EVIDENCE–BASED APPROACHES TO THE SECURITY–DEVELOPMENT NEXUS

INSTITUTIONAL LEAD
The Brookings Institute

MODERATOR

Michael Miklaucic
Senior Fellow and
Editor-in-chief of PRISM,
National Defense University

OVERVIEW

Scholars and practitioners have acknowledged a security–development nexus for over 25 years, but there is a divide between each community. Even within academia and the implementer community, the security, development and humanitarian subfields are in their own silos. This session focused on creating a better understand of each of these divides and brainstorming how they can be bridged to create better, evidence-based approaches in the security–development nexus.

OBJECTIVES

The session had four objectives. First was to identify the significant gaps of understanding that practitioners face when developing strategies and programming in the security–development nexus, and to understand better the gaps between the security, development and humanitarian practitioner fields. Second was to identify major research agendas regarding the security–development nexus, incorporating the subfields of development, humanitarian efforts, security and peace science, and to understand better how these subfields interact. Third was to develop an understanding of the institutional incentives across and within the academic, security, development and humanitarian communities that challenge coordination and evidence-based approaches. The fourth objective was to propose ways to overcome structural barriers in order to bridge the security–development nexus with the academic community.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Having the two communities—security and development—working in the same space creates a need to work together more effectively. However, the there are several challenges to making this happen. There is an intellectual cultural gap between the academic and practitioner communities, with disincentives to collaboration in the face of the need to understand each other better. Moreover, the security, development and academic communities work according to different time frames: while the security community is forced to work rapidly, with shorter time frames, the development and academic communities both have a time frame with a long-term focus. There is also an information asymmetry between the security and development communities, which poses a challenge. Likewise, the two communities have different agendas that need to be bridged.

Host country ownership was identified as a key component to ensure successful programmes. The need to approach local researchers and bring in their expertise and perspective was highlighted. Moreover, it was emphasized that policymakers have a tendency to push for research that supports

policy agendas rather than drives change. It was concluded that these challenges are inherently political and not necessarily subject to rational solutions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Create common institutional platforms in the field in order to tackle the challenge of the security and development communities having different agendas.
- Eliminate disincentives in order to overcome and bridge the existing intellectual cultural gap between the academic and practitioner communities. Similarly, incentivize familiarity of the two communities and through that further bridge the existing gap.
- Engage with the local community as a key component of success and sustainability.
- Continue development support beyond the peacekeeping phase in order to achieve sustainability and build trust among the local community.

RESOURCE LINKS AND DOCUMENTS

International Peace Academy, 'The security–development nexus: research findings and policy implications', Program report, Feb. 2006, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep09516>.

World Bank, *World Development Report 2011: Conflict, Security, and Development* (World Bank Group: Washington, DC, 2011), <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/4389>, overview chapter 1.

Kharas, H. and Jones, B., 'Improving the relationship between security and development', Brookings Institution, 27 Apr. 2018, <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/future-development/2018/04/27/improving-the-relationship-between-security-and-development/>.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Development Assistance Committee (DAC), 'DAC recommendation on the humanitarian–development–peace nexus', 22 Feb. 2019, <https://legalinstruments.oecd.org/en/instruments/OECD-LEGAL-5019>.

Stern, M. and Öjendal, J., 'Mapping the security–development nexus: conflict, complexity, cacophony, convergence?', *Security Dialogue*, vol. 41, no. 1 (2010), <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0967010609357041>.

Karolina Eklöw
@KarolinaEklow

#SthlmForum Focus Day 1

Evidence-based approaches to the security-development nexus, by @BrookingsInst

- Local realities > ivory towers
- Long term development programs > quick 'security' interventions
- Synergies > nexus

10:58 AM - May 15, 2019

See Karolina Eklöw's other Tweets