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Jessica Piombo’s edited collection, The US Military in Africa: Enhancing Security and Development, examines the US Department of Defense’s (DoD) shift from traditional to non-traditional role that blends security, governance and development in sub-Saharan Africa. The book shows this shift and examines the nexus in the context of the hegemonic discourse that the world will be a secure place if poor countries and fragile states get the opportunity to develop (Stern & Œjendal 2010). This nexus brought governance into the paradigm of securitization of development since attention to the multiple layers of this discourse where security, laws and development are made and brokered, is vital in the quest for development (Luckham and Kirk 2013). In this shift, the role of the United States (US) military goes beyond mere ‘training and equipping’ to include reconstruction and humanitarian activities (p. 213). The book provides a glimpse of the way the US tried to provide a multidimensional solution to the security problem of Africa with the conviction that its own security is grounded on the success of liberal ideals in other lands (Dexter 2008). It elucidates how the United States Africa Command (AFRICOM) was formed in 2007 to integrate security and development and how it assumed the task of designing and enforcing the DoD programs in sub-Saharan African countries. The book also indicates how AFRICOM came to be in charge of those programs that were under US Pacific Command, US Central Command and the US European Command. The creation of AFRICOM showed how the problem of governance and development in Africa became an indirect security threat to the US after the 9/11 attack.

The war on terror, which came after the 9/11 attack and has been formulated within the humanitarian narrative, is based on the rhetoric that the US’s national security relies on the triumph of liberal ideals in countries other than the US (Dexter 2008). It marks a change in the US military’s role from traditional to non-traditional security activities where the military plays a significant role in security, humanitarian activities, reconstruction and development. This brought governance into the security-development nexus in Africa, adding governance to Anan’s dictum that development and security are two sides of the same coin (Annan in Stern & Œjendal 2010). While some are critical of this security-development nexus, the argument that it is reduced to the anti-terrorism and security program of the West without noticeably adjusting the significance of security to boosting development and decreasing poverty, others believe the opposite (Luckham 2009).

The editor and contributors to the volume argue that the deep-rooted economic and social insecurity, lack of good governance and poverty not only cause national security problems in fragile states but also in the US. Piombo, the editor and author of three chapters of the book, argues that the DoD security policies were linked to development and poverty reduction in the anti-terrorism operation worldwide (Stern & Œjendal 2010), argues that ‘efforts to address any single side of the triangle must take into account the others in the nexus (p. 1). Secondly, the old ways of treating human security independently of state security are not enough. With the declining of interstate conflict and the rise of conflict within states (Dexter 2008, Kaldor 2013, Luckham 2009, Oberschall 2010), it is true that relying on the old ways of treating human security and addressing the challenges of a ‘new war’ may not be successful (Kaldor 2013). Furthermore, the DoD’s shift from traditional to non-traditional military activities is unnecessary.

Bringing governance to the nexus fills the gap in the securitization of development since it is important to know the way security arrangements are made at the global, regional and local levels, as well as their strengths and inconsistencies in the process of development (Luckham 2009). The editor and contributors show how the DoD not only draws on the wider academic debates in the field but they also have used case studies, besides their analysis of policy and strategy documents of the DoD, USAID, AFRICOM and other state documents. The volume is an important contribution to the academic debate that transcends the security-development nexus and considers governance as one of the strands in the nexus, quite apart from the areas of future research that it opens up. The delicate treatment of such concepts as ‘fragile states’, ‘underdevelopment’, ‘liberal peace’, ‘governance’, ‘social movement’ and ‘humanitarian assistance’, among others, enhances the value of the volume.

Framing states as ‘fragile’ is making ways for intervention using the rhetoric of the responsibility to protect that has a role of sanctioning the intervention of the international community in fragile or failing states in the Global South (Luckham 2009). Walther-Puri, one of the contributors, writes that ‘the most persistent and potentially dangerous threats come from fragile states that offers [sic] violent extremist organizations a safe haven to exist, plan and carry out attacks... threaten the security and prosperity of not only Africans across the continent but, Europe and the US as well’ (p. 83). However, terrorists from the West can be invoked as a counterargument to invalidate this claim. It is also proof that development, which tends to be inherently regulatory (Duffield and Hewitt 2009), by itself cannot bring security. Cognizant of this, O’Gorman (2011) argues that instead of reducing conflict, development itself can be harmful and result in discrimination that induces conflict. Unpackaging the problem rather than repeating the narratives of the colonial past is important. Taking into account the current shift in the intervention discourse from failed state to fragile state (Duffield and Hewitt 2009), that discourse is founded on streamlining the tools of government to the prevailing social order (Duffield 2012). The discourse in this case is to make African countries fit the label ‘fragile’ to justify humanitarian intervention. Surprisingly, such interventionism embodies the prolongation of the governance articulated and by the European powers (Duffield and Hewitt 2009).

Portraying Africa as a ‘fragile’ world underdeveloped, full of failures and violence is perpetuating the same stereotype of the hegemonic colonial discourse. This is evident in Talentino’s articulation and by the European powers that it is perpetuating the discourse. This is evident in Talentino’s discourse. This is evident in Talentino’s discourse. This is evident in Talentino’s discourse. This is evident in Talentino’s discourse. This is evident in Talentino’s discourse. This is evident in Talentino’s discourse.

In the liberal peace model, which highlights the interests and priorities of the Occident (Richmond and Mac Ginty 2014), the ‘peace ideal’ model, which suppresses conflict rather than transforming it, is suited for African tribal societies, where alternative dispute resolution methods – adjudication, negotiation, mediation, among others – have been used for long. We can see these methods, which involve forgiveness and reconciliation, being effective in African societies. Thus, to bring genuine and sustainable peace, peacebuilding should be grounded in and led by local stakeholders instead of the international agencies (Richmond 2010). Peacebuilding relies on the social context and cultural values of specific constituencies (Luckham and Kirk 2013). In the liberal peace model, which uses force to suppress conflict, however, this forgivness and reconciliation is totally missing. These alternative ways, which have a proactive approach, provide positive peace that transcends the absence of violence and includes addressing the end of fundamental causes and dynamics of violence in order to avoid its recurrence and to establish a durable peace (O’Gorman 2011) while liberal peace, which focuses on development, provides nothing more than negative peace, leaving the conflict to recur.

Although it is important to recognize the way different levels of security hierarchies are made, including their strengths and weaknesses, to succeed in the process of peacebuilding (Luckham...
in his or her own right for security entails not only the right that citizens need to have as an entitlement to be protected from violence but it also presupposes their ability to fully practice this right (Luckham and Kirk 2013). Today, the US and Europe need to engage their Muslim communities in order to work together for a better future since through more inclusion it is possible to reduce and even cut off the flow of new members to extremist organizations (Duffield and Hewitt 2009). Failure to do this would incur a higher price than has been paid already.

These days, particularly when the Occident is in a state of war (Dexter 2008) and a significant number of radicals are emerging from its midst, the US and its allies need to devise a de-radicalization strategy rather than resorting to arms. We have witnessed such a resort to arms creating more hostility and duplicating terror threats in Afghanistan, Palestine, Iraq and Libya, to cite just a few examples. The increase of the ‘new war’ that kaldhor (2013) speaks about can only be managed with a governance system that acknowledges everyone despite his or her status. Considering that positive and sustainable peace can be realised and that everyone is duty bound to his or her fellow human to work for its fulfilment (Dower 2009), this review recommends a pacifist approach to peace and security, which in turn would enhance development.
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Depuis 2006, avec l’admission de jeunes filles à l’école de la gendarmerie, les Forces Armées sénégalaises ont entamé un recrutement élargi qui sera poursuivi avec l’accueil de personnels féminins au Centre d’instruction de Saint-Louis en 2008. Ce qui indique que le Sénégal est en train de faire des efforts significatifs en matière de réduction des inégalités de genre, conformément à ses engagements internationaux. Des réformes institutionnelles ont été entreprises tant sur le plan juridique que politique, telle la constitutionnalisation de l’égalité des femmes et des hommes en 2001. À ce titre, l’intégration des femmes dans tous les corps des forces armées répond aux orientations des Nations unies et des États membres pour assurer l’égalité des hommes et des femmes dans tous les domaines et plus récemment dans le secteur de la paix et de la sécurité. Toutefois, il a été constaté qu’une véritable politique de sécurité nationale intégrant le genre est loin d’être réalisée dans ce pays, malgré les nouvelles législations et les politiques adoptées pour une bonne promotion de l’égalité des genres. Cette note de politique fait état des forces et des faiblesses de l’incorporation des femmes dans les forces armées sénégalaises.