cannot assure basic security for all of their
citizens.” 23 A fairly daring statement but one that fold somewhat hand in hand with the
utility of human security, something that will be discussed later in this thesis.

“… if humanitarian intervention is, indeed, an unacceptable assault on sovereignty,
how should we respond to a Rwanda, to a Srebrenica – to gross and systematic viola-
tions of human rights that offend every precept of our common humanity?” 24

These are words from the former UN general secretary Kofi Annan In his Millennium Re-
port to the General Assembly. The reason for this quote is mainly to again, given the
means, to weigh a state’s sovereignty with the values of humanity.

2.3 Peacekeeping

My intention is not to go further into peacekeeping than a brief presentation and definition
to what it is and in what way it is separate from Humanitarian Interventions. The main rea-
son for my exclusion of the Peacekeeping agenda is that it is somewhat limited to the sole
actor that is the United Nations or states’ forces acting directly under U.N. control, without
saying it is not to be considered important. In a way it could be described as what is done
after the intervention have been implemented. Also that is a peacekeeping action could not
be a state per se, but rather countries under U.N. authority. By U.N. definition;

“Peacekeeping is a way to help countries torn by conflict create conditions for sus-
tainable peace. UN peacekeepers—soldiers and military officers, police and civilian
personnel from many countries—monitor and observe peace processes that emerge
in post-conflict situations and assist conflicting parties to implement the peace
agreement they have signed. Such assistance comes in many forms, including pro-
moting human security, confidence-building measures, power-sharing arrangements,
electoral support, strengthening the rule of law, and economic and social develop-
ment.”

Note here that humanitarian interventions as they are separate from the peacekeeping op-
erations of the United Nations. As Garrett points this out since peacekeeping practices do
not really distinguish morally between the conflicting parties in a conflict with an assump-
tion “…that at least some tentative agreement on ending hostilities has been previously
agreed to by these parties.” 26

Humanitarian Intervention on the other hand makes the attempt to shape and re-define an
order within the conflict zone or affected country that have the goal and aims to end the
abuses that the older order stood for. At the same time as peacekeeping instead as men-
tioned engage “…the effort to maintain the status quo or at least the status quo as it has

23 Ibid.

24 Annan (2000)

25 The United Nation homepage www.un.org

26 Garrett (1999), p. 18
now come to be after a previous period of instability.”27 The reason this section is needed is because I will focus merely on Human Intervention and to do so there is a need to know what Peacekeeping entitles as well.

It is as stated in previous segment the intention is not to go into much detail when it comes to peacekeeping and peacekeeping actions. However since one of the questions that this thesis strives to answer: When is a Human Intervention needed and when is it successful? The case were the UN in fact have a definition to what a successful peacekeeping action entitles, it might as well be presented to grasp the full extent of this concept.

“Certain factors are critical for the success of any UN peacekeeping operation. The international community must diagnose the problem correctly before prescribing peacekeeping as the treatment; there must be a peace to keep; and all key parties to the conflict must consent to stop fighting, and to accept the UN role in helping them resolve their dispute and to the deployment of a UN peacekeeping mission. Members of the Security Council must agree on a clear and achievable mandate. Deployment must proceed quickly.” 28

Another reason to present a definition of a successful Peacekeeping action is to provide a line of thought, since it will be substantially ‘harder’ to define ‘success’ with regards of humanitarian interventions, mainly due to the concept’s complexity.

27 Ibid.

3 Theoretical Frameworks

This chapter will present and discuss the theoretical frameworks, Realism and Feminism, which this thesis is based upon. Realism is included due to its importance historically in International Relations and Feminism to provide a more critical approach to the International Society. Since what is at question here the re-evolution of the referent object of security, e.g. the state or the individual, a segment on Human Security is introduced in order to further grasp the growing importance of the individual.

3.1 Defining Realism

Founding fathers of modern Realism, with a slight irony, could in some sense be said to be Hans Morgenthau and Kenneth Waltz. Historically the start of modern Realism came as a result of the devastation the World War I had on the world. The discipline of international relations began its course towards a field concerned mainly with breaking the seemingly inevitable cycle of international war. With the ending of the World War II that came with even greater devastation became the tipping point for several scholars to devote to what they saw as a more ‘realistic’ way of dealing with international politics. Hence also claiming that “...conflict was inevitable: the best way to assure the security of states is therefore to prepare for war.”

Another way of attempting to explain the ‘realistic’ line of thought, through Tickner,

“...realists take as their basic assumption a dangerous world devoid of an overarching authority to keep the peace. In this “anarchical” world, realists prescribe the accumulation of power and military strength to assure state survival, the protection of an orderly “domestic” space, and the pursuit of legitimate national interests beyond one’s territorial boundaries.”

However note that this is written in a critical manner but could serve the purpose of introducing the major line of thought.

Even if a lot has been written about Realism and the fact that it has had impact on the international level it is not to say that it is in anyway a simple task to try and define Realism. Realism is an approach to international relations that has developed gradually through the work of a series of analysts who have situated themselves within a typical but still diverse style or tradition of analysis. Donnelly (2000) presents several authors within the topic of Realism and international relations, but as Morgenthau is seen as one of the founding fathers the presentation of his major principles serves as severely interesting.

---

29 Tickner (1992), p. 10
30 Tickner (1992), p. 11
31 Donnelly (2000)
1. “Political Realism believes that politics, like society in general, is governed by objective laws that have their roots in human nature” (1954: 4).

2. “The main signpost that helps political Realism to find its way through the landscape of international politics is the concept of interest defined in terms of power” (1954: 5).

3. Power and interest are variable in content across space and time (1954: 8-9).

4. “Realism maintains that universal moral principles cannot be applied to the actions of states” (1954: 9).

5. “Political Realism refuses to identify the moral aspirations of a particular nation with the moral laws that govern the universe” (1954: 10).

6. “The difference, then, between political Realism and other schools of thought is real and it is profound . . . Intellectually, the political realist maintains the autonomy of the political sphere” (1954: 10).

Since it is safe to say that one of the most important realists in modern times is Hans Morgenthau and as the previous section provides us with the six principles of political Realism that he stated in his “Politics among Nations”.

- Anarchy shapes a distinct politics among states and their governments that makes international politics realm of insecurity.
- The pressures and constraints of the international system are the major determinants of states’ security goals and relations.
- International or transnational community is limited in favour of sovereignty and national community, restricting cooperation and the management of security.
- States as unitary, self-interested actors are inherently insecure, competing for power as the key to security. That competition creates security dilemmas.
- The structure of the international system is the distribution of power among leading states.
- States seek to develop and maintain suitable distributions of power for maintaining security – disagreeing about what a suitable distribution (multipolar, bipolar, or unipolar) is and how much power each state needs.

The realist view has had a large impact on international relations, and has always found international politics distinctive because of anarchy, meaning the absence of any ultimate power and any authority over states; when it comes to international politics there is little

---

32 Donnelly (2000), p. 16

33 Collins (2007), p. 22
rule. The realist claim is that the absence of rule makes power, autonomy, the international political system, and its structure significantly different from domestic politics, with anarchy making international security relations particularly system driven. The nature of this system with its pressures and constraints, are the main factors in determining the security goals and relations, in a way the security agenda of the national governments. In that aspect it is that they are more important factors than their domestic character, the qualities of their leaders and political systems, their ideological preoccupations, or their decision-making processes, hence it is so that foreign policy as such is in large a rational response to external necessities.  

From Collins what this is trying to explain, that this means a state exists slightly apart from society, having an own identity and agenda towards international politics. Therefore it could be said that the state as a unitary, self-interested actor following a strategy to dealing with other states. The fact that leaders and governments come and go, realists se the continuity over time within a government’s foreign policy and basic objectives such as the concept of security. That is the idea of foreign policy would remain somewhat constant since the state has its own identity and in some way stands above the society. Also security is given through the constant motion of the state.

In Collins when discussing the realist perspective they also introduce the concepts of security dilemma and that of balance of power in order to further the understanding. The security dilemma could be explained as when competition is in increased by the fact that when one state expands its power in order to feel safer, what it leads to is an increase in fears of other states. Therefore the security dilemma, due to additional military power for defence might in fact also increase one’s capacity to attack, and a states’ effort to become secure might be leading to enhanced insecurity. The problem here is the competition with military power might on the one side lead to increased security and insecurity at the same time. Within a state, by enhancing its military power a state becomes more secure from threats from others. On the other hand a state is seen as more of a threat by others increasing the insecurity of the state, and increasing insecurity for the others in the international arena.

The concept of ‘balance of power’ is very disputed and criticised. Morgenthau (1993) defines the term ‘balance of power’ when used in his text in four different meanings:

“... (1) as a policy aimed at a certain state of affairs, (2) as an actual state of affairs, (3) as an approximately equal distribution of power, (4) as any distribution of power.”

The idea is to see that the ambition for power on the part of a number of states, in a struggle to maintain or overthrow the status quo. According to Morgenthau this leads to a configuration that is called the balance of power and to policies that aim at preserving it. In Collins it is ‘balance of powers’ is described as:
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“...what frequently happens as a result of the competition among states; they com-
pete and the result is that over time a rough balance of power among competitors
emerges, constraining all actors.”

Hence one could argue as well the impact that the ‘security dilemma’ has on the ‘balance of
power’, when it comes to realism.

---
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3.2 Human Security

The reason for me to bring in the human security concept is due to the fact that the 1994 Human Development Report of the United Nations Human Development Programme. What it did was to acknowledge a need to take more ‘threats’ of security into consideration, moving away from Realism’s old static threats to security. The intention here is also that to briefly point out that human security, as the feminist analysts also do, moves the referent object from the ‘state’ as Realism does to a more individually based approach.

The label ‘Human Security’ is said to be coined in the mid 1990’s and nowadays serves several useful purposes. The concept in itself became accepted into development thinking when it was introduced in the 1994 Human Development Report of the United Nations Human Development Programme. The outcome of this report was a new definition of security and human security was defined as freedom from and fear and freedom from want. This was located in seven categories, the economy, food production, health, environment, the personal, community level, and politics, rather than being simply based upon the state. The concept of human security has since the mid 1990’s been under constant questioning and heavy debating.  

In order to link the concept of human security with Feminism, and in due course focus merely on Feminism, it might be useful to follow the discussion in “Engendering Human Security”. The claim here is that significant advances have been made in shifting the referent of security from the state to the people and in turn thus the individual. Accordingly approaches that move away from a state-centric, militaristic, in some sense undemocratic and elitist focuses. Also the contribution the book makes is pointing towards a necessity to deepen the understanding of the mentioned individual, by questioning which individual. That is Feminism acknowledges individuals as such but also the women in particular.

What Feminism does here, is to provide a feminist standpoint that highlights the structural and symbolic creation “…of ‘the individual’ through the intersection of multiple and layered identities which are simultaneously gendered/ethnicised/classed/racialised.” This could thus be making expansion of the boundaries of human security and also of its conceptualisation of the human subject.

A broader and more multilayered conception of human security is somewhat given “…in the feminist engagements which link the global and the local and align issues of recognition and redistribution as evident in the emergence of transnational feminist networks in the last decade.” This vision that feminists and also the feminist perspective as such could help accomplish is to engender human security towards a more humane security vision.
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3.3 Defining Feminism

In the same way as with Realism the outlining and definition of Feminism will be from authors within international relations, this is to make it “fit” with the purpose of this thesis. It becomes clear when reading up on Critical Security Studies that Feminism as a scientific tool could at times be regarded as being within the realm concept of critical studies and not something that needs to be specified on its own terms. However the intention of this section is to define Feminism in itself and also as a part of Critical Security Studies on international matters.

Feminism today is generally perceived as being in crisis or vast decline, mainly due to the decline of media coverage of Feminism in the ‘western world’. If you cannot hear or see it, it is thought to be non-existent. All the same, an idea that Feminism would be irrelevant and outdated could easily be shattered. 45

As we know the world is far from perfect, even though most of the ‘western countries’ in the world could say they provide basic rights and independence for women. The majority of women in the world do not live under those types of arrangements, and therefore lack basic human rights and legal protection. Even if we no longer, in the same way we used to see:

“... a mass of women’s movement, feminist activities continue at all levels from the local to the global in self-help groups, community organisations, pressure group, trade unions and formal institutions.” 46

What we see today is an acknowledgment that by moving away from a ‘one size fits all’ mentality to a more context dependent approach. With the implication that flexibility like that would make feminist theory to not be restricted by the labels which have been used to classify it, a new Feminism. 47

It is even the case that a touch of Feminism exists in a lot of schools, this since there is a discussion of broadening the security agenda to include more levels. When reading up on Feminism it comes quickly clear that even Feminism could be said to be separated between ‘extremes’. In several writings on the subject gives similar outlining attempts as the one in Collins:
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• Feminist analysts and gender analysts are not united in their views about the relationship between women, men, and security.

• Liberal feminists wish to see a complete equality of opportunity between men and women. Liberal feminists wish to see an ending to the exclusion of women in public life and are keen to see equal representation of women in the high offices of state and advocate the right of women to participate in combat.

• Radical feminists would prefer to see a shift in the dynamics of the state security apparatus. This includes a rejection of masculine values and desire to feminize institutions and conflict. Some radical feminists emphasize peace as the endpoint of changing institutions and mindsets.

• Marxist feminists work on the issue of class and gender. Their work highlights not only the subordination of women in the workplace but the general overrepresentation of women in the lowest socioeconomic groups across the globe. They draw our attention to the links between economic deprivation, security, and vulnerability.  

It is a very important claim that is needed to state thoroughly, as Tickner does, not all women are feminists. Furthermore that feminist theories are constructed in such a way that they are made out of the experiences of women in their countless and varied circumstances, experiences that have tended to be neglected by most previous intellectual disciplines. Tickner does also similar to the figure above discuss the contemporary feminist theories, and by following her line of discussion we could enhance what Collins tried to explain, but also to specify it into the international arena of international relations.  

It is sought to say that majority of contemporary feminist perspectives define themselves in terms of reacting to traditional liberal Feminism that has put its main focus to eliminate legal restraints excluding women in their ability to access the full ability to participate in the public world. That is they instead claim that the sources of discrimination against women run much deeper than legal restraints, hence seeing that the exclusion of women in areas such as economic, cultural, and general social structures of society would not end simply due the abolishment of legal restraints. The common goal for almost all feminists has been to attempt to describe as well as explain the sources of gender inequality, and initiate strategies to end it.  

---
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As mentioned above in the figure, Marxist feminist believe that capitalism is the source of women’s oppression, radical feminists claims that women are oppressed by the system of patriarchy that, according to Tickner, has existed under almost all modes of production. With the system of patriarchy here meaning it is institutionalised through legal and economic, but also social and cultural, institutions. With some radical feminists arguing that a low value assigned to feminine characteristics in themselves also have a major impact on and contributes to women’s oppression. Tickner also presents the socialist feminist to be mentioned before reaching an attempt to apply Feminism to the international arena. Social-ist feminists have attempted to bind all these mentioned approaches together into what they find to be a comprehensive explanation of women’s oppression. Their utter claim is that:

“...women’s position in society is determined both by the structures of production in the economy and structures of production in the economy and by structures of reproductions in the household, structures that are reinforced by the early socialization of children into gender roles.”  

Therefore in order to reach full equality is to eliminate women’s unequal status in all these structures. So what the socialist feminists attempt to do is to try and understand the position of women in their multiple roles, to find a one and single standpoint from which to explain their condition. The standpoint said to be found under the premises that those who are oppressed have a greater understanding of the sources of their oppressors. With the inten-tion that, “A standpoint is an engaged vision of the world opposed and superior to dominant ways of thinking.”  

On this point the socialist Feminism have been very criti-cised however, especially by post-modern feminists, the notion is here that it is close to impossible to unify the notion of women in the sense of a unified representation.

Post-modern feminists also criticise, as many feminists do, existing knowledge that has its ground on experiences of White Western men, by defining women under one standpoint could therefore be seen as establishing a notion only based on the notion of a White Western women. This is something that would lead to an additional risk of reproducing similar dualising distinctions that feminists object under the patriarchal discourse. The key to a ‘successful’ Feminism through the eyes of post-modern feminists lies in the importance of including the voices of all women and not to be yet another hierarchical system of knowl-edge construction.

In order to discuss Feminism on the international level and with regards to international relations and in turn, humanitarian intervention, Tickner and Sylvester have attempted to apply feminist thoughts onto that level. What they both seem to believe and Tickner clearly puts down in writing is that the world of international politics is masculine domain. However as theoretical perspective that depends on a broader range of human experience is equally important for women and men, hence there is a need to implement new ideas when discussing our contemporary dilemmas.

Various concepts that are central to international relations theory and practice, for example power, security, and sovereignty have all from the feminist perspective been associated in
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terms with masculinity. A way to limit current settings of insecurities may be done through
drawing on feminist theorising to examine and critique such concepts that are fundamental
to international relations.

“Just as realists center their explanations on the hierarchical relations between states
and Marxists on unequal class relations, feminists can bring to light gender hierar-
chies embedded in the theories and practices of world politics and allows us to see
the extent to which all these are interrelated.” 54

In an attempt to define a common goal of feminist theory and its analytical framework
Kouvo in “Making Just Rights?” tries to do so with a minimisation of the gender aspect as
a analytical category.

“In 1987, Jane Flax defined the goal of feminist theory as “…to analyze gender rela-
tions: How gender relations are constituted and experienced and how think or,
equally important, do not think about them. The study of gender relations includes
but is not limited to what are often considered to be distinctively feminist issues: the
situation of women and the analysis of male domination.” 55

The discussion continues along the lines as such that gender relations as analytic category is
designed to capture a complex set of social relations, here the notion of security might be
helpful to do so.
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The following section will instead of presenting the theories in general terms, give a more	head on approach to really specify the differences between just Realism and Feminism.
First in what could be described as their separate historical differences, and then off course
in terms of the differences regarding security and referent object.

With regards to international relations it is possible to put these theoretical frameworks
head to head, especially if you read Tickner and others likeminded. After the Cold War a
change in the international environment, lead to a new international climate, however insti-
tutions and frameworks did not evolve with this new international climate as established in
the introduction. The old theories seemed stuck and a cry for new frameworks was clear.

Realism on the one hand is one school in the old state-centric argument and it plays an im-
portant role in highlighting past important sets of historic threats to the state. Human secu-

[Footnote 56][56]rity and Feminism on the other hand, clearly linked to humanitarian intervention in the
sense that it emphasises the safety and well-being of individuals, groups, and communities
rather than putting priority to state and state-interests.

Realism when it comes to humanitarian interventions lack some in interest since it theoret-
cally does not deals with the state per se. That is Realism ignores a variety of threats that
can undermine the state and its conditionality of sovereignty, also that it seems to be un-
clear as to its ultimate purpose regarding protection of the people. Hence it is easy to ques-
tion where Realism stands, not denying its importance more questioning its position in
conflict regarding someone else’s people.

By the end of the Cold War a shift occurred from the old school Realism and towards a
new variety of discussions presented here by Tickner, on the international environment. An
introduction of competing theories and approaches, a realisation of new issues on the
agenda and new actors into the concept of international relations worked hand in hand
with a shift to a more normative approach to mentioned field. One example of this could
be said to be the world order perspective asked how humanity substantially help reduce any
likelihood of international violence and set up an agenda with “…minimally acceptable con-
ditions of worldwide economic well-being, social justice, ecological stability, and democ-
ratric participation in decision-making processes.”

The main agenda of contemporary scholars was the questioning of the state as the ‘only’
adequate key in solving international dilemmas. Since militarised states in fact can be of
vast threat to the security of their own people, by economic in-equality, poverty etc. and
also the fact that a threat of pollution and overuse of resources sees no real state bounda-
ries.
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What Tickner observes in this is that it is not hard to detect some as she calls ‘masculine-linked characteristics’, but that scholars concerned with structural violence have paid little if any attention to how women have been affected by global politics and such. This could be seen as another reason to take Feminism a step further into the international arena.\textsuperscript{60}

### 4.1 Differences with Regards to Security

In order to provide a tool for applying the difference in referent objects empirically, there is a need for a discussion about how the different theoretical frameworks view security and insecurity and it is here we could extract the significant differences to apply.

The realists traditionally define models of national security as merely focused on military security, and with a strong relation with violence as physical violence. In that sense threats to security have traditionally been defined as threats to national boundaries. For realists, security is tied to military security of the state, through the perception of the:

> “...pessimistic assumptions about the likely behaviour of states in an “anarchic” international environment, most realists are sceptical about the possibility of states ever achieving perfect security.”\textsuperscript{61}

Thus security is understood through that the state covers its citizens, state interests are beyond the interests of the citizens, and by securing the state it is inherently ensuring the security of its citizens. When the referent object is the state and its sovereignty then the threats is defined as those that threat the ability to protect the state. Thus what is needed is to protect the sovereignty, economics, and the military threats. Tickner (1992) claims that these ideas have been establish through a male-centric framework.\textsuperscript{62} A traditional approach could be described as a based on a top-down perspective, with main emphasis on structural matters such as the ones mentioned above like sovereignty, the feminist approach is more of a bottom-up approach.\textsuperscript{63}

In order to establish a definition on how feminism outline security, and also explain how feminism is more of a bottom-up approach. The main difference initially between Realism and Feminism when defining security could be said to be that security, in Feminism, as such means nothing if it is built on others’ insecurity, whilst that is the core of Realisms definition of security. Regarding national security the feminist perspective takes us beyond Realism’s statist representations, thus there might be more to national security than that of the security of the state.\textsuperscript{64}

---
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Women’s definition of security are multileveled and multidimensional, defined as such: “...the absence of violence whether it be military, economic, or sexual.” What feminists also have found over the years is that the state in itself is a somewhat male security state. Thus what is needed that is a vast separation between men in the sense of that of the military, and women that historically are not in the military and thus not regarded in that state.

Also, from Collins, that “...biology and the continual demands of the state on the females and its childbearing constituencies. Women have been used by virtue of their biology to promote certain security goals.” However here Feminism tries to implement female participation on a military level and thus limiting the old framework, bringing us to what Feminism claims that security and gender needs to go hand in hand.

To conclude this section, attempted has been to compare the two theoretical frameworks on the notion on security to apply on the humanitarian intervention in Kosovo, 1999. The main difference between the two, Realism and Feminism, lies within the notion of the referent object of security.

Realism sees the state as what through the act of military force would and should be secured, implying that the state is a primary object that is to be secured, in order words the state is here the referent object of security. Whilst when discussing Feminism the referent object would in first hand be women within the state but also individuals in general within the state, with the notion that gender have impact on security. Note here it is not to say that Feminism finds women as more important it is more a case of acknowledging them at all, something Realism for example have neglected.

Finally in order to sum up this discussion and attempt to apply it on the intervention in Kosovo, realism is based on a top-down perspective, with main emphasis on structural matters such as the ones mentioned above such as sovereignty, the feminist approach is more of a bottom-up approach.
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5 The Humanitarian Intervention in Kosovo

Since the concept of Humanitarian Intervention severely changed after the end of the Cold War, the period after this therefore provides a lot of events/crises that exemplifies when Humanitarian Interventions was needed. To give some examples that have been very controversial one could mention Bosnia in 1992, Somalia in 1992, Rwanda in 1994, and Kosovo in 1999. This chapter will provide a background to the conflict in Kosovo and also in some extent the outcome of the intervention as such.

As the title suggests the intention of this section is to go into more detail with regards to the Kosovo intervention in 1999. This is done through the work of Hawk (2002) who presents it in the context that they are relevant cases where military action has taken place in order to protect people and save lives. But also the U.N. and NATO provide important information in order to provide a ‘fair’ framework. Here follows a brief background of the conflict.

5.1 Background to the Conflict

According to Hawk (2002), a common phrase you hear almost anywhere in former Yugoslavia is that “The Yugoslav crisis started in Kosovo and it will end in Kosovo…”70, no one on the other hand is able to predict how or when the crisis definitely will end. Without further detail it is easy to write off the conflict in Kosovo an ‘ethnic’ one, since the main body within the conflict is the ‘hate’ between Serbs and Albanians. As these groups are of different ancestral groups, have different religious traditions, and speak different languages. However the truth here is that it the conflict of Kosovo is more infected than that.71

The conflict and humanitarian intervention that is referred to here is the one that occurred in 1999, the area have however been in conflict prior to this. Slobodan Milošević, president of Yugoslavia, launched a brutal offensive against Kosovo using the ‘militant’ attempts of KLA72 to get Kosovo separated from Serbia. In this offensive approximately 1500 Kosovar Albanian civilians were killed, and an estimate of 400 000 people were driven from their homes. At this time both the United States and several European countries pleaded for diplomatic ways to deal with the growing crisis but Milošević choose not to listen.73

On March 24 1999, NATO warplanes started the airborne strike over Kosovo, named Operation Allied Forces74. This sprung as a slight surprise on many levels:
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“NATO officials were surprised that Yugoslavian president Slobodan Milošević did not acquiesce to diplomatic settlements; Serbian officials were surprised that NATO made good on its threats. Russia, an advocate of Serb interests, was incensed that NATO had circumvented the UN Security Council, leading to increased tensions with the United States.”

The original plan was for the strike only to last a couple of days but ended up lasting for seventy-seven days, ending on June 10 1999.

On June 10 1999, the UN Security Council passed the Resolution 1244, presenting a need for the deployment of an international security force and the further establishment of a civilian UN mission to serve as the in temporary government of Kosovo. The security force was in turn authorised by Chapter VII of the UN charter and was set to include substantial NATO participation deployed under unified command and also controlling arrangements. That is both NATO and the UN would act as under joined unified command. The Kosovo Force was part of NATO, KFOR in short, and had among other chores to provide a secure enough environment so that the refugees could return home safely, and a transitional administration could be established, for human aid to be delivered, and also to ensure public safety and order in the initial stages.

With regards of Resolution 1244 that was agreed upon in June 1999, UNMIK was born. UNMIK the UN ‘force’ in the region was essentially given authority over the basic territory and people in Kosovo. Their responsibilities included:

“...to perform basic civilian administrative functions, promote the establishment of substantial autonomy within the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY) and providing self-government in Kosovo, and facilitate a political process to determine Kosovo’s future status. UNMIK also sought to coordinate humanitarian and disaster relief from all international agencies, support the reconstruction of key infrastructure, maintain civil law and order, promote human rights, and assure the safe and unimpeded return of all refugees and displaced persons to their homes in Kosovo.”

In order to implement its mandates the structure of the UN mission was based upon four pillars. The reason for these pillars was based upon an innovative arrangement designed to divide the tasks between international organizations with the right resources and expertise in the area. Since Kosovo still is under U.N. surveillance the current pillars are:

Pillar I: Police and Justice, under the direct leadership of the United Nations
Pillar II: Civil Administration, under the direct leadership of the United Nations
Pillar III: Democratization and Institution Building, led by the Organization for Security

---
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5.2 Outcome of the Intervention in Kosovo

It is hard to find out whether an intervention is successful or not and also in some way try to establish whether the findings are sustainable in the long run or the short run. Also as this thesis objective is to test the view of Realism versus the theoretical framework of Feminism on this particular humanitarian intervention, this part proposes what impact the interventions have had in the particular case. Therefore this section will be based on the discussion of Kathleen Hawk. In her “Constructing the Stable State: Goals for Intervention and Peacekeeping”, she among other conflicts looks into what happened in Kosovo.

What is done here is first it is asked if the external intervention was successful in diffusing the humanitarian intervention in the short run and after that looking into the longer run effectiveness of the intervention, and sustainable peace.

“Therefore, I really am not looking to say whether the external effort succeeded or failed according to standards the international actors may (or may not) have set for themselves, but to look at what was done and attempt to ascertain whether the dimensions considered essential to “statebuilding” were addressed.”

What Hawk does is discuss the outcome of the intervention from a set of questions and even if that could be useful, the intention of my thesis is not to do that, answer them one by one, but rather to give a presentation to her findings. This is due to the fact that the purpose of this essay is more of a test of the shift of the referent object between Realism and Feminism.

As promised above following section have the intention to denote for what happened in Kosovo and whether the intervention was a success or not. The reasons for the intervention, as noted under the section ‘Kosovo’, was that after the KLA lead armed revolt for independence in 1997 with Milošević responded through increased levels of brutality. Eventually NATO decided to undertake an airborne strike lasting an immense seventy–eight days, forcing Serbian forces from the area. As this conflict is fairly resent one took notice of previous mistakes and successful efforts particularly from the then war torn area of Bosnia in 1992.

To discuss the success of the external actors and the humanitarian intervention in itself is rather controversial, perhaps mostly due to the fact that the province still does not stand on its own but is under U.N. administration. Another reason for the controversy of the case of Kosovo is that, as Hawk states:

“For better or worse, the success of external efforts into bring peace and stability to Kosovo likely will temper future decisions to undertake such ambitious mandates. If
it succeeds, it may set a precedent that the international community can – and perhaps should – become involved in at least some of the many violent internal conflicts around the world. On the other hand if it fails or even ends up inconclusive, requiring international forces to be committed indefinitely, the United Nations, NATO, and especially the United States likely will back away from future missions of this sort.84

This is a quote that provides a lot of controversy in itself, however something worth taking into consideration.

In the short run it is easier to see the impact and success an intervention has had, however in order for it to be completely successful it is the case that it in some ways provides ‘stability’ in the long run as well. However with regards of the Kosovo intervention we are in some sense bound to find out what the long term outcomes will be. The most common expectation, according again to Hawk, when discussing Kosovo is that if the foreign forces were to leave the infected province is that the territory instantly would revert to anarchy and violence.85
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6 Analysis

The concept of Humanitarian Intervention as discussed in the first chapter is not unproblematic. One of the main reasons lies within the concept itself. How a ‘humanitarian intervention’ could ever be seen as ‘humanitarian’ when the main means to solve it is through ‘military’ action. Another aspect here is the fact that the concept ‘humanitarian intervention’ could be interpreted as somewhat emotionally biased, since the concept in itself carries emotional baggage. As defined “Humanitarian Intervention” means:

“...threat or use of force across borders by a state (or groups of states) aimed at preventing or ending widespread and grave violations of the fundamental human rights of individuals other than its own citizens, without the permission of the state within whose territory force is applied”\textsuperscript{86}.

Note here that humanitarian interventions are in fact a problematic issue. As discussed under the chapter named just “Humanitarian Intervention” there is the problem of “to intervene or not to intervene” a line of thought that Walzer discusses in his “Arguing about War”. Walzer concludes that intervention should always be the last resort.\textsuperscript{87} Before moving on to discussion of the specific examples in this essay with separate theoretical frameworks, I find especially useful to conclude what Collins (2001) does, the inability of a state to protect its people the principle of non-intervention yields to the international responsibility to protect.\textsuperscript{88}

The example used here of when a humanitarian intervention was both needed and also given, is in this thesis found in Kosovo 1999. The reason for the use of this intervention is the fact that it in some way can be found as groundbreaking. Why the Kosovo case was groundbreaking was since the UN did not manage to reach a unified decision in the matter and the intervention was carried out, despite several adversaries, by NATO instead. There are several ways to go around this analysing part, what I have chosen to do is, analyse the Kosovo intervention through the theoretical framework of Realism and Feminism.

As I have tried to establish previously the main difference between Realism and Feminism is in the way they view security. This is essential to the interpretation of humanitarian intervention and its outcome, and therefore to this essay. The difference here as I have found them is that Realism’s take on security is that of the state, whilst Human Security and Feminism’s take on security is more ‘people’ driven, the case of state’s security versus people’s security in some sense. Thus as presented in the introduction the referent object differs between the two isms, with referent object as noted previously is meant as the primary object that is to be secured.

The difference between Realism and Feminism lies therefore in that in Realism the referent object is the state, and with regards to Feminism it is more the case that it is the individual
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that is the referent object in general and women in particular. Note here that a similar difference is that Realism is more associated with military force and threat to reach or establish security whilst Feminism searches for ways to delimit military violence and thus rather through absence of violence.89

The discussions attempted with regards to the differences between Realism and Feminism has been mostly focused on how they view security and also the referent object, as above. However in order to be able to apply the theoretical frameworks onto the humanitarian intervention that took place in Kosovo in 1999 there is a need to differentiate between the two perspectives. On that note the difference entitles that realism is based on a top-down perspective, with main emphasis on structural matters such as the ones mentioned above with e.g. sovereignty, the feminist approach is more of a bottom-up approach.90 Which would entitle that what is treated as important in the conflict would differ between the approaches.

Realism's approach to what happened in Kosovo 1999 would in such entitle that the security here was jeopardised by the conflict between KLA and the Yugoslavian president Slobodan Milošević and also jeopardising the security of the region as a whole, hence promoting a military intervention to secure the area. Whilst the feministic approach on the conflict in Kosovo, thus the security or insecurity, were more related to what was going on within the region, the ethnic cleansing of the Kosovar Albanians, calling for a humanitarian intervention to end the cleansing and help secure the humans. The reason for the NATO intervention could here therefore be explained as they either wanted to secure the state and region if explaining through Realism, or through the gendered lens, which is of Feminism, secure the individuals. In other words by shifting referent object whilst discussing the intervention as such provides a major difference.

In order to analyse the success or outcome of the intervention instead, through the same differential findings in how the frameworks define security we also need to discuss the insecurity. The reason for this is to establish the success in use of force. What Tickner (1997) finds is that when analysing military aspects of security and conflict, in general, the focus is on the consequences of what happens during wars rather than what causes them. What is questioned here is also that of the realist boundaries between dangers on the outside of the state and therefore the given security of the people in the state, where feminists believe that such state-centric analyses misses the interrelation of insecurity across the levels of analysis. On the notion that feminist’s focus more on what happens during war they draw from previous negative impacts that military conflicts have had. 91

This importance of a feministic lens to understand the world is not something taken out of thin air, there is a frequently asked question which states; “what is the feminist take on what happened in Bosnia?”. Thus the intention of this thesis to establish the differences between Feminism and Realism when it comes to humanitarian interventions is along the same lines. However it is not to say that finding the answer would be easy if even possible.

Marysia Zalewski does in an article from 1995, “‘Well, what is the feminist perspective on Bosnia?’ touches upon these issues. She finds there to be two ways around answering how
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to establish the feminist take on the conflict in Bosnia, even though my exemplified examples does not include Bosnia I find it an interesting line of thought and something that fits within the topic.

What Zalewski claims is that there is an easy and a difficult way to go around answering the question; what is the feminist perspective on Bosnia?, however here I take it as it could apply to any conflict. The easy or perhaps simple answer lies within looking into what happens to women in conflict. “No one can deny that women suffer in gender specific ways in wartime, although this is often represented as simply a nasty side-effect.” 92 However this first ‘easy’ way of interpreting what the answer might be directly leads us into the difficult answer. Here I choose to follow her exact example with Bosnia.

“When we start to take seriously the experiences of women in the light of the work that has been done on gender, scholars and practitioners of international politics might consider the gravity of Christine Chinkin’s claim that ‘the rape of women during war is a deliberate instrument of warfare and a consequence of male power and masculine privilege’ the widespread coverage of the rape of Bosnian women by Serbian soldiers risked presenting as “something exceptional”.” 93

The presented reality here is that rape and abuse of women in armed conflict has a long history, with examples in Somalia, Kuwait, and Burma to name a few. In Burma for example rape is a ‘common’ punishment, even routine if you will, and have the intention to show ‘who the master is’. This is documented throughout conflicts over time and also occurred in Kosovo. On the other hand however there is a persistent, since the end of World War I, tendency for women or rather female solidarity as being used to insist on peace. The perhaps most valid point that Zalywskia brings forward is:

“Feminists’ exposure of the double illusion of the ‘naturalness’ of gender differences and the apolitical nature of the private sphere has opened up a great swathe of possibilities for increased understanding of world political, the asking of new questions allows the telling of new answers.” 94

By changing the referent object in order to follow up this section and discuss the success or outcome of the intervention instead, through the same differential findings in how the frameworks define security we also need to discuss the insecurity. Here to ties lose ends together is the discussion of when referring to warfare to view it on behalf of the security or insecurity. In shifting referent to the individual or bottom-up perspective, instead of the state-centric top-down approach, there is a need to consider the structural violence on women and refugees as a major part of the security within the region.

With regards to the humanitarian intervention as such Realism and the realist school acts from a more policy oriented perspective, some argue such as Garrett (1999) that, it grants it’s “... legitimacy to actions based on the effective exercise of power in support of community objectives, and that receive least tacit of acceptance.”95 Furthermore Garrett
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through Farer claims that it is impossible even in modern times to support a contemporary right of humanitarian intervention if one is to rely on this classical approach.\(^96\)

Morgenthau dismisses for one the idea of human rights, since he finds it obvious that

“...the attempt to impose so-called human rights upon others or to punish them for not observing human rights assumes that human rights are of universal validity – that, in other words, all nations or all people living in different nations would respect human rights if they knew they existed...”\(^97\)

Further along these lines he argues it to be ignorant to assume that all nations would be able to provide basic human rights for their citizens, ignorant also to punish nations that fail to show respect of these rights.\(^98\)

Thus it is hard to see how Realism would see the legality and need for a humanitarian intervention, if it is hard or impossible to demand basic rights for all humans. However it is not impossible to note that in order to protect a states own territory from an outer threat a humanitarian intervention could help with that. That is a ‘strategically’ important territory regardless of who it belongs to might prove crucial in protecting the own territory, remember the Cold War and the ‘balance-of-power’.

Unlike Realism Feminism is more along the lines of the concept of ‘human security’ stating that the main reason for a humanitarian intervention is to protect human rights in general and women’s right in particular. By looking traditionally something both Collins (ed.) 2007 and Skjelsbaek (2001) touches upon is that women have been seen as the natural peacemaker. Skjelsbaek also denotes that at the local level women have played a part in the de-escalation of conflict and mitigation their effects. Essential in this process would have to be the protection and promotion of human rights, where women’s group have been most helpful.\(^99\)

Even though women are major recipients of humanitarian assistance that is in the intervention as a result of dealing with an ongoing conflict, to date, women have been largely absent from work and agencies that act in the names of humanitarian intervention. Thus what Feminism could help improve is the ability for women to get a more active participation role of women, not only in delivering humanitarian assistance but also help decide what assistance might be needed and in what way this would be done, and finally also to whom the assistance should be delivered.\(^100\)

In order to apply this onto what happened with regards to the Kosovo example we conclude that the intervention indeed was carried out. The reason for the NATO airstrike on Kosovo depends on what theoretical framework and therefore it is most likely that the outcome of a successful humanitarian intervention would differ between them as well. If taking the top-down approach of Realism, where one would assume that the reason for the intervention was to secure an important foreign territory and create stability in the particular
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region. If one on the other hand would you look through the more gendered lens of Feminism and the bottom-up approach you would first and foremost consider the human suffrage of the Kosovar Albanians and strive for them to be safe.

According to Youngs (2004) does the old realistic take on security:

“...fail to take account of the specific ways in which women and children are affected by war, military occupation, militarization, (forced) migration, human trafficking, sexual and other forms of slavery and (forced) prostitution”\textsuperscript{101}.

Through that it also fails to acknowledge the insecurities of these groups. This in turn would enable realists to see positive outcomes of military actions in war torn areas, to a greater extent than what a feministic approach would. The realistic or traditional take on the reason for an intervention in Kosovo, to secure the territory, would thus be seen as a successful outcome at least in the short run. After seventy-seven days long bombing raid by NATO on Kosovo territory the Serbs retreated, thus the territory was secured. In the longer run, stability in the region is not reached up to date, and peacekeeping forces are still present to keep it stable to a certain degree.

By approaching the outcome of the humanitarian intervention in Kosovo on the bottom-up perspective and feminism the intervention would not see it in the long turn as successful either but on other notions. By including women’s suffering during the war time were it is known that rape is a common threat and the insecurity within the society neglected by the realist approach, the outcome is bound to be different. The individuals and women in Kosovo were subject to humanitarian cleansing and by observing the conflict bottom-up, a success could thus be interpreted as when the cleansing stopped and the individuals could safely return to their homes and feel more secure in general. Note the difference, as I find it, Realism defines it as a success when the state is secured, thus it is then given that the society within the state is secured, whilst Feminism would view a success if the individuals felt secure and the cleansing was put to a stop.

With regards to the NATO intervention in Kosovo the humanitarian cleansing at least in the short run ended, which would be denoted as a success through Feminism, however since the reference also are the women the outcome could not be as easy. As several feminists such as Youngs (2004) and Zalewski (1995) notes is the systematic abuse on women in warfare, this is not limited to being within the conflict as such, especially with regards to the Kosovo case, it is clear that even the peacekeeping organisations like NATO and the U.N. are causing the insecurity of women through rape and trafficking\textsuperscript{102,103}.

I would therefore like to make it clear that humanitarian intervention does not only come bearing good. Also true is the idea that humanitarian intervention should always be the last resort and only be used as an utter extreme. In the hindsight of humanitarian intervention done by external actors and forces, it is not all good news. Just think of all prostitution and trafficking that takes place in war torn areas in the world. As time has passed more and more stories has come onto the light of the media etc. By staying within the examples touched upon in this thesis through the attention of Amnesty International the conflict in Kosovo have provided several stories to bring focus to what has been going in under Hu-
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manitarian Interventions. Not to say that warfare as such does not fuel sexual exploitation of women, but seeing that peacekeepers and humanitarian interventionists being part of this problem as well, rather than only providing for a solution.

7 Summary and Conclusion

The questions this thesis intended to answer was:

In what way does the theoretical framework of Realism differ from that of Feminism?, What is a Humanitarian Intervention and when is it needed?, By changing the referent object, from e.g. territory (state) to people within a territory (state), how could the success or outcome from a Humanitarian Intervention differ?

The main focus of this thesis has been to examine the latter question since I consider it to be of most interest. The other questions must be answered in order to lay the foundation for answering the main question of interest. My findings and thus also at least part of this concluding section is that by changing referent object from viewing the state as the primary concern of security, like Realism does, to a more ‘humane’ way of thinking with the people as the main concern of security like Feminism does. Therefore the difference in outcome and in a way the reason for the intervention will exist between the two.

The main difference I have found, in order to attempt and better understand humanitarian intervention is their notion of security, where the realistic approach could be described as a top-down one, whilst the feminist approach is said to be more of a bottom-up approach. To better understand and to apply it on the humanitarian intervention is the differences in referent object were Realism has the state and Feminism has the referent object of the individual and also the woman.

In order to present the humanitarian intervention, a qualitative text analysis has been made. Humanitarian intervention regardless of theoretical frame work could be defined as the threat or use of force by an agent to prevent or put a stop to severe violations of fundamental human rights of individuals outside the own territory. Yet with the theoretical frameworks applied Realism is in large not acknowledging human rights and thus in name of humanity dismisses intervention. Through the gendered lens of Feminism a humanitarian intervention is since it defends human rights in general and women's right in particular favours the intervention.

Finally with regards to what occurred in Kosovo, the theoretical description, the different theoretical approaches to security and with regarding different referent objects to secure, is used more as a tool or framework for the testing.

The realistic or traditional take on the reason for an intervention in Kosovo, to secure the territory, would thus be seen as a successful outcome at least in the short run. After seventy-seven days long bombing raid by NATO on Kosovo territory the Serbs retreated, thus the territory was secured. In the longer run, stability in the region is not reached up to date, and peacekeeping forces are still present to keep it stable to a certain degree.
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The feministic take on what happened would thus have a gendered lens and the individuals and women in Kosovo were subject to humanitarian cleansing and by observing the conflict bottom-up, a success could thus be interpreted as when the cleansing stopped and the individuals felt secure. Here the NATO intervention in Kosovo ended the humanitarian cleansing at least in the short run, which would be denoted as a ‘success’, however since the reference also are the women the outcome could not be as easy. As several feminists such as Youngs (2004) notes is the systematic abuse on women in warfare, this is not limited to being within the conflict as such, especially with regards to the Kosovo case, it is clear that even the peacekeeping organisations like NATO and the U.N. are causing the insecurity of women through rape and trafficking.

Shift in the referent object when examining the humanitarian intervention that took place in Kosovo 1999 offers a new perspective. Before the end of the Cold War it would not have been useful to apply a feminist perspective in analysing conflicts and interventions, but in the new international climate Feminism have more of an ability to help analyse and explain what is going on. Even if Feminism was not to be accepted as a ‘valid’ approach then, as I hope this thesis have provided reason for, it would be worth considering especially regarding Humanitarian Intervention to get a more colourful idea of what is going on in the world.
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