
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In 2002, there were approximately 30 conflicts worldwide.¹

In 2003, there were 19 major armed conflicts.²

In 2003, there were 27,314 reported deaths as a result of political violence.³

According to a recently published, but contested, Lancet survey, there have been 654,965 excess war-related deaths since the 2003 invasion of Iraq.⁴

In 2004, global defense expenditures totaled more than \$1 trillion.⁵

The cost of the war in Iraq has reached some \$320 billion.⁶

Some 300,000 child soldiers are involved in more than 30 conflicts worldwide.⁷

In 2004, there were at least 11 international tribunals and countries prosecuting grave human-rights abuses.⁸

Nearly one-fifth, 19.4 percent, of the population of the developing world was living on less than \$1 per day in 2002.⁹

If we are to have any hope of improving these numbers, we need to devise ways of addressing the root causes of the multitude of security challenges facing us. This book contributes to this aim by setting out a new security principle. Its inception owes much to the numerous contributions of those academics and practitioners who have called into question the primacy of the state and the military in both academic and practical approaches to security. The search for more adequate approaches to security has taken a number of turns over the last decade and a half. Some have emphasized the possibility of overcoming the negative implications of international anarchy through collective

security, thus not fully abandoning the traditional focus on the state and the military. Others have distanced themselves further from the traditional security paradigm by widening the scope of security to include sectors other than the military. In addition, the emergence of a human-security paradigm has called into question the habitual focus on the state as the object that is to be secured to an even greater extent, arguing that the individual, and not the state, should be the primary focus of security. Others still have combined dimensions of all of the above.

Today, it seems fair to say that it is widely recognized that security involves more than the accumulation of military power. Most policy makers and academics would not argue with the claim that security may be enhanced through, for example, increased police cooperation, institution-building within new states, and the democratic reform of armed forces. Moreover, many would go a step further and claim that human security should be at the center of our attention and of policy agendas. These advancements notwithstanding, we propose an even more comprehensive approach to security. This requires outlining a more complete classification of global security that allows for the consideration of a number of referent objects of security. It also means developing a framework for the pursuit of security that focuses on issues other than those linked to the use of military force.

The next section contains a discussion of the new approaches to security that have served to change the field of Security Studies, as well as an assessment of their contributions to the reconceptualization of security. The subsequent section sets out the argument made in the book and briefly outlines the chapters.

1. New Approaches to Security

The discipline of International Relations (IR) has traditionally been governed by realist thinking. In the field of Security Studies, the realist security paradigm – the old state-centered and militaristic view of security – has reigned supreme for many years. According to the realist approach, states are the primary source of both security and insecurity. According to the proponents of this view, states will inevitably suffer from insecurity as long as there is no overarching authority structure in the international system. In the absence of a higher political authority that can guarantee security, states, which are assumed to be rational entities, will make similar strategic calculations. Each will

seek to acquire military power in order to deter an attack. Since no supranational authority exists, states have only themselves to rely on for security, making the international security system a self-help system characterized by the security dilemma.¹⁰

The “logic” of the security dilemma has been contested by those informed by liberal or idealistic principles, who contend that the negative implications of international anarchy can be modified through the creation of rules and norms that govern state behavior, such as that informing the practice of *collective security*, for example. Yet, despite the tremendous contribution of the United Nations (UN) to global security and stability, the concept of collective security does not depart significantly from the traditional security paradigm’s military- and state-centrism. As the Cold War came to an end, the preoccupation with interstate conflict gave way to a number of other security issues, such as intrastate conflict. A number of other issues were also recognized as security concerns, including illegal immigration, environmental degradation, organized criminality, and terrorism. As a result, a greater departure from the traditional approach to security was thought to be required.

Accordingly, a debate ensued between those seeking to broaden the scope of Security Studies and those who sought to preserve a narrower focus.¹¹ Those in favor of widening the agenda argued that issues traditionally associated with domestic policy, such as health, the environment, immigration, and rights, ought to be viewed as global security issues. Given this altered focus, the means of achieving security necessarily extended beyond the use of force and deterrence. An increasing number of IR scholars, including some neo-realists, called for a widening of the security agenda. For example, the Copenhagen School sought to set out a framework for security capable of incorporating a wider security agenda. It aimed to establish a more radical view of Security Studies by including both military and non-military issues and the securitization of those threats (i.e., a way of distinguishing security from merely political issues). Their so-called *sectoral approach* classified security into five principal substrates: military, political, economic, environmental, and societal security.¹²

Efforts to increase the scope of security have been accompanied by attempts to challenge the military- and state-centrism of the traditional security paradigm on a more fundamental level through the *concept of human security*, which refocuses security on the individual rather than the state. By focusing on the individual, the numerous

ways that human welfare is affected by different phenomena, such as environmental degradation, poor governance, and organized crime, could more adequately be captured.

Many of the issues rendered more visible by a widening of the security agenda and the concept of human security were transboundary in nature in that they transgress the boundaries of individual states and thus affect a number of states at once. This means that effectively addressing such security challenges requires cooperation between states. In many respects, in response to the realization that states needed to cooperate in order to tackle many of the multifarious security challenges identified during the post-Cold War era, a *cooperative-security concept* was elaborated in the late 1990s. According to this concept, national security was no longer just a national concern; rather, it was also transnational in that no state can claim or achieve security through its own efforts alone. In elaborate form, cooperative security combined many dimensions of all of the above efforts to reconceptualize security, but it went beyond each individual contribution. It went further than the concept of collective security in that it emphasized achieving security with other states, as well as against them when necessary.¹³ In some versions, it called for cooperation between states not only in efforts to tackle transnational security challenges, but also to promote human security within a zone of cooperative security, as well as beyond it.

Security through cooperation is imperative in a world in which threats to security are often transnational. Transnational security threats are non-military in nature and transcend a number of state borders, threatening the political, social, or economic integrity of a state. The primary agents driving many transnational threats are often non-state actors, such as criminal and terrorist networks, and traffickers of various kinds. This creates considerable problems for states and state-based arrangements that have been established to deal with more traditional, military-security challenges. It also encapsulates the sense in which national borders demarcating separations between national economies and ethical norms are less important than they once were. The focus on individual or human security, for example, implies that universal human-rights norms override the principle of non-interference that had previously been crucial to state sovereignty.

We propose classifying global security into five substrates: human, environmental, national, transnational, and transcultural security. While analytically separate, there is, of course, a great deal of

overlap between them. Our motivation for this classification is our concern with the human condition, the biosphere, good governance at the state level, the need for cooperation between states, and the cost of suspicion, frustration, and anger as a result of exclusionary collective identities. The first four substrates are, as indicated, represented in one form or another in the above-mentioned approaches to security. These four referents largely capture the essence of both the sectoral and cooperative approaches. However, one facet of global security that has not yet received sufficient attention is transcultural security. In our view, Security Studies should be concerned not only with threats posed to individuals, the environment, and states, but also with cultural and civilizational interactions. Unfortunately, cultural and civilizational questions have been sorely lacking in security thinking, with the exception of the Copenhagen School's concept of societal security, which suggests that there exist within states collective identities that are not necessarily coterminous with the state that may become securitized (i.e., elevated to a security concern). The identification of the security of groups and cultures within states is particularly important within the context of transnational realities, including migration and irregular immigration and xenophobic and exclusionary tendencies in host societies with regard to culture, political beliefs, and religion. A better understanding of different cultures and greater tolerance and respect for diversity could help to prevent or at least mitigate some of the most pressing security concerns of our day.

At the level of the international political community, alliance-building and the coexistence of civilizations are critical when dealing with transnational threats to security. Nevertheless, the end that we have in mind is not simply coexistence between cultural groups and civilizational forms. We argue that a synergy must be found within these cultural groups and civilizational forms, even if competition and non-violent conflict can sometimes generate improvements in the human condition. This is particularly the case in an age of intensified transcultural interaction. When acting together, individual cultures and civilizations can have a greater impact on global security than any individual culture or civilization could when acting independently. Thus, a plurality of cultures can have a net effect on global security that is greater than would be the case if representatives of individual cultures acted individually. This we might think of as transcultural synergy. Transcultural security is a vital component of enhancing

security globally, with the eventual goal of achieving transcultural synergy.

While the means of ensuring that these five aspects of security are achieved are likely to be wide-ranging, we believe that attaining justice should be at the heart of long-term solutions to security issues. The pursuit of justice is, therefore, central to our proposed security principle, **the multi-sum security principle**. In general terms, justice may be defined as the correct distribution of benefits and burdens. What justice may require in the domestic realm has received considerable attention. However, its application to the international sphere is a far more contested subject. Within the context of globalization, debates about global justice have, nevertheless, been underway. Here, justice concerns include the gap between rich and poor, the vulnerability of people to abuse, violence, occupation, exclusion, humiliation, disease, and starvation.

Justice, in our view, is a fundamental security concern. Where injustice is present, feelings of frustration, anger, and humiliation are likely to result. This can lead people to experience alienation from the societies and institutions that are supposed to represent them and extreme forms of behavior. Deploying military force alone in the pursuit of security will not be sufficient or even appropriate in instances where groups, states, or sub-national or supranational non-state cultures feel they are the victims of injustice. People intent on propagating insecurity and instability will find fertile ground for their arguments in places where injustice continues to form part of people's lives.

Of course, this has immediate relevance in relation to the so-called war on terror. While *international terrorism is completely unacceptable, whatever its causes*, confusion resulting from rapid modernization within a globalizing international system has seemed to increase the appeal of messages being propagated by international terrorist networks. In response to a seemingly unjust and largely economic form of globalization, which appears to be accompanied by the spread of a banal form of cosmopolitanism that amounts to little more than consumerism, people may feel that their cultural specificity is under threat. New technologies and increased ease of travel also mean that that people are increasingly aware of what is occurring elsewhere in the world. In addition to enhancing mutual awareness, this may also result in a heightened awareness of injustices as a result of political oppression, abuse, and discrimination. Terrorist networks also thrive

on the failure of states, as well as the international community, to deliver promote some form basic social justice. Seen from this angle, addressing the root causes of international terrorism clearly requires cooperation between states, mostly through non-military means. Military force alone is unlikely to diminish the number of people being recruited daily by international terrorist groups. If we wish to do so, we must recognize the importance of considerations of justice.

The precise form that justice may take is likely to depend on the specifics of particular problems. While it may appear obvious that justice should inform state policies, conflict prevention and conflict resolution, and rebuilding war-torn societies, it is all too often not the case. In order to contribute to global justice, all governments should be committed to international and international humanitarian law without reservations.

Creating the conditions under which lasting security can become a reality will require good governance. At the domestic level, the promotion of justice for individuals, states, and cultures requires a combination of respect for civil liberties, accountability and transparency, protection of the country and population, the pursuit of sustainable growth, tolerance and respect for diversity, and adequate representation of the people. At the regional level, good governance requires the establishment of representative, transparent, and accountable institutions and practices. Good global governance also involves the pursuit of global justice. But the international community as an agency-bearing entity suffers from a number of shortcomings, and possibilities are circumvented by the continued salience of short-sighted conceptions of national interest.

Without justice, security at all levels will prove elusive, because in a globalized world, the security of any state or culture cannot be disconnected from that of others and, therefore, cannot be achieved without ensuring security through *justice* for *all* individuals, states, and cultures, no matter how challenging this may be.

2. A Proposal for a New Security Principle

In an effort to contribute to a more inclusive approach to global security, we wish to propose a new principle of security, which we will call the **multi-sum security principle**, which states that: **“In a globalized world, security can no longer be thought of as a zero-sum game involving states alone. Global security, instead, has five di-**

mensions that include human, environmental, national, transnational, and transcultural security, and, therefore, global security and the security of any state or culture cannot be achieved without good governance at all levels that guarantees security through justice for all individuals, states, and cultures.”

This principle aims not only to promote cooperative interaction between states that looks both inwards and outwards, but also a certain degree of cohesiveness that is required both within and between countries in order to enhance stability and security.

The five dimensions of global security include five substrates of modern security: **human, environmental, national, transnational, and transcultural**. The first is human security, which, as mentioned, refers to the security of individuals. The second is environmental security, which refers to the security of the biosphere. The third is national security, referring to the more traditional economic, societal (state population), political, and military dimensions of national security. The fourth, transnational security, involves security against transnational threats that refer to any type of illegal cross-border movements. The fifth, transcultural security, refers to the integrity of large collective identities.

3. Overview of the Book

The first section of Chapter 2 reviews existing approaches to global security in order to elucidate the points of departure of our proposed new security principle. Then, in the second section, we put forward our own classification of global security. Having proposed this new classification of security, which allows for a variation of referent objects, as well as a variety of means with which to enhance security, we briefly introduce our new security principle, the **multi-sum security principle**.

In Chapter 3, we outline our new classification of global security in greater detail. We argue that global security may be thought of analytically as comprising five dimensions of security. In each of the subsequent sections, we discuss each substrate of global security in turn. Within each respective section, we define our understanding of each substrate, highlight some of the major issues of each of the five dimensions of global security, and specify some of the achievements and outstanding challenges within each substrate.

Chapter 4 focuses on the security implications of injustice and the significance of justice for the advancement of global security. We argue that justice must be viewed as a fundamental security concern. Nevertheless, it is all too often ignored by policy makers, or it is viewed as a question of philosophy rather than national security. As we have highlighted, however, many security challenges are at some level spawned by injustice of one sort or another. For this reason, justice constitutes a vital dimension of our multi-sum security principle. We begin by looking at the relationship between injustice and feelings of frustration, anger, and humiliation. We suggest that such sentiments are generated by alienation, which often provokes extreme forms of action. We then briefly examine some contemporary examples of how real or perceived injustice can help to generate a sense of humiliation, alienation, feelings of frustration, and anger. Lastly, we argue that justice is imperative if lasting security and stability are to be achieved. Thus, we suggest that attempting to deal with many security problems by resorting to the use of military force will not be effective as long as real or perceived injustice continues to exist. This, we argue, is because people who feel alienated also feel dispossessed of their agency, and as long as this is the case they will use whatever means available to them to try to regain it and to be faithful to their true evaluative commitments. Moreover, as long as injustices persist, people who wish to propagate insecurity and instability will find an audience for their ideas, no matter how illogical, futile, or violent. Therefore, without justice, long-term security will be forever ephemeral.

Respect for people's equal worth, whether in terms of identity and dignity or their cultural, ethnic, and religious diversity, is vital to promoting greater justice. Efforts to reduce structural economic and political inequalities that contribute to alienation and possible conflict are also vital to the cause of justice. People are driven to extremes because they cannot express their frustrations, their anger, their hopes, and their fears through regular political channels. The attainment of justice allows people to regain their full agency as human beings capable of defining themselves and their lives in a way that is authentic to them. One of the most vital things to understand when promoting greater justice is the significance of empowerment.

In Chapter 5, we provide a detailed explanation of our new security principle, the *multi-sum security principle*. This principle draws together our proposed classification of global security, which comprises five dimensions of security – human, environmental, na-

tional, transnational, and transcultural security – and the notion that justice is a prerequisite for security. Having outlined the principle, we then explore the relationship between injustice and insecurity within the five substrates of global security and suggest what it might mean to pursue justice in each of our substrates.

The last chapter deals with the question of good governance. At the domestic level, we claim that good governance involves the protection of basic civil and human rights, inclusivity (socioeconomic, cultural, and political), and effective institutions (impartial, transparent, and accountable). In our view, however, good global governance entails overlapping structures of authority. While states are still relevant, they do not form the only locus of authority. Where governance structures at the regional level already exist, they should be participatory, transparent, and accountable, taking on transnational questions that cannot be dealt with adequately at the state level. Where they are still lacking, they should be established. At the global level, we claim that good governance implies the primacy of cosmopolitan law, effective multilateralism and multilateral bodies, economic cosmopolitanism, and the promotion of ways of increasing peaceful coexistence and exchanges between civilizations.