Sustainable Global Security

Nayef AL-RODHAN[1]

Programme Director Geneva Centre for Security Policy

Abstract. There are five inter-related dimensions to global security. Unless all of them are attended to security will not ensue. Human nature is moulded by three factors, only one of which- 'amorality'- can realistically be shaped for the better. Ten non-traditional areas of further research are adduced.

Keywords. human security; environmental security: national security: transnational security; transcultural security: Multi-Sum Security Principle: human nature; emotional amoral egoism; neurophilosophy: symbiotic realism

Introduction

I need to start by congratulating Professor François Géré and his institute (The French Institute for Strategic Analysis, IFAS) as well as his co-partners, the European Science Foundation and NATO for this conference. This is clearly the way to go because security issues are multi-faceted and will require combined efforts like this to gain the necessary insights.

I am both a neuroscientist and a geostrategist and therefore my talk on global security will reflect both of these specialties and I will address three themes:
1. What is global security and how can it be sustained?
2. I will mention a few words about human nature, its neurobiological foundations and its relevance to security and conflict, and
3. I will end with new ideas for political research in response to François' request.

What is global security and how do we sustain it?

In a previous book of mine called 'The Five Dimensions of Global Security: Proposal for a Multi-Sum Security Principle' (Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2007), I suggested that global security has five essential and inter-related dimensions that have to be addressed with equal importance if we are to be collectively secure.

Central to this multi-dimensional nature of global security is what I have previously called the multi-sum security principle. This is a security principle that I think is more applicable to our connected and interdependent world because I believe that the days of the security dilemma and zero-sum paradigms are dangerous and obsolete. The multi-sum security paradigm states that "In a globalised world, security can no longer be thought of as a zero-sum game involving states alone. Global security instead has five dimensions that include human, environmental, national, transnational,

---

[1] E-mail: nalrodhan@gmail.com

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."

Now let me touch upon these five dimensions quickly.

a. Human security

The guarantee of human dignity is a central pre-requisite for global security, because humiliation, inequality and double standards are the most certain way to persistent insecurities.

b. Environmental security

I do not have time to go into this, but this clearly impacts all of the above and must be taken seriously through burden-sharing and global efforts, while balancing economic needs for progress with true environmental concerns and to take into account the concerns of developing and rising powers in this regard. It is important here, not to conceal geopolitical aspirations under this environmental umbrella to avoid the development of lack of trust and goodwill which may have the potential for the unraveling of global cooperation in this regard.

c. National security

In a globalised world of instant connectivity and interdependence, the national security of any nation is no longer just national, and therefore cannot be achieved through national capabilities alone regardless of how powerful a state may be. Global justice is a pre-requisite of national, regional and global security. Typical excuses as to why this cannot be adhered to include things like: whose justice is it, who defines justice, and according to what value system? My answer to this is, if there is a will, there is a way, and that it will not be hard for well intentioned and reasonable people to figure out what needs to happen for each particular situation, but this needs a different mindset of escaping narrow geopolitical interests realising that global justice is above all a national interest. The problem is that these are medium- to long-term results which are beyond the electoral cycles that politicians are interested in. Therefore I believe in this case the responsibility lies with career diplomats and security experts who are entrusted with doing what is in the long-term interests of their states rather than their short-term gains.

d. Transnational security

Because of the nature of new security threats, multilateral and transnational cooperation is critical for global security both from natural disasters as well as from man-made ones.

e. Transcultural security

Large collective identities, whether sub-national or supra-national, must have jobs, respect and understanding to avoid the 'us-versus-them' concept that breeds mistrust,

division, alienation, exclusion and exceptionalism, all of which are counter-productive. These cultural groups must not be asked to choose between their cultures and their new homes, because they can have both. However, in return, their loyalty must be first and foremost to their new homes and their grievances must be voiced through democratic and civil society institutions which must themselves be open and welcoming.

If they feel welcome and included, they will automatically assimilate slowly and enrich their new cultures. Avoiding stereotyping and humiliation through educational materials, media, and the entertainment industry is essential not only because it is the right thing to do, but because it is the only way to ensure the loyalty of these groups and to achieve sustainable security. Apparent differences in norms, ideals, value systems, etc.. should be moulded to achieve an acceptable minimum common standard. I am not worried about these differences in the long-term because these things have a way of resolving themselves. My concern is in the short term, where maximum wisdom and sensitivity is required in avoiding populist and divisive electoral political statements.

Clearly, things are not that simple, but patience, empowerment, equality, opportunity and inclusiveness will win in the end rather than quick, critical and judgemental approaches that will result in the development of defensive postures on all sides of a conflict.

Now a few words about human nature because of its importance in understanding global security.

My own philosophy of human nature, which I have termed emotional amoral egoism and published in a book of the same name last year, is a neurophilosophical theory based on neurochemistry and its neuropsychological manifestations.

I am neither Machiavellian nor Hobbesian and I have the benefit of collective scholarly insights of a few hundred years since Machiavelli's insights in 1506 and those of Hobbs in 1651. Although the nature of man has not changed since those days, our interpretations of certain behaviours have improved because we know more about molecular genetics, neurochemistry, have better behavioural methodologies and more sophisticated functional neuroimaging techniques than in the past.

My theory applies to the vast majority of humanity, and accepts that there are some people who will always act morally in spite of their own miseries, but these are rare and cannot be thought of as the norm. The theory proposes that humankind can be defined by three attributes:
1. Emotionality
2. Amorality
3. Egoism

We cannot do much about the first attribute, namely emotionality because that is how we are wired due to evolutionary selection pressures that were necessary for survival over millions of years.

We should not stifle the third attribute, namely egoism because that is essential for progress.

But we can and should do a great deal about the second attribute, i.e. our "amorality" which affects the other two attributes. This is done through normative governance mechanisms, checks and balances, reward and punishment, transparency, accountability, and liability, and therein lies the promise of sustainable harmony, security and progress.

This theory is supported by the realisation that the enduring assumption that human behaviour is governed by innate morality and reason is at odds with the

persistence of human deprivation, injustice, brutality, inequality and conflict.

In my book proposing this theory, 'emotional amoral egoism' I advocated a general theory of human nature and a specific theory of human motivation drawing on a wide range of philosophical, psychological, evolutionary and neuroscientific approaches. This theory argues that human behaviour is governed primarily by emotional self-interest and that the human mind is what I have called a pre-disposed tabula rasa (in response to John Locke's clean slate approach). In other words, our emotional and cognitive repertoire has been programmed for survival through evolutionary selection pressures over millions of years.

In my opinion, human beings are neither innately moral nor immoral but rather amoral and circumstances will determine the survival value of humankind's moral compass. This realisation has profound implications for the re-ordering of governance mechanisms at all levels with a strong emphasis on the role of society and the global system in setting the standard of ethical, fair, just and dignity-based self-interest rather than short-sighted and narrow political and policy agendas that will not work in the long run, especially in today's world. Fear, alienation, injustices, inequalities and humiliation will never be acceptable to the neurobiological foundations of the human mind even if it cannot do anything about them. I do not have time to go into more details, but for example I have suggested in the book (amongst other suggestions) what I have called fear-induced pre-emptive aggression which stresses that anarchy, constant humiliation and inequality will precipitate anger, frustration, and possible aggression primarily because of fear and dignified survival needs. So doing the right thing in keeping with global standards and international norms is the way to go, not simply for altruistic reasons, but because it is in our collective self-interest to do so, especially in our connected and interdependent world.

And finally, I will end by proposing a few non-traditional new research areas that are worth considering:

1. Help develop endogenous culture-specific, accountable governance paradigms, i.e. help but do not dictate, because for these to be workable, they have to be specific to histories and cultures and be appropriate, acceptable and affordable, and that all of these must meet common and minimal global standards to ensure maximum political and moral cooperation.

2. Tie global justice and human dignity needs as a pre-requisite to extensions of national and regional security paradigms, i.e. global justice that guarantees human dignity should be thought of as national and regional security issues rather than purely altruistic acts.

3. Legitimise public diplomacy to reflect specific gains, real changes, actions and results that guarantee respect, inclusiveness, and awareness of historical baggage, pains and vulnerabilities, rather than some cosmetic way of covering up geopolitical ambitions, because in today's informed world this will not work for long. Explanations of state policies, their motivations and potential results must be clarified to avoid mis-representations, mis-perceptions and conspiracy theories that can cause defensive postures that are unhelpful and counterproductive.

4. Develop minimum common global values and norms and focus on commonalities rather than differences. State ambitions can only be sustainable if they conform to international norms in spirit and substance.

5. Develop interstate relations that are governed by what I have previously called 'Symbiotic Realism' where absolute rather than relative gains are allowed and

that non-conflictual cooperative competition is the only sustainable way forward, and to enlarge the spectrum of unitary actors beyond the state and non-state actors as I have done in my new theory of international relations which I have called 'Symbiotic Realism'.

6. Reconcile power with interests and justice through what I have previously proposed as 'just power' that uses hard, soft and smart power paradigms as conduits of global justice through which itself is thought of as a national security tool.

7. Reconcile the eight global interests which I have proposed recently (individual, group, national, regional, cultural, global, planetary and moral interests).

8. The importance of education, a responsible media and entertainment industry and inclusive political statements.

9. Develop inclusive and fair policies for cultural groups in new situations - here the comparative experiences of various cultural groups in the United States and Europe is worth studying. These groups clearly do better in the United States than in Europe and there are many reasons for this, which are worthy of analysis.

10. More awareness of human motivations, namely emotionality, amorality and egoism and the urgent development of global ethical norms in response to the rapid convergence developments in various emerging technologies (like bio-, nano-, info-, material, etc.) which are essential for security as well as human dignity as we approach our inevitable trans-human and even post-human existence.

References

Nayef R.F. Al-Rodhan, The Five Dimensions of Global Security: Proposal for a Multi-sum Security Principle (Berlin: LIT, 2007), p. 15-16.

Nayef R.F. Al-Rodhan, "emotional amoral egoism": A Neurophilosophical Theory of Human Nature and its Universal Security Implications (Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2008).

Ibid.

Nayef R.F. Al-Rodhan, Symbiotic Realism: A Theory of International Relations in an Instant and an Interdependent World (Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2007).

Nayef R.F. Al-Rodhan, Neo-statecraft and Meta-geopolitics: Reconciliation of Power, Interests and Justice in the 21st Century (Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2009).

Ibid.

Nayef R.F. Al-Rodhan, The Role of Education in Global Security (Genéve: Slatkine, 2007).

Nayef R.F. Al-Rodhan and Lisa Watanabe, A Proposal for Inclusive Peace and Security (Genéve: Slatkine, 2007).

Al-Rodhan, op. cit., note 2.