

Mandatory securitization: Implications for the responsibility to protect

Rita Floyd

r.Floyd@bham.ac.uk



UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM


The Morality of Security

A Theory of Just Securitization


Rita Floyd

Background

- I am here because....
- Morality of Security: A theory of just securitization
- Just war theory + securitization theory
- I will say much more a little later on.
- The book develops a theory of just securitization (eine Theorie der gerechten Absicherung)
- It sets out just cause, right intention etc
- Securitization can be just (morally permissible/moralisch zulaessig) yes, but can it also be a moral duty (moralische Pflicht)?
- If so when, who has such duties and to whom?



The Duty to Secure: From just to mandatory securitization

- 
- Different level's of analysis
 - States
 - Non-state actors
 - Regional actors
 - Systemic level
 - At the systemic level much in common with the responsibility to protect (die Schutzverantwortung)
 - I want to use R2P to explain and promote my theory of morally mandatory securitization

R2P

- 'The Responsibility to Protect – known as R2P – is an international norm that seeks to ensure that the international community never again fails to halt the mass atrocity crimes of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity'.
- <https://www.globalr2p.org/what-is-r2p/>

History

- Rwanda and Kosovo
- Non-action
- Relevance of UNSC?





THE RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT

REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL
COMMISSION ON INTERVENTION AND
STATE SOVEREIGNTY

ICISS

- Responsibility to prevent
- Responsibility to react
- Responsibility to rebuild
- Range of issues



¶138
&139

- Responsibility of states and responsibility of the international community to prevent and act on atrocity crimes, if peaceful means are exhausted, by forcible means

Eventually:

PILLAR ONE

- Every state has the Responsibility to Protect its populations from four mass atrocity crimes: genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing.

PILLAR TWO

- The wider international community has the responsibility to encourage and assist individual states in meeting that responsibility.

PILLAR THREE

- If a state is manifestly failing to protect its populations, the international community must be prepared to take appropriate collective action, in a timely and decisive manner and in accordance with the UN Charter. (text from <https://www.globalr2p.org/what-is-r2p/>)

3 shortcomings

People erroneously think that Pillar three = armed intervention (and that responsibility to react is about war)

Problems associated with armed intervention (mission creep; abuse; fear of being invaded etc)

Inaction (selectivity)

Limited scope (why atrocity crimes only and not other threats, climate disaster etc)

Morally mandatory securitization

- **My theory can deal with these shortcomings and refocus R2P away from armed humanitarian intervention.**
- What is morally mandatory securitization?
- First,
- What is securitization?
- What is just securitization?
- Securitization = the identification (usually in language) of existential threats **and** the adoption of extraordinary emergency measures

Securitization



Securitization is threat dependent, but...

- There is always



UNGA75 HIGH-LEVEL SIDE EVENT

Protecting Human Rights During the COVID-19 Crisis and Beyond: Digital Pandemic Surveillance and the Right to Privacy

5 OCTOBER 2020 10:00AM-11:30AM EDT

WATCH LIVE: <https://www.un.org/unga75-side-event>

CO-ORGANIZED BY

UNITED NATIONS HUMAN RIGHTS OFFICE
OHCHR

ACCESSNOW

CO-SPONSORED BY

Permanent Mission of Finland to the United Nations
British Embassy in the United Kingdom
Delegation of the European Union to the United Nations
Permanent Mission of the Republic of Korea to the United Nations

Just initiation of securitization

- 1. Just reason: there must be a current objective existential threat to a referent object, that is to say a danger that, threatens the survival or the essential character/properties of either a social or political order, an ecosystem, a non-human species or individuals
- Objective existential threat not fact-relative but evidence-relative.
- Existential does not mean lethal



Just initiation continued

- 2. Just referent object: Only objectively valuable referent objects are morally justifiable and on that basis eligible for self or other-defence. Referents are morally justifiable if they meet basic human needs of autonomy and physical health.
- 3. Right intention: The securitizing actor must be sincere in their intention to rescue the referent object
- 4. Proportionality: Securitization cannot cause more harm than it seeks to prevent.
- 5. Reasonable chance of success: Securitization must be expected to have a greater chance at achieving just cause than less harmful alternatives.

The Duty to secure: From just to mandatory securitization

- Securitization is **not** a moral duty when it is permissible
- Securitization is **supererogatory** when it is morally permissible (good to do, but not wrong not to do)
- (there is value in autonomy, at this stage ...)
- Securitization becomes obligatory (right to do and wrong not to do) when other less harmful options have been tried and failed to satisfy just cause (last resort)
- Obligation requires Greater certainty than permissibility
- Criterion 5 JST: Reasonable chance of success: Securitization must be expected to have a greater chance at achieving just cause than less harmful alternatives.
- Last resort + just institution of securitization (bar reasonable chance of success) = must cause


Which actors?

- In international relations many actors have a duty to secure (not securitize)
- States towards citizens
- NATO towards allies
- The UNSC towards people without a protector
- And so on
- These duties are triggered by different things: contractual, culpability, relationship + capability
- Duties extent to outsiders
- Non-contractual duties are pro-tanto duties (they can be overridden)

International level

- UNSC most significant actor
- Must secure those that have no protector
- If must cause is satisfied with recourse to securitization
- R2P similar.
- Responsibility to prevent (political and securitizing measures) while responsibility to react (securitizing and war-like measures)



A large orange circle is positioned on the left side of the slide, partially overlapping the white background.

What does
MS bring to
R2P?

1. Advantage

Refocuses R2P away from war and towards reactive and direct preventative measures short of war (sanctions, embargoes, denial of membership etc).

2. Advantage

- Must cause offers a clearer threshold than 'conscious shocking atrocity crimes'



3. Advantage

- Not limited to atrocity crimes.



To conclude

- MS enables R2P to be **more timely, less controversial, more effective** and **more in line** with the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty's (ICISS) ideal of R2P, which first introduced the concept

- Thank you!