IAS Institute of Advanced Studies

UNIVERSITY OF SURREY

An international multidisciplinary symposium

On the Receiving End of Intervention: Methods in Human Security

cii - The Centre for International Intervention, School of Politics

University of Surrey
16 - 17 June 2014

Historic Palestine meets social media - Image by C. Gillespie

BRITISH ACADEMY
THE UK'S NATIONAL ACADEMY FOR THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

AL-AZHAR UNIVERSITY-GAZA

BIRZEIT UNIVERSITY

CFCCS

FMK Fakultet za medije i komunikacije

BRITISH COUNCIL

About Us

cii - The Centre for International Intervention

cii – the Centre for International Intervention at the University of Surrey – is an initiative designed to provide critical scrutiny of the range of interventions used in international relations today. These include developmental projects situated within peace building/state building operations in conflict-affected and "fragile" states, military intervention and humanitarian assistance in situations of extreme crisis, and 'softer' forms of intervention such as mediation and diplomacy. cii's purpose is to develop an in-depth, solid, understanding of how interveners conceptualise, rationalise, and operationalise their interventions, of the response from recipient communities, and of the consequences for both. It undertakes this task with the aim of enhancing both academic and practical understanding of intervention.

cii provides a forum for the exchange of ideas, research, and data to enable local and international stakeholders from diverse fields and backgrounds to "make sense of international intervention" in line with the above perspective. It achieves this by carrying out innovative multi-disciplinary research into theoretical and practical dimensions of international intervention, developing strong collaborative links with other institutions involved in the study and practice of intervention, and organising workshops and conferences aimed at feeding back insights to relevant bodies and to inform future research in the area. This is done by producing briefs for different audiences including academics, policy-makers, the military, NGOs, and the corporate sector.

Within cii, the project, entitled "On the Receiving End: towards more critical and inclusive perspectives on international intervention", directed by Marie Breen-Smyth in Surrey and Helga Baumgarten in Birzeit has build a teaching and research partnership between Birzeit University in Palestine, Al Azhar-Gaza University, the Center for Comparative Conflict Studies (CFCCS) at the Faculty of Media and Communications, Singidunum University in Serbia and the University of Surrey in Guildford in the UK.

The project has supported critical work on international intervention, evaluated how international intervention has been practised, documented local voices in areas that have experienced international intervention and compared these with the views of policy makers in the UK. Following research training, students in the three locations are in the process of developing written and audio-visual course materials on intervention based on their conduct of this primary research and on their reading of the literature. Research training and film-making facilities in these locations have recorded some of this work. Summer-schools and teaching on intervention and on research methods have been delivered in Belgrade, Birzeit and Surrey. Some of this work will be presented at this event.

Executive Director: Professor Sir Michael Aaronson

Academic Director: Professor Marie Breen-Smyth

Welcome

Dear Delegate,

We are delighted to welcome you to the University of Surrey's School of Politics and to the Centre for International Intervention in particular. We hope that at this symposium you will meet some of the people we have been working with over the past few years and have the opportunity to exchange views and develop ideas during our time together.

We particularly wish to welcome our colleagues from Birzeit University and Al-Azhar-Gaza in the Palestinian Territories, from the Center for Comparative Conflict Studies (CFCCS) at FMK Singidunum University, Belgrade/Serbia, from the Oxford Research Group, the International Committee of the Red Cross, other organisations and to those of you who are meeting us for the first time. During the course of the two days, two general themes will be addressed:

Day 1 - How can the impact of intervention and non-intervention be researched and/or taught? How can 'receiving end' perspectives be included? What are the implications for insider and outsider researchers?

Day 2 - Impact of interventions on Human Security - how do we understand international intervention in the context of the security of populations? What methods are available to researchers to assess the effects of conflict? Can such methods transcend state centric security perspectives?

We hope that during your time at Surrey, you will meet old friends, make some new ones, discuss some important ideas and hatch up plans for future collaboration and important work. If there is anything we can do to assist you during your time here, or if you wish to follow up with us later after the symposium, do not hesitate to contact me.

Professor Marie Breen-Smyth
Associate Dean International FAHS
Professor of International Politics and Director of Research
School of Politics, University of Surrey

Programme

VENUE: Wates House, Firs Room

DAY 1: 16 JUNE 2014

08.30 09.00 **Breakfast and Registration**

09.00 09.30 **Marie Breen-Smyth:**
Welcome & Setting the Agenda for Human Security: University of Surrey

09.30 10.15 **Keynote Speaker 1:** Lord John Alderdice
"Paradox and Counterparadox in Human Security"

10.15 10.45 **Opening Plenary: Setting the Agenda for Human Security**

10.45 11.15 **Coffee and networking**

11.15 12.45 **Panel 1: Recording Casualties: methods**

12.45 13.30 **Lunch**

13.30 15.00 **Panel 2: On the Receiving End of International Intervention - 1**

15.00 15.30 **Coffee and Refreshments**

15.30 17.00 **Panel 3: On the Receiving End of International Intervention - 2**

17.00 18.15 **Film 1: "**Missing in Pakistan"
Discussant: Annie Waqar
Film 2: "Health care in danger: The human cost"
Discussant: Helen Murphy

17.00 18.15 **SIMULTANEOUS MEETING: Initial Meeting of ESRC bid team**

18.15 19.00 **Reception (The Lewis Elton Gallery)**

19.00 **Dinner (The Refectory)**

VENUE: Wates House, Treetops

DAY 2: 17 JUNE 2014

Operationalising the Human Security Agenda: Theory and practice in sub-state security

08.45 09.00 Coffee

09.00 09.30 **Keynote Speaker 2:** Edward Newman:
"Operationalising Human Security: Reconciling Critical Aspirations with Political Realities"

09.30 10.00 **Questions**

10.00 10.15 **Coffee and networking**

10.15 11.45 **Panel 4: Operationalising Human Security - 1**

11.45 13.00 **Film 3:** "Injured": On those injured in Northern Ireland conflict
Discussant: Ann Gallagher

12.00 13.00 **SIMULTANEOUS MEETING: ESRC bid team**

13.00 13.45 **Lunch**

13.45 15.15 **Panel 5: Operationalising Human Security - 2**

15.15 15.45 **Coffee and Refreshments**

15.45 16.30 **Round Table: Furrukh Khan, Hamit Dardagan, Mkhaimar Abusada, Basem Ezbidi, Elizabeth Minor, Chair: Marie Breen Smyth "Operationalising Human Security in Context"**

16.30 **Closing Plenary**

Keynote 1

Paradox and Counterparadox in Human Security

Lord John Alderdice, *House of Lords, UK*

In this keynote address Lord Alderdice will present examples of how the usual governmental approaches to Human Security may have counter-productive effects. In particular he will show the errors of the so-called 'realpolitik' model, which treats communities in conflict as rational actors whose behaviour can be modified by forceful interventions using physical sanctions and socio-economic drivers. Instead he will propose that in contexts of existential threat individuals and groups become devoted actors driven by 'sacred values'. Appreciation of these apparently paradoxical findings opens the door to a different set of understandings and interventions, which he will outline from his practice in dealing with intractable conflicts.

Bionote:

Lord John Alderdice *is a medical doctor, psychiatrist and psychotherapist who has been active in politics since the 1970s. He was a key negotiator of the Good Friday Agreement in Northern Ireland. He sits as a Liberal Democrat in the House of Lords and has substantial experience of political conflict and international terrorism and is currently focusing on the Middle East. In 2006 he was appointed to the Commonwealth Commission on Respect and Understanding.*

Keynote 2

Operationalizing Human Security: Reconciling Critical Aspirations with Political 'Realities'

Edward Newman, *Leeds University, UK*

According to the principle of human security, the referent object and beneficiary of security analysis and policy should be individuals and communities. The concept has had some success as a rallying theme for human-centred policy movements and it is an important normative reference point for policy interventions in areas such as development assistance and peace-building. However, it has not been broadly welcomed by theoretically critical security studies scholars for a number of reasons. Most importantly, there is a fundamental paradox at the heart of human security in terms of its policy operationalization. In its pure form human security calls for a critique of the structures and norms that produce human insecurity, yet the ontological starting point of most human security analysis and its policy orientation assume the inevitability and legitimacy of these structures and norms. Is this paradox inevitable? Can 'progressive' ideas have an impact upon structural realities – or can they meaningfully have an impact upon individual lives and 'do good' without changing the structural sources of deprivation? Is human security destined to remain an inadequate policy movement without critical theoretical credibility – or can it be saved? This paper will consider these questions twenty years after the UN Development Programme's landmark Human Development Report put the concept onto the international agenda.

Bionote:

Edward Newman *writes on international security studies, broadly defined, including theoretical security studies, critical approaches and 'human security'; intrastate armed conflict, civil war, intervention and political violence; international organizations and multilateralism; and peace-building and reconstruction in conflict-prone and post-conflict societies.*

Abstracts

Panel 1: Recording Casualties: Methods

Respondent: Furrukh Khan **Chair: Ann Gallagher**

The Challenges Of Auditing Injury Due To Armed Conflict. Marie Breen Smyth, *University of Surrey, UK*
The importance and methods of accounting for casualties of armed conflict have been the subjects of recent influential studies and campaigns by the Oxford Research Group and Action on Armed Violence and previous research on both death and injury due to armed conflict by this author. This paper argues for the relevance of including non-fatal injury in such casualty counts, pointing to the significance of the inclusion or omission of injury in measures of the social, economic, political and personal costs of armed conflict. Drawing on an earlier study on injury in the Northern Ireland conflict, the paper outlines the two main challenges facing those who would include injury in such casualty counts: the difficulty of defining what counts as injury and where the limits and boundaries of any definition might lie; and the challenge of designing a methodology for operationalising such a definition in very diverse international settings and in fields where hot conflict might be ongoing. The paper concludes by outlining a study which aims to overcome these difficulties and meet these challenges.

The Field Of Casualty Recording: A Spectrum Of Approaches. Elizabeth Minor, *Oxford Research Group, UK*
Casualty recording is the attempted comprehensive, systematic and continuous documentation of individual deaths and/or injuries from armed violence and the incidents in which these occur, with the public release of this information as long as it is safe to do so. Fundamental to the dignity and recognition of victims, casualty recording also provides ways of understanding and addressing violence. Concentrating on methods for recording the casualties of armed conflict, this paper proposes that there is a broad field of casualty recording, made up of a connected range of different approaches, which can be implemented both during and post conflict to the benefit of conflict-affected populations. The information produced by casualty recording can serve a variety of purposes, from academic analysis and the development of evidence-based violence reduction policies, to supporting justice and accountability procedures. The information and analysis in this paper is drawn from Oxford Research Group's original research with casualty recording practitioners.

Accounting For Civilian Casualties: From The Past To The Future. Mike Spagat, *Royal Holloway and Oxford Research Group/* Nicholas P. Jewell, *University of California, Berkeley/* Britta Jewell*, Imperial College, UK*
We draw a sharp distinction between the estimation and the documentation of civilian war casualties. We provide a historical overview of both estimation and documentation, including extended discussion of the US Civil War and World War 1. Next is a discussion and critique of the five main methodologies to account for civilian casualties and a look at the future of the field.

The Inconstant Value Of A Civilian Life. Chris Woods, *Freelance Journalist (formerly Bureau of Investigative Journalism), UK*
Post 9/11 conflicts involving the United States and other Western powers have been characterised by significant ambiguity towards civilian non-combatants. This can be illustrated via the war in Afghanistan and related US operations in Pakistan. A hierarchy of risk existed for civilians, dependent upon which pro-government forces might be involved in any operation – and which side of the international border any such actions might take place. Despite US covert actions in Pakistan having mainly transitioned by 2008 to operations related to the Afghan war for example, major differences in Non-Combatant Values, in Rules of Engagement and in interpretations of IHL led to significantly differing risks to non-combatants. Within Afghanistan, various Coalition partners operated under differing Rules of Engagement – and ROEs even differed radically between various units of US troops. Many variables were therefore in play regarding potential risk to civilians. Yet these were often incalculable – with non-combatants often unaware of which Coalition force or even which Rules of Engagement any kinetic action might involve. ISAF began prioritising with some success a major reduction in civilian casualties, which according to UN monitors was achieved through greater transparency and accountability. There remains a concern that any 'post-2014' international contingent – most likely a mix of Special Forces and armed drones – would be far less accountable than ISAF forces, with associated greater risks for non-combatants. In this paper I explore these many complex issues.

Panel 2: On the Receiving End of International Intervention: 1

Respondent: Maxine David **Chair: Krisztina Racz**

"We Want Intervention, Don't We?" Palestinian Students And International Intervention In The Israeli-Palestinian Conflict. Helga Baumgarten and Maisaa Aldarsa, *Birzeit University, Palestine*
Against the background of an analysis of the political positions of the PLO leadership towards international intervention, this contribution is based on interviews with students at Birzeit University on the question of intervention. After an introductory lecture on intervention covering the present international discussion, students were asked to present their position on intervention. In the first round of interviews, perhaps not unsurprisingly, students were asking for intervention and could only see positive outcomes as a result of intervention. However, depending on their political/ideological orientations, some supported intervention in Syria and Libya, but opposed it in Iraq. Others opposed intervention in Libya and Iraq, but asked for it in Syria. Presently, students are doing in-depth readings before we'll move to the second round of interviews. As this is work-in-progress, we will only be able to present our final findings during the workshop in Surrey.

The Butt Of Non-Intervention: Bosnian And Syrian Responses To Partial Or Minimal Intervention. Gregory Kent, *Roehampton, UK*
In the 90s Bosnians begged their European neighbours for intervention against the Serbian military machine. For most of the war they felt betrayed by the UNPROFOR operations to provide humanitarian aid, 'keeping us alive, to be murdered later' was how many described the 'international community's' contribution. During the last three years, Syrians in revolt against their repressive government, have made similar calls, and bitterly identified a corresponding sense of bad faith on the part of the western democracies. In both cases intervention (of sorts) took place – albeit less so in Syria - just not the kind of full humanitarian intervention or even the 'lift and strike' alternative so readily requested by the Sarajevans… and (in very similar terms) even the original peace activists in Homs or Hama, let alone FSA fighters, demanded a No-Fly Zone and arms to take on Assad's airforce. This paper, based on primary interview material from Syrian participants in the revolution and conflict in 2013 (in Jordan and on the Syrian border in Lebanon) and the reflections of Bosnians from earlier years, draws out similarities and differences, key tensions and anomalies of those increasingly rancorous at the failure to secure a deus ex machina redemption they so longed for.

Understanding Experiences Of Civil Violence Against The Emergency Services: The Paramedics' Story. Helen Murphy, *University of East London, UK*
Recent epistemological paradigms in psychology as a discipline have begun to move from empiricist to phenomenological paradigms with the addition of a now populist and plastic research methodology known as Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA). The methodology was employed to document the experiences of paramedics in Northern Ireland when carrying out their duties during the height of the Troubles and also during the 'post-peace' period of the noughties when ambulance personnel have come under attack from community groups during periods of civil strife. The paper presents the experiences of five paramedic staff with over 100 years of on-the-ground experience and locates their accounts within the changing political landscape of Northern Ireland, bolstering our understandings of the experiences of public health workers who operate in sites of conflict. The paper will close with considerations given to IPA as a research methodology in documenting such experiences, the role of the identity of the researcher in the

Abstracts

process and finally, using qualitative methodologies to locate armed conflict as a public health issue on the international agenda.

The Role Of Casualty Recording In Multilateral Interventions. Hana Salama, *Oxford Research Group, UK*
UN peacekeeping operations are a common form of multilateral intervention in conflict. Most peacekeeping operations, mandated by the UN Security Council have a Protection of Civilians mandate where peacekeepers are mandated to "protect civilians under imminent threat of physical violence." However assessment of this threat is often lacking and peacekeeping operations lack detailed information regarding civilian casualties (deaths and injuries) where they operate. This type of information can potentially be extremely useful to planning and conducting protection activities across military, civilian and police components of the mission. Drawing on the findings of Oxford Research Group recent report on the UN's role in casualty recording and the case of UNAMA's relative success of using casualty data to better protect civilians, this presentation will give recommendation on how both member states and the UN could mobilise to implement casualty recording, a practice which has been recognised by the Secretary General as an emerging good practice to support the protection of civilians in conflict.

Panel 3: On the Receiving End of International Intervention: 2

Respondent: Ciaran Gillespie **Chair: Orli Fridman**

International Law, Intervention And Global Geopolitics In The Middle East. Samer Abboud, *Arcadia University, USA*
International intervention in the Middle East has taken on multiple forms. Although the literature on humanitarian intervention is relatively developed in terms of assessing a broad range of questions about the legitimate use of force, the law itself tends to be regarded as neutral, ignoring its instrumental use as a form of intervention. In this paper, our primary research question is: How has international law been marshalled as a form of intervention in the Middle East? In addressing this question, we will expose the limits of the existing literature on intervention, which tends to consider a series of humanitarian considerations justifying the sovereign breach. Drawing on the example of the Special Tribunal for Lebanon (STL) we argue that this form of intervention destabilizes and delegitimizes the sovereignty of the Lebanese state. By internationalising the adjudication of a domestic crime, the STL makes possible the advancement of regional geopolitical interests through international legal mechanisms, undermining the legitimacy of the Lebanese state and its sovereign capacities. Such legal interventions ultimately serve to restructure domestic politics in a manner not altogether different than international humanitarian and military interventions, such as Iraq and many others, with robust plans for domestic political and socio-economic overhaul.

Aerial Intervention In Pakistan And Human Security. Wali Aslam, *University of Bath, UK*
This paper studies the consequences of terrorist relocation from the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (or FATA) of Pakistan to the rest of the country due to American drone strikes. This relocation comes at a major cost to the terrorists' new host communities, who become their next targets, as these individuals continue their lethal activities once they move out of their tribal hideouts. The paper starts by asking who bears responsibility for the harmful consequences of terrorists' relocation when they are displaced but continue their lethal activities elsewhere. It consults the Critical Security approach to argue that the irresponsible drone strikes conducted by the US and the 'double games' played by Pakistan's army, that sometime necessitate those strikes, have negative implications for ordinary Pakistani citizens who are at the receiving end of the violence perpetrated by the terrorists dislocated from FATA. The paper highlights the need for a critical approach to fully evaluate the consequences of America's aerial involvement in Pakistan, for individuals as well as societies. By focusing on those at the receiving end of America's aerial intervention, the paper will also highlight the necessity of a stronger engagement with the notion of human security to fully appreciate the consequences of any intervention.

Security Sector Reform, Authoritarianism And The Paradoxes Of International Engagement: The Case Of The Occupied Palestinian Territories. Tahani Mustafa, *School of Oriental and African Studies, UK*
Security Sector Reform (SSR) has become the cornerstone of the Oslo-declared state-building project and the latest iteration of external intervention in the Arab region. Supported financially and politically by the international community, SSR has influenced the content of international programmes for development assistance, security cooperation and democracy promotion. The bedrock of SSR's conceptual framework is its holistic understanding of the security sector, the main objective of which is human rather than regime security. However, contrary to the way it is commonly perceived, SSR is not a politically benign model. It is highly intrusive and has increasingly become the dominant framework for Great Power intervention in and regulation of non-western societies. Unlike the current critical discourse on SSR, this presentation will explicitly acknowledge the political dimension of SSR in the oPt, scrutinising the conceptual apparatus from which SSR draws much of its substance and legitimacy. It will critically examine the role international donors have played in the design and implementation of the program, and how and why concepts of human security, good governance and human rights have been utilised if not fully operationalised to illuminate the inherent socio-political paradox SSR has created on the ground, a reality that diverges substantially from conventional understandings of security and statehood, and effectively negates the emancipatory potential SSR purports to provide.

Panel 4: Operationalising Human Security: 1

Respondent: John Alderdice **Chair: Adele Stanislaus**

Memories Of The 1999 Nato Bombing In Belgrade, Serbia. Orli Fridman, FMK, *Singidunum University, Belgrade, Serbia*
This paper analyses local memories of residents of Belgrade of the 1999 NATO bombing of Serbia (then still Yugoslavia). By focusing on the memories of this event, yet placing them in a broader context of the conflicts of the 1990s – the break-up of the country and the post-Yugoslav wars – this essay explores what international intervention has meant to respondents in Belgrade and documents memories of international intervention among older and younger generations, as well as active members of anti-war NGOs in Serbia, and citizens who were not engaged in activism in the period of the 1990s. By focusing on the memories of the 1999 NATO bombing this paper aims at extending the scope of the discussions on dealing with the past and transitional justice and place them in the context of social memory studies. Even more specifically as related to the case study of Serbia, the text contributes to the analysis of local mnemonic battles as part of the creation of the collective memories of the 1990s in Post- Miloševi**ć** Serbia.

Trauma Or Entertainment? Collective Memories Of The Nato Bombing Of Serbia. Krisztina Racz, *University of Ljubljana, Slovenia*
This paper addresses the absence of trauma and the creation of a collective memory among the contributors of the journal Symposion following the 1999 bombing of Serbia. The paper explores how the community's collective memory is created and what place within it does the non-acknowledged trauma occupy. Through an examination of the e-mails and conducting interviews with members of this group, it is argued that the shared narrative patterns about and the everyday activities during the air-raids constitute a mnemonic community, and that their shared cultural frameworks create a space for remembering. The paper highlights the manner in which the community's dynamics, their social position and ethnic belonging contribute towards the creation of a collective memory.

Abstracts

Panel 5: Operationalising Human Security: 2

Respondent: Helga Baumgarten Chair: Basem Ezbidi

A Gender Perspective Of Human Security In Bosnia-Herzegonvina: Freedom From Want Vs Freedom From Fear. Gorkem Atsungur, *American University of Central Asia, Kyrgyz Republic*
This article will seek to explain the concepts of human security in Bosnia-Herzegovina since the Yugoslav wars from a gendered approach. It focuses on how women in Bosnia insecure and under risks from all types of conflicts: freedom from fear (poverty, lack of state capacity, damages from violent conflicts, etc.) vs. freedom from want (hunger, disease, etc.) during and after the Bosnian war. The concept of human security promotes and protects human rights, including women rights. It empowers individuals and societies for establishing security; therefore, people contribute solutions to conflicts and insecurity. Women during the Bosnian war (1992-1995) were subjected to specific forms of violence and crime whether organized by the (other) state institutions and/or other ethnic groups. As many as fifty thousand Bosnian women were raped, leading to the first conviction for sexual violence The main research question is; to what extent does gender based violence threaten human security in Bosnia since the Yugoslav wars?

Revisiting 'Human Security' In Critical Security Studies. Ciaran Gillespie, *University of Surrey, UK*
In the post-Cold War period, the shift in focus from the state to the individual as the primary referent in security studies has been significant. The mainstreaming of concepts like 'Human Security' has had influence over major international security norms such as 'responsibility to protect'. While critics have pointed to Human Security's lack of practical applicability, the concept has been adopted as a policy guideline for many states and NGOs. While there are deep-seated differences in approach to Human Security across the spectrum of security studies, this paper argues that a recognition of these differences can aid in the future operationalisation of the concept. By looking at how each perspective understands the problem, it is possible to identify the particular schools of thought that might be able move the concept forward. It concludes that while Human Security presents a range of difficult political and analytical problems, as a normative framework it still represents the most promising critical security policy agenda to date.

Reframing Objects As Subjects: Local Agency In International Intervention In The Balkans. Mary Martin, Denisa Kostovicova, Vesna Bojicic-Dzelilovic, Sally Stares, *London School of Economics, UK*
Human security approaches to post-conflict reconstruction have to address key questions of agency, in order to be consistent with the shift towards individuals' security interests, and the normative promise of human security to be emancipatory and empowering. Rethinking agency challenges conventional state-centric methods of analysis, as well as programmatic interventions, to instead respect people as active subjects of reconstruction. This paper draws on recent research projects in the Western Balkans to highlight structured dialogue as both a research tool and a policy framework which can give a more meaningful role to local constituencies. The paper examines three ways in which dialogue can enhance agency in post-conflict reconstruction: in taking account of multi-actor relationships and concomitant power imbalances which characterise external interventions; in adapting to constantly changing facts on the ground; and to critique and overcome limitations in traditional methodologies for assessing and analysing security, both quantitative and qualitative.

Roundtable

Mkhaimar Abusada, Al-Azhar University Gaza, Palestine.
Hamit Dardagan, Oxford Research Group, UK.
Basem Ezbidi, Birzeit University, Palestine.
Furrukh Khan, Lahore University of Management Sciences, Pakistan.
Elizabeth Minor, Oxford Research Group, UK.
Chair: Marie Breen Smyth

Participants

Sameer Abboud, Arcadia University, UK
abbouds@arcadia.edu

Mkhaimar Abusada, Al-Azhar University, Gaza, Palestine
abusada@hotmail.com

Maisaa Aldarsa, Birzeit University, Palestine
Maisaa.darsa@gmail.com

Lord John Alderdice, House of Lords, UK
alderdicej@parliament.uk

Wali Aslam, University of Bath, UK
w.aslam@bath.ac.uk

Gorkem Atsungur, American University of Central Asia, Kyrgyz Republic
atsungur_g@mail.auc.kg

Helga Baumgarten, Birzeit University, Palestine
baumgartenhelga@gmail.com

Marie Breen Smyth, University of Surrey
m.breen-smyth@surrey.ac.uk

Sarah Cotton, International Committee of the Red Cross
scotton@icrc.org

Hamit Dardagan, Oxford Research Group, UK
hamit.dardagan@oxfordresearchgroup.org. uk

Maxine David, University of Surrey, UK
m.david@surrey.ac.uk

Basem Ezbidi, Birzeit University, Palestine
bezbidi@gmail.com

Jane Fielding, University of Surrey
j.fielding@surrey.ac.uk

Orli Fridman, FMK, Singidunum University, Serbia
orli.fridman@fmk.edu.rs

Ann Gallagher, University of Surrey,UK
a.gallagher@surrey.ac.uk

Ciaran Gillespie, University of Surrey, UK
gillespie ct@surrey.ac.uk

Vanda Green, University of Surrey,UK
vg00007@surrey.ac.uk

Gregory Kent, Roehampton University, UK
g.kent@roehampton.ac.uk

Furrukh Khan, Lahore University of Management Sciences, Pakistan
furrukh@lums.edu.pk

Denisa Kostovicova, London School of Economics, UK
d.kostovicova@lse.ac.uk

Elizabeth Minor, Oxford Research Group, UK
elizabeth.minor@oxfordresearchgroup.org.uk

Helen Murphy, University of East London, UK
h.murphy@uel.ac.uk

Tahani Mustafa, School of Oriental and African Studies, UK
211545@soas.ac.uk

Edward Newman, University of Leeds, UK
e.newman@leeds.ac.uk

Krisztina Racz, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia.
krracz@gmail.com

Hana Salama, Oxford Research Group,UK
hana.salama@oxfordresearchgroup.org

Mike Spagat, Royal Holloway University of London,UK
m.spagat@rhul.edu.rs

Adele Stanislaus, University of Surrey,UK
a.stanislaus@surrey.ac.uk

Sally Stares, London School of Economics, UK
s.stares@lse.ac.uk

Annie Waqar, University of Surrey, UK
s.waqar@surrey.ac.uk

Chris Woods, Freelance Journalist, UK
freelance.woods@gmail.com

Notes

6541-0514

Faculty of Arts and Human Sciences

School of Politics
University of Surrey
Guildford, Surrey GU2 7XH UK

surrey.ac.uk/politics