

## Chapter I Conceptualizing Security

When we speak about security, in its simplest and broadest definition, we find that it can be explained as the absence of danger or threat.<sup>1</sup> However, when that term—security-, is contextualized in the international relations arena, there is no simple and broad definition. Concepts such as national security, collective security, hemispheric security, and more lately human security, among others, arise and take part in the complicated international security puzzle.

In trying to sort out and find some meaning to that puzzle, security theorists such as Michael Mandelbaum, Peter J. Katzenstein, and Barry Buzan among several other scholars and policymakers have sought to find clear definitions, giving birth to a prolonged and seemingly never-ending debate. We can at least identify two distinct breaking points in this debate: that of the traditionalists, whose optic of security relies on the State as main and only actor and in military defense as their field of action; and their critics, who contend that there are different angles of security, different actors, and consistently, different answers to solve different kinds of in-securities. In other words,

...the key axis of the contemporary debate over the conceptualization of security [is] whether the security agenda should be broadened to incorporate other, nonmilitary issues and whether the agenda should be extended away from a statist view of what constitutes the correct 'referent object' for security discourse.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> For instance, the Oxford Dictionary definition of Security is as follows : **noun** (pl. **securities**) **1** the state of being or feeling secure. **2** the safety of a state or organization against criminal activity such as terrorism or espionage. **3** a thing deposited or pledged as a guarantee of the fulfilment of an undertaking or the repayment of a loan, to be forfeited in case of default. **4** a certificate attesting credit, the ownership of stocks or bonds, etc. (Ask Oxford On-Line URL <http://www.askoxford.com/dictionaries/?view=uk>)

<sup>2</sup> Richard L. Wyn, Security, Strategy, and Critical Theory, (Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1999) p. 103

These efforts to find new concepts of security are a response to the changes that occurred in the international system with the end of the Cold War. From the end of World War II to the fall of the Berlin Wall, the world known to politicians and scholars had been pretty much unchanging, and a common vision of security was more or less shared. Then, when the rivalry between the U.S. and the USSR officially ended, came the time to expect the unexpected, and realize that security theories had failed to predict the end of the Cold War. Katzenstein expressed that

[t]he main analytical perspectives on international relations, neorealism and neoliberalism, share[d] with all their critics their inability to foreshadow, let alone foresee, these momentous international changes. Furthermore, with the end of the Cold War, international relations specialists, whatever their theoretical orientation, [were] uncertain about how to interpret the consequences of change.<sup>3</sup>

With the downfall of the USSR, the United States, as well as the rest of the so called “free world” should have become more secure. But with the absence of the menacing shadow of the “empire of evil”, several security problems within states began to emerge as the next security challenges for the international community, and with them a need to reassess and re-conceptualize security. For many, the traditional concept of security was no longer universal in use,<sup>4</sup> and for some it had even become an obstacle in itself, expressing that “...the rigidity of security conceptualization in the discipline of International Relations, coupled to the tendency to strive to provide universally valid theoretical interpretations of the ‘international system’ has led to a partial understanding

---

<sup>3</sup>Peter J. Katzenstein, “Introduction: Alternative Perspectives on National Security” (in The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics, New York: Columbia University Press, 1996) p.3

<sup>4</sup> For example, then UN Secretary General Boutros Boutros Ghali proposed important reforms to the United Nations system during the 1990s, and his report entitled “An Agenda for Peace” played an important role to influence areas like peacekeeping. For further information the report is available On-Line at URL <http://www.globalpolicy.org/reform/initiatives/ghali/1992/0617peace.htm>

of what security means within and between states. This has led to an overwhelmingly statist and static view of what security means, one which tends to obscure the (in)security of many societies on the developing world, and arguably, elsewhere.”<sup>5</sup>

### **I.1 National Security**

Some of the changes that resulted from the end of the Cold War were reflected on the dominant concepts and theories that had prevailed in the bi-polar context. Such concepts as national security, in terms of military defense, began to lose relevance as theorists attempted to “rethink some of the basic categories of thought concerning world politics and to delineate the contours of this new era. As a result, much of what [had] previously passed muster as timeless wisdom has been fundamentally problematized and challenged.”<sup>6</sup>

Concerns for a different approach to the concept of national security, other than military, brought scholars and theorists to explore the possibility that the arms race as well as the power the governments amassed during the Cold War in the name of national security had become a security threat to individuals, menacing their rights and freedoms as well as their physical safety even more than “any putative external threat.” Thus, a new and broader definition of the concept was needed, one which would not only be comprised of the traditional military threats, but also of nonmilitary ones, such as famine and the environment, and other issues in which it was becoming clearer that the states were responsible of generating insecurity.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Lisa Thompson, States and Security : Emancipatory Versus Orthodox Approaches, (Bellville, South Africa : School of Government, University of the Western Cape, 1996) p. 5

<sup>6</sup> Wyn, Security, Strategy, and Critical Theory, p.93

<sup>7</sup> Ibid, p.99

According to Katzenstein, it was Kenneth Waltz's formulation of a neorealist theory which had the greatest influence in the arena of security studies. In it, he argues that it is the international system the factor that "molds states and defines the possibilities for cooperation and conflict." In this theory, Waltz identifies three main characteristics of the international system: its being decentralized; its main actors are "unitary and functionally undifferentiated"; and there is a distinction between multipolar and bipolar state systems based on the distribution of the capabilities of the most important states.<sup>8</sup> However, with the end of the Cold War that theory fell short for explaining the new international arena.

The Cold War bi-polar environment had restricted the view on security as one of "action-reaction dynamics of rival powers."<sup>9</sup> With the disappearance of this rivalry, the need for a new approach was in part exacerbated and justified as a direct result of the end of the bipolar world context due to several problems emerging from the fall of the soviet block,<sup>10</sup> such as the resulting poverty of several of the former soviet countries, ethnic conflicts within them, etc. Security issues were no longer just part of the U.S.-USSR confrontation, providing the field of security studies with a whole new meaning and giving way to criticisms against both the theorizing and approach to security:

There are serious weaknesses in the theoretical underpinnings of the traditional approach to security. The statism of traditional security studies not only appears to be empirically unhelpful but also to act as an ideological justification for the prevailing status quo—a status quo in which the vast majority of the world's population are rendered chronically insecure.

---

<sup>8</sup> Katzenstein, "Introduction: Alternative Perspectives on National Security," p.12

<sup>9</sup> Barry Buzan, People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era, (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1991) p.4

<sup>10</sup> Wyn, Security, Strategy, and Critical Theory, p.105

Traditional security studies has tended to abstract military issues from their broader context by making a series of often implicit assumptions about that context based on realist premises, for example, those concerning the role and value of the state.<sup>11</sup>

Traditional National Security Studies during the Cold War were mainly based on military issues and their relation to economic, technological, political factors within the “national framework”; and the nature and distribution of power-military power, that is-, and the use of the force among other issues at the international level.<sup>12</sup> Analysis of security was based solely on the concepts of threats and power; realism and liberalism; war and a “simple-minded” view of security<sup>13</sup> that becomes an obstacle in itself in the sense that it doesn’t allow exploring a broader range of problems that might be related to security issues.

The traditional concept of national security became an obstacle, according to its critics, since it was based on a state-centered point of view which allowed the states to decide what was deemed as national security, and to act according to what the political and military elites deemed as national interest, leaving aside not only other security problems, but also other important actors, such as institutions and individuals, whom where also part of the state. This state-centered point of view saw national security as the defense of the state against other states, and it was being challenged by those who thought that national security comprised more than territorial integrity and military menace. Realism and traditional theories were not considering the effects that this other actors were having on security issues,

...the effects that culture and identity have on national security. The prevailing theories deliberately slight these effects. For realists,

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibid, p. 102

<sup>12</sup> For a more detailed outline of the field of National Security Studies see Klaus Knorr, “National Security Studies: Scope and Structure of the Field” in National Security and American Society: Theory, Process, and Policy, Frank N. Trager and Philip S. Kronenberg, Eds. (Lawrence, KA: University Press of Kansas, 1973)

<sup>13</sup> Buzan, People, States and Fear, p. 2

culture and identity are, at best, derivative of the distribution of capabilities and have no independent explanatory power. For rationalists, actors deploy culture and identity strategically, like any other resource, simply to further their own self-interests.<sup>14</sup>

Further on, he argues that “in sharp contrast to the realist view of the international system as a Hobbesian state of nature, neoliberalism offers a theory of the cultural-institutional context of state action. It defines regimes as particular combination of principles, norms, rules, and procedures.” However, Katzenstein also argues that neoliberalism is no much better to explain the changes that were occurring in the international system. Its usefulness in explaining the importance of institutions at the end of the Cold War stopped at that, since it couldn’t help scholars and policymakers understand the central features of international politics after the Cold War.<sup>15</sup>

Cultural and institutional factors gained relevance for other theorists when it came to analyze security regimes and the security dilemma between the United States and the Soviet Union.”<sup>16</sup> Some of the critiques to the traditional security theories came then from what has been called the “emancipatory challenge”, which is described as “an attempt...to point out how western theory has tended to serve the interests of dominant groups, and dominant states.” This approach has resulted from postmodernism and feminism, and seeks to bring into focus groups of individuals and states that have been overlooked by traditional security theories and analysis, as well as to determine “the negative consequences of exclusion.”<sup>17</sup>

However, a lack of a more comprehensive approach of national security is not the only problem discussed in the security debate. It was deemed that the concept of national

---

<sup>14</sup> Katzenstein, “Introduction: Alternative Perspectives on National Security,” p. 17

<sup>15</sup> Ibid, p. 19

<sup>16</sup> Ibid, pp. 19-20

<sup>17</sup> Thompson, States and Security, p.7

security per se was vague and ambiguous, and it continues to be one of the main points of debate. According to some of the critics of traditional national security theory, a plausible explanation of why such an important concept as security has not been completely defined is that in maintaining its ambiguity, policymakers can justify actions and policies without further explanation, serving varied interests. Thus, an ambiguous notion of national security is of the interest of political and military elites due to its usefulness as a power-maximizing leverage.<sup>18</sup>

When it comes to answering questions such as to what are policymakers responding, and what is the final object to be protected when formulating security policies; or what is national security and how is it determined, one must have in mind that “...the state is central to the whole concept of security, then one needs to examine the state as a referent object of the term” but “[s]ince the state is composed of individuals bound together into a collective political unit, one might expect...difficulties...to be compounded when trying to make sense of security on the state level.”<sup>19</sup> In short, the state is the main actor when it comes to national security concerns, but policymakers should bear into mind that the state is composed of citizens, and therefore, they are relevant to the interest of the state.

Further on, individuals within a state and their shared collective identity<sup>20</sup> have been found to be another important factor when it comes to determine national security, and if “[d]uring the Cold War, it may have been reasonable to take for granted state identities, at least on the central issues of national security along the central front that

---

<sup>18</sup> Buzan, People, States and Fear, p. 11

<sup>19</sup> Ibid, p. 57

<sup>20</sup> A shared collective identity could be described as the cornerstone of Nationalism. For a more thorough explanation of this relationship go to Benedict Anderson’s Imagined Communities.

divided East from West” it is now clear that “[d]efinitions of identity that distinguish between self and other imply definitions of threat and interest that have strong effects of national security policies.”<sup>21</sup> We can then see that the relationship between the state and the individuals and the way it shapes national security is deeper than it seems. Different collective political units in different states will have different notions and approaches to security, that is certain, and Buzan further explains that:

The contrast between individual and state provides an interesting lead as to why the abstract side of the state is so important to the understanding of national security. States are vulnerable to physical damage and deprivation, but the state appears to be much less intimately connected with its ‘body’ than is the case of an individual...damage to territory and population does not affect the survival of the state nearly as directly as damage to the human body affects individual survival...One can infer from these points that the state exists, or has its essence, primarily on the socio-political rather than on the physical plane.<sup>22</sup>

Being the essence of the state on the socio-political plane implies that there is no specific meaning of security, since the conditions and situations of the different states to which it can be applied will be diverse. That itself makes the concept of national security ambiguous, since it doesn’t have the properties of more easily defined concepts and cannot be measured by simple indicators,<sup>23</sup> even though some traditionalists and policymakers will try to measure it in terms of military capacity. So, for Buzan and his supporters, the ambiguity of the concept is not just due to the convenience of it being so for policymakers, but in the very essence of the state.

Critics of the traditional way of thinking about security, like Buzan, believe that “National security implies strongly that the object of security is the nation, and raises

---

<sup>21</sup> Katzenstein, “Introduction: Alternative Perspectives on National Security,” p. 19

<sup>22</sup> Buzan, People, States and Fear, p. 63

<sup>23</sup> Ibid, p. 69

questions about the links between nation and state.”<sup>24</sup> The problem to find a definition of national security, in those terms, resides in the fact that there is no consensus yet to determine if nations create states, or states create nations, and the implications it has. There are other factors that could be looked upon as obstacles as well, since multi-ethnicity, division within certain states, etc. not only make the relation between nation and state and creating a concept of national identity and thus, national security, difficult, but “[n]ationality issues pose a constant source of insecurity for the state”<sup>25</sup> in many cases.

Unless the idea of the state is firmly planted in the minds of the population, the state as a whole has no secure foundation. Equally, unless the idea of the state is firmly planted in the ‘minds’ of other states, the state has no secure environment. Because the idea of national self-rule has a high legitimacy in the present international system, a firmly established link between state and nation acts as a powerful moderator on the unconstrained operation of the international anarchy.<sup>26</sup>

Every state is subject to threats, whether they are military, environmental, economic or political and social insecurities. “The different components of the state appear vulnerable to different kinds of threat, which makes national security a problem in many dimensions rather than just a matter of military defense.”<sup>27</sup> Strong and weak states will have different levels of threat, the first predominantly from the outside while the latter will also have inside threats and insecurities. Whatever the threat, and wherever it comes from, it is still the prerogative of the state to decide whether it endangers its national interests or not, and if so, how to counteract the threat.

---

<sup>24</sup> Ibid, p. 70

<sup>25</sup> Ibid, p. 76

<sup>26</sup> Ibid, p. 78

<sup>27</sup> Ibid, p. 97

Then a second theoretical problem arises: how to define the national interest. According to Katzenstein, “State interests are constructed through a process of social interaction.” This social interaction occurs not only within the state, but also within states. Once again, we see that after the prolonged period of bipolarism, the social interaction of states in the international arena was deeply affected, and:

...with the end of the Cold War, the mix of factors affecting national security is changing. Issues dealing with norms, identities, and culture are becoming more salient....a sociological perspective on the politics of national security ...argues that security interests are defined by actors who respond to cultural factors...States and other political actors undoubtedly seek material power to defend their security. But what other kinds of power and security do states seek and for which purposes?...the dramatic changes in world politics since the mid-1980s... have profoundly affected the environment for the national security of states.<sup>28</sup>

Katzenstein “concentrates on two underattended determinants of national security policy: the cultural-institutional context of policy on the one hand and the constructed identity of states, governments, and other political actors on the other...[exploring] these determinants from the theoretical perspective of sociological institutionalism, with its focus on the character of the state’s environment and on the contested natures of political identities.”<sup>29</sup> This approach suggests that social factors affect the creation of a national security idea, that will affect national security policy “at times in ways that contradict the expectations derived from other theoretical orientations.”<sup>30</sup>

Since the traditional definition of the concept concentrates on the state and its military capacity to face other states, therefore leaving out the possibility to encompass economic, social, political and even environmental threats and security that affect

---

<sup>28</sup> Katzenstein, “Introduction: Alternative Perspectives on National Security,” p. 2

<sup>29</sup> Ibid, p. 4

<sup>30</sup> Ibid, p. 5

individuals and groups of non-state actors within the state, for its critics it was obvious that a new and different analysis of national security should be at hand. Of course, generating new perspectives of the security problem led to dissent among the critics of the traditional concept:

Since different analytical perspectives suggest different definitions of national security, such disagreements are probably unavoidable. Those interested in the state and in traditional issues of national security tend to favor established realist and liberal approaches developed during the last decades. A new generation of scholars built on these approaches in reinvigorating the field of security studies as an intellectually challenging field of academic scholarship during the 1980s. In contrast, those interested in unconventional, broader definitions of national security—such as economic competitiveness, human rights, or human welfare—as affecting not only states but also nonstate actors tend to favor alternative analytical perspectives...What scholars and policy makers consider to be national security issues is not fixed but varies over time...The domain of national security issues thus is variable. In the nineteenth century, the concept covered economic and social dimensions of political life that, for a variety of reasons, were no longer considered relevant when national security acquired a narrower military definition in the first half of the twentieth century, especially during the Cold War.<sup>31</sup>

This does not mean that the traditional security approach should be eliminated, since the state continues to be the main, if not the most important, actor on security issues. Since changes in the international arena have broadened states' security agendas, and non-state actors have been found to be relevant to issues of security, both military and non-military, "theoretical debates about how strategic and security issues relate to the social sciences suggest that commonly made analytical distinctions—for example, between international and domestic politics, security issues and economic issues, facts and values—often hinder rather than help our description and explanation of real world events."<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> Ibid, p. 10

<sup>32</sup> Ibid, p. 524

In short, learning from the inadequacy of the narrow definition of traditional security theory, new national security definitions should be broader and try to encompass the varied actors and factors that comprise national security in modern terms. “Theoretical developments in the social sciences, in international relations, and in the specific field of national security studies provide a second main reason why the intellectual agenda of security studies should be broad, not narrow. The dominant theoretical issues no longer relate, as they did in the 1970s and early 1980s, to debates between realist, pluralist, and structural-global analytical perspectives—that is, academic versions of conservatism, liberalism, and Marxism. Rather, the central theoretical debates now engage rationalist and constitutive explanatory approaches to theory.”<sup>33</sup>

## **I.2 Collective Security**

If there is one concept in the field of security issues that for the most part remains unchanged and is agreed upon, it is the existence of and the need for collective security:

As long as states continue to perceive that external threats to their national security exist, alliances—the traditional means for states to ensure national security—will continue to matter. Although a security or military arrangement is not necessarily a prerequisite...alliances are only legitimate if they establish security partnerships for defensive purposes that together provide a system of collective security for all parties involved. In the military context, all members of an alliance expect to maximize the deterrent effect of the arrangement to protect them from potential hostile acts against any individual member. The collective strength of the whole is perceived to be greater than that of its parts; an alliance thus increases the effectiveness of deterrence as well as the credibility of the will to use collective hard power in response to external aggression should deterrence fail.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> Ibid, p. 525

<sup>34</sup> Dingli Shen, “Can Alliances Combat Contemporary Threats?” (in *The Washington Quarterly* (Spring, 2004)) p. 165

Collective security as such has been present, for many, since early times of European history, but as an “attempt to modify the anarchic structure of the international system” some theorists like Michael Mandelbaum suggest that “[t]he nineteenth-century balance of power system represents the most extensive, successful collective approach to security in modern times...the nineteenth century was recognizably different from the eighteenth. It was more peaceful, and this was not simply by chance. It was partly attributable to the rules and procedures that the great powers acknowledged and followed. Collective practices became part of European politics. The idea of the interest of Europe as a whole – that is, of the claims of the system – influenced individual policies.”<sup>35</sup>

In a conscious effort to preserve a balance of power by restraint and cooperation, coupled with equilibrium, the Europeans created a set of rules and procedures that Mandelbaum refers to as a “managed balance of power system”, which can be described as “a departure from the normal international practice in which states seek security individually, through ‘self help’ policies. It represented a collective approach to the security problem. It was collective because it involved all of the European powers, or at least all of the important ones. The participation of each depended, in the end, on the participation of all the others. As with individuals in Hobbes’s state of nature, each would have found itself worse off by practicing restraint unless all the others did the same....The pattern was contrived, not the unintended sum of individually determined policies. ..[The great powers] were conscious that there was an European interest distinct from the interests of Europe’s individual states.”<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> Michael Mandelbaum, *The Fate of Nations: The Search for National Security in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988) pp.13-14

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid*, pp. 12-13

This redefinition of interests, to accommodate restraint and cooperation, was at the same time a conscious effort of each state to pursue its own interests, which at the moment were security and the avoidance of war. However, if this managed balance of power system modify the international arena, it did not change the relations among states: “If it was the zenith of the collective approach to security, if it marks the farthest the world has moved from uncoordinated self-help policies toward cooperative measures to provide common security, it also shows how resilient the anarchic structure of international policies is and how unyielding traditional self-help international policies therefore are; for the nineteenth-century managed balance of power system did not, in the end, move very far from the norm of unfettered anarchy.”<sup>37</sup> In the end, each state’s approach to collective security was, and always will be, to further its own security interests and solve its own insecurities.

What this managed balance of power system contributed to future collective security was the establishment, with the Vienna Congress and its follow ups, of the practice of frequent international meetings and of a collective approach to solve certain issues and problems that affected Europe as a whole. This practice was continued to be applied later both inside and outside of Europe. The European powers sought to sustain equilibrium, and did so not by dictating how the different states would be governed, but by conveying how they would address themselves to external considerations such as their borders and the balance of power they had created.<sup>38</sup>

However, the Concert of Europe did not last long, and the European powers failed to “establish successful collective arrangements after World War I,” which resulted in a

---

<sup>37</sup> Ibid, p. 13

<sup>38</sup> Ibid, p. 23

second confrontation barely twenty years later. It wasn't until the end of World War II and particularly with the creation of nuclear weapons that a major incentive was found to avoid another great war.<sup>39</sup> "After the end of World War II an equilibrium of sorts was reestablished in Europe. The settlement has some features in common with the work of the Congress of Vienna."<sup>40</sup> Other organisms that promoted collective security were created within the limits and reach of international law, like NATO or the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance—or Rio Treaty—to name a couple.

Collective security and the nuclear race gave way to another concept: common security. In the 1980s, as a result of the "maturing of deterrence" beyond the U.S.-USSR confrontation, it was appealed to Common security to once again bring about change in international relations:

Common security, while in certain respects still an ill-defined and ambiguous term, had an immediate attraction for supporters of radical change as well as the more pragmatic proponents of a strategic *modus vivendi* between rival blocs. The former looked to common security as a replacement for the doctrine of mutual deterrence, and to the evolution of a reformed international system in which political tensions and strategic instabilities can be overcome. The latter, while accepting that insecurity can eventually mute political competition, were more concerned to promote a permanently stable form of deterrence...They sought a framework in which to balance the increasing demands for co-operation and constraint as a means of ensuring that competition did not get out of control, against the more familiar concerns of credibility. It is this concept of common security as a reassertion of the idea that adversaries can indeed ameliorate some of their common strategic problems within the context of a more or less overtly acknowledged partnership...Common security creates a framework in which it is possible to reduce the growing problems created by the momentum of technological competition and the fear of war. It offers a way out of that dangerous situation whereby states become the prisoners of their own weaponry....What nuclear weapons have done is to

---

<sup>39</sup> Ibid, pp. 28-29

<sup>40</sup> Ibid, p. 70

dramatize the need for balanced rather than for competitive security policies.<sup>41</sup>

The arms race and the proliferation of nuclear weapons generated a threat of nuclear war which had an impact in the political sphere. After crises such as that of Cuba in 1962, it was obvious that the governments of the major powers could not afford the possibility to lose control “whether as a result of stress, accident, or miscalculation.”<sup>42</sup> Having an enormous amount of weapons was no longer equivalent to security, and “Common security provided an ideological rationale for reductions and restraint which had been absent in the 1960s and 1970s when the military retained a monopoly over security matters.”<sup>43</sup> Further on, Mangold explains that

...there can come a point at which the spiral of competition reverses itself, so that security policies begin to reinforce rather than subvert one another. As the pressures of competition begin to tell, and adversaries gradually recognize how dependent they are on one another in resolving their strategic dilemmas, insecurity partnerships can develop a momentum of their own. Once the habits of co-operation and self-restraint take hold it becomes increasingly possible to scale down competition and force levels, to evolve more comprehensive and reliable frameworks for reducing the risk of nuclear war...Any insecurity partnership, particularly one between states competing on a global basis, is vulnerable to the actions of third parties, just as they in turn are ultimately dependent on the way in which that rivalry is conducted. The evolution of a more co-operative relationship is thus likely to have a knock-on effect throughout the system, not just in which they have been indirectly involved, but also because some of the new concepts to which their relationship gives rise may have wider international application.<sup>44</sup>

However, Common security was not the only approach to the Cold War environment.

Most modern alliances were created in that context to deter and defend states from Cold

---

<sup>41</sup> Peter Mangold, National Security and International Relations, (New York: Routledge, 1990) pp.70-71

<sup>42</sup> Ibid, p. 72

<sup>43</sup> Ibid, p. 75

<sup>44</sup> Ibid, p. 80

War threats and survived the end of the Cold War, although many of their critics sustain that the threat for which they were created as protection no longer exist and thus, their *raison d'être* is no longer valid. The best example of such an alliance is NATO (the North Atlantic Treaty Organization) which was established to muster Western European, United States and Canadian forces in an alliance against the threat of Soviet expansionism and communism.<sup>45</sup>

In short, we find that the concept of collective security can cover “a wide array of measures and ideas that range from armed combat, the negotiated settlement of conflict, and preventive diplomacy to global institutions to foster international peace and well-being.”<sup>46</sup> But in essence, the broad purpose of collective security remains unchanged: to find a solution to security issues as a group, and as a group face the threats that menace international security or one of the members of the alliance. Common security, on the other hand, involved adversaries recurring to strategies other than deterrence to improve common strategic problems.

However, just as with the rest of security issues, the end of the Cold War brought about changes to the way in which the international security is threatened, and a “global era of counterterrorism” emerged after the attacks of September 11, which “fundamentally changed the primary threats to international security and redefined the concept of security for all states.” One would assume that this new menace, global terrorism, would enhance the need for collective security and facilitate the relations between states concerning international security issues, but “...it is difficult to come to any sort of international consensus about the relevance and legitimacy of alliances today

---

<sup>45</sup> Shen , “Can Alliances Combat Contemporary Threats?,” p. 165

<sup>46</sup> Laura Reed and Majid Tehranian, “Evolving Security Regimes” (in Worlds Apart: Human Security and Global Governance, Majid Tehranian, Ed. NY: IB Tauris Publishers, 1999) p.27

because national interests, threat perceptions, and concepts of collective security remain disparate even after the September 11 attacks.”<sup>47</sup>

There has been a conscious effort to find a common approach to international security. As an example the United Nation’s High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, in its 2004 report, entitled *A more secure world: Our shared responsibility*, “presents a comprehensive vision of collective security for this century. It states that ‘the central challenge of the twenty-first century is to fashion a new and broader understanding of what collective security means’”<sup>48</sup> The need to identify and establish a relation between security, economic development, human freedom, responsibilities, commitments, strategies and institutions within a collective security system has been addressed. “The globalization process, the Panel says, has led to a world of ‘interconnected threats and mutual vulnerability’, and because today’s threats are linked and recognize no national boundaries, no threat can be dealt with effectively unless the others are addressed at the same time. International cooperation is crucial—no State, no matter how powerful, is able to protect itself alone; global policies and institutions are therefore necessary.”<sup>49</sup>

### **I.3 Human Security**

Of the different new approaches to security, it’s the concept of Human Security the one which contrasts more deeply with the traditional, state-centered notion. Human security emphasizes on the security and wellbeing of the individual, as opposed to the traditional point of view which places the security of individuals as secondary to that of the state.

---

<sup>47</sup> Shen , “Can Alliances Combat Contemporary Threats?,” p. 166

<sup>48</sup> Horst Rutsch, “A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility: High-Level Panel Presents New Vision of Collective Security” (in *UN Chronicle* (No.4, 2004) [URL:http://www.un.org/chronicle](http://www.un.org/chronicle)) p.77

<sup>49</sup> Ibid

However, there is no real consensus as to which threats to the individual are more pressing, and a wide variety of them have been identified by different scholars, ranging from poverty and famine to pollution and human rights violations.

...the concept of human security is, in principle, quite broad. It takes the individual as the nexus of its concern...as the true lens through which we should view the political, economic and social environment. At its most basic level, human security means freedom from fear. These concerns have been traditionally the domain of nation-states, and where there was democracy those concerns were at least addressed, if not always successfully. Internationally, the security of our citizens was promoted through a set of interlocking agreements between governments, through international organizations.<sup>50</sup>

According to the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Human Development Report of 1994, “[h]uman security has two central aspects: It means, first, safety from such chronic threats as hunger, disease and repression. And second, it means protection from sudden and hurtful disruption in the patterns of daily life—whether in homes, in jobs or in communities.” Human security concerns with issues such as physical, psychological, gender, social, economic, cultural and communication, national, international and environmental security; which are all overlapped and interwoven.<sup>51</sup>

According to Legler, the concept of human security can be studied under one of two major branches or points of view: maximalist, and minimalist. Maximalists stick to the PNUD’s definition of human security as freedom from fear and needs. However, from a political viewpoint, a broad definition as such makes it difficult to decide what is most important, since there are many issues considered as human security concerns. The

---

<sup>50</sup> Rob McRae, “Human Security in a Globalized World” (in Human Security and the New Diplomacy: Protecting People, Promoting Peace Rob McRae and Don Hubert, Eds. Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2001) p.15

<sup>51</sup> Reed and Theranian, “Evolving Security Regimes,” p. 36

minimalist approach is narrower and focuses on the elimination of fear, which translates to physical and violent threats against individuals and their communities, whether from state or non-state actors. For decision makers, it is easier to define policies in these terms.<sup>52</sup>

However, it is still a broad definition of human security and what it entails, and he further addresses other problems that human security faces: "...human security is a clouded, unpractical concept both in the political and academic worlds. There is no consensus surrounding its meaning, and it is not easy either to translate it into policy. There exist additional problems in terms of its application and execution...even when numerous small and middle powers as well as part of the United Nations support human security, the same is not true about large powers."<sup>53</sup> Superpowers are still dominated by political realism when it comes to design foreign policy, and even more so when it comes to national security, and without their support, the prospects for human security look slim.

The concept and the need for human security were also enhanced by the end of the Cold War. With the fall of the soviet block there was a discovery of "a complex variety of localized conflicts that requires a fundamentally different approach to problems of human security...simmering ethnic conflicts have exploded into the open with forces that threaten to engulf neighbors and great powers as well."<sup>54</sup> Human in-security then threatened to become another aspect of international security as well, since these conflicts could cross borders and extend to other states.

---

<sup>52</sup> Thomas Legler, "¿Víctima del Terrorismo? La Seguridad Humana Después del 11 de Septiembre" (in *Seguridad Hemisférica: Un largo y sinuoso camino*, María Cristina Rosas, Coord. México D.F.: UNAM, 2003) p. 286

<sup>53</sup> Ibid, p. 284 (My translation)

<sup>54</sup> Reed and Theranian, "Evolving Security Regimes," p. 23

The 1990s showed that conflict had mutated, and it no longer belonged exclusively to the states. “ While a tenth part of conflict victims at the beginning of the twentieth century were civilians, by the end of the century that figure was up to almost 90 per cent...In the new reality of the 1990s, States appeared to be more secure when it came to threats of destruction and annihilation, but numerous individuals, their families and their communities confronted an abundant number of threats to their personal security coming from landmines, small arms, organized crime, state repression, and even genocide, famine, drought, infectious diseases and environmental damage.”<sup>55</sup>

There was a general agreement that individuals needed to be protected, but there the consensus ended. While during the Cold War human rights were secondary to policy, they had increasingly become a major issue in international relations. Donor countries and international financial institutions sought to condition aid to third countries to human rights improvement, as a means to improve the situation of endangered communities.

But the obstacles to enacting human security still remained many:

Relacionada con sus limitaciones conceptuales, la seguridad humana también enfrenta serios desafíos en términos de su aplicación y ejecución. Dado que es un bien público, el instrumento principal para la promoción de la seguridad humana es el Estado, y pese a ello los Estados son a menudo quienes principalmente perpetran abusos en materia de derechos humanos y crean dañinas amenazas para los individuos...Cuando las iniciativas de seguridad humana son promovidas por actores externos, se requiere la cooperación internacional o el uso de la fuerza. En el caso de la cooperación internacional, los agentes externos normalmente deben contar con alguna forma de invitación formal...Cuando las autoridades locales no están dispuestas o no están convencidas ni obligadas a permitir alguna forma de intervención extranjera en sus territorios, la fuerza o las sanciones son usadas a menudo.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> Legler, “¿Víctima del Terrorismo?”, p. 285 (My translation)

<sup>56</sup> Ibid, p. 288

The paradigm is that while the state is the one responsible to look out for its citizens, it is the state in many cases the one that foremost endangers and threatens human security. A second paradigm is that having third states or the international community as a whole imposing themselves in order to ameliorate the problem is not always a good solution, since it has been seen that sometimes sanctions affect the civilians more than they do the governments, as has been the case with the Embargo on Cuba, or economic sanctions in Iraq.

Of the many attempts to define human security, the approach that is more accepted as “human security doctrine” is the one of the International Commission on Sovereignty and Intervention’s report *The Responsibility to Protect*. In essence, the report stresses the need to further the westfalian notion of state sovereignty included in article 2 of the UN Charter, and include the idea that sovereignty is not just comprised of states’ rights, but also of obligations and responsibilities. The first and foremost obligation is what is deemed the responsibility to protect, which means that if a state is unable to protect the rights and securities of its citizens, other states have the moral obligation to intervene in the name of human security to face immediate threat. They should prevent, react and reconstruct. However, as Legler points out, having the responsibility to Protect as the base of human security leaves the possibility to other states to use and abuse intervention to further their own interests.<sup>57</sup>

The report is not comprehensive when it comes to take into account the amount of resources (lives, material, economic, etc) and what is expected to be at risk or lost during intervention, as it does not define the point up to where humanitarian intervention is justified:

---

<sup>57</sup> Ibid, p. 293

...proporciona una respuesta poco satisfactoria a la pregunta de hasta qué punto la intervención humanitaria se justifica. Plantea una 'causa justa' definida en general como la pérdida actual o inminente de la vida de un número importante de personas...con su énfasis normativo, el informe le presta muy poca atención al mundo real de las asimetrías y las capacidades del poder...es poco probable que intervengan sobre la base humanitaria en los asuntos de una superpotencia como Rusia o China a diferencia de que como lo harían en algunos Estados pequeños.<sup>58</sup>

Some see the work of the United Nations on Human Rights, the UN Charter and the Declaration of Human Rights as antecedents of human security, focused on humanitarian aid, and development assistance; "humanitarian action of this kind has sought to respond to basic needs in a moment of crisis...human security provides a new insight."<sup>59</sup> Human security concerns are far too diverse let alone to be dealt with, but even to be recognized by state governments due to its larger implications. While humanitarian aid and assistance were presented as more moralistic in nature, human security deals with issues that correspond to the national and international security fields, and as such should be more central to the states:

The international community has been better organized in dealing with some aspects of human security than others. Cross-border aggression, natural disasters...and such atrocities as genocide receive at least some attention. Yet, while these traditional concerns continue to be relevant, there is growing recognition of the dangers posed by hunger, epidemics, internal violence, and environmental degradation. Furthermore, chronic encroachments on human security such as prenatal defects, malnutrition, political repression, health hazards, and air pollution receive little or no notice in security studies. These threats to human security could be collectively called the 'quiet killers'. They have led to a serious reconsideration of the concept of security. There seems to be an emerging consensus among policymakers and the general public to approach the subject more comprehensively.<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>58</sup> Ibid, p. 294

<sup>59</sup> McRae, "Human Security in a Globalized World," p. 16

<sup>60</sup> Reed and Theranian, "Evolving Security Regimes," p. 35

If it is true that many governments have embraced the concept of human security, it is also to be noted that the most important actors in the international arena have not agreed to grant human security an important place in their policy making, as they have done with military issues. For that reason, it has been said that The United Nations is not well suited to promote the human security agenda, while the Security Council itself might be an obstacle since some of the permanent and non-permanent members oppose the support of intervention measures such as is explained in the ICSI Report. While there have been UN actions to support humanitarian interventions, these have been reactive and not preventive, and other international and national non-state actors lack enough resources to make a significant difference, and therefore have a limited capacity to protect human lives. “In sum, the human security that advocates to the protection of individuals from violent threats resides in state action, which more than often is imperfect.”<sup>61</sup>

State action, as we have seen, is difficult to be attained since the human security concept still lacks a proper definition that suits policy making. Still, that doesn't make human security issues less relevant, especially in an increasingly globalized world. “If the safety and security of civilians, and their welfare, has traditionally been the responsibility of nation-states, it has become increasingly clear that , in a globalized world, these states no longer possess all of the means to deliver...every domestic issue has an international dimension and vice versa[...]globalization makes localization and local conflict more deadly...Foremost, it empowers nonstate actors as never before...they have a global impact because they promote international crime, terrorism and extortion...the export of deadly local conflicts to other parts of the world is exacerbated by globalization.”<sup>62</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup> Legler, “¿Víctima del Terrorismo?,” p. 289

<sup>62</sup> McRae, “Human Security in a Globalized World,” pp. 17-18

Human security advocates suggest that by protecting and enhancing human security and building the right mechanisms for that purpose helps build stability and sound human capital for the future. “By focusing on threats to human security, and specifically on preventative measures, peacebuilding, and the protection of civilians in conflict situations, it has become increasingly apparent that we need new instruments, often complemented by old, in order to take effective action. ...[like the]creative use of military deployments...this successful adaptation of our militaries belies the arguments of some that human security is no substitute for the ‘real security’ provided by more traditional means. Human security and traditional security are not alternatives: security is a single continuum, and is protected and enhanced by a series of interlocking instruments and policies...the challenge is to adapt the mandates and institutional arrangements governing our armed forces, our development assistance agencies, even our police, to the new security environment, so as to make them more flexible and more responsive.”<sup>63</sup>

However, there will always be critiques, and human security as a concept has been difficult to defend. Many of the countries that defer from accepting human security as a justification for intervention fear that it would be used as a cover up for other less moral interests. As an example, the “humanitarian justification of regime change in Baghdad highlighted the potential for abuse of the idea that there is an international responsibility to protect those suffering serious harm if their own state is either causing or alternatively unwilling or unable to avert it. As a result, the modest space for consensus about the legitimacy of military interventions for specific human protection purposes that had been emerging since the mid-1990s has been undermined and may suffer lasting

---

<sup>63</sup> Ibid, p. 22

damage. Future attempts to intervene in cases of mass murder or systematic human rights violations could be discredited merely by referring to the war in Iraq.”<sup>64</sup>

Another major obstacle for human security emerged with the terrorist attacks of September 11. With all their cards set on the fight against terrorism, the United States consider that “[h]umanitarian efforts that are not immediately connected with national interests could be regarded as a diversion from pressing new security challenges.”<sup>65</sup> After the 9-11 attacks, national security in terms of political realism seems to have regained strength, while the human security, which had been ambiguous since its beginning began to lose momentum once the international arena became more focused on the war against terrorism.

However, as Legler explains, “September 11 emphasizes the fact that human security and national security are not necessarily gone. In fact, failed or dysfunctional states...are not only a humanitarian issue but also a national security problem...the responsibility to protect people then can become a real national interest.”<sup>66</sup> As we have seen, “[i]n the field of international security, a focus on the individual as the nexus of concern enables us to understand both the broad spectrum of threats, and their interlocking nature, in any given context.”<sup>67</sup> The availability of small arms, paramilitaries, mercenaries, child soldiers, and other such insecurity generators, funded through crime and corruption, resources like oil, black markets, and warlords, to name a few, are aspects of human security that could very easily turn into a matter of international security, and which, in some way or the other, have fostered terrorism.

---

<sup>64</sup> Macfarlane et al, . “The Responsibility to Protect: is anyone interested in humanitarian intervention?,” p. 977

<sup>65</sup> Ibid

<sup>66</sup> Legler, “¿Víctima del Terrorismo?,” p. 296 (My translation)

<sup>67</sup> McRae, “Human Security in a Globalized World,” p. 21

#### **I.4 Terrorism: A “new” threat to security?**

While terrorism took a new meaning after the September 11 attacks on United States’ territory, the concept is not new. According to Laqueur, terrorism emerged during the nineteenth century as a response to “great national tension and social ferment”. While he gives a thorough account of the history of terrorism,<sup>68</sup> the terrorism that we know, he explains, was born in Italian and Irish patriots’ secret societies, and manifested in varied countries from the Balkan region, in Turkey and Egypt. It was discussed within the European far left, but not because they alone thought about terrorism as a way of propaganda, but because the right held the political power and as such experienced no need to find alternate ways of expression.<sup>69</sup> Laqueur defines terrorism as “propaganda by deed”, and identifies different forms of terrorism:

Terrorism has been defined in many different ways, and little can be said about it with certainty except that it is the use of violence by a group for political ends, usually directed against a government, but at times also against another ethnic group, class, race, religion, or political movement. Any attempt to be more specific is bound to fail, for the simple reason that there is not one but many different terrorisms. [...]Traditional terrorism appeared in various forms: in conjunction with a civil war or guerrilla warfare, in the framework of a political campaign, and also in ‘pure’ form. It has been waged by religious and secular groups, by the left and the right, by nationalist and internationalist movements, and by governments who engage in state-sponsored terrorism. Terrorists have seldom, if ever, seized power...But they have on occasion brought about political change, inasmuch as they have helped to bring down democratic governments that were replaced by military dictatorships. They have also on occasion helped to trigger war...In a few cases, terrorism has had an effect on world history, but it has not always been the one the

---

<sup>68</sup> For a detailed history of terrorism, see Walter Laqueur, The New Terrorism: Fanaticism and the Arms of Mass Destruction, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999)

<sup>69</sup> Walter Laqueur, The New Terrorism: Fanaticism and the Arms of Mass Destruction, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999) p. 12

terrorists intended...The impact of terrorism has been so erratic and diffuse that its impact on history has been slight.”<sup>70</sup>

That last line could have been true until 9-11. After that day, terrorism not only gained a new and more profound meaning, but the international system itself was changed. The United States began a crusade against terrorism, and whomever wasn't on their side, was against, as President George Bush boldly proclaimed. The most recent U.S. national security strategy,<sup>71</sup> places terrorism and WMD proliferation, and most particularly the dangerous mixture of the two, as the main threats not just for the United States but for the international community as a whole. “As disagreements over whether to go to war with Iraq show, however, different nations view the collective threat posed by the nexus of terrorism and WMD differently.”<sup>72</sup>

Terrorism, as human security, is a concept that has not been clearly defined. As has been stated, the issue was not new to the international security; it just regained strength after the attack on the United States. Lack of proper definition is not the only problem that discussions about terrorism present, but also a path of action not only to respond to, but to prevent terrorism. As Rakmil points out,

The debate on terrorism in the United Nations mostly stagnated from 1972 to 1994 in political disputes over definitions of terrorism...For every cause and conspiracy no matter how violent, there are supporters...a notion that for a long period precluded countries agreeing on a definition of terrorism. Some scholars have argued, to get around this political minefield, that ‘one democracy’s terrorist should be another democracy’s terrorist.’ Still, the UN General Assembly adopted its 1994 Declaration against Terrorism unanimously, explicitly stating that criminal Acts intended or calculated to provoke a state of terror in the general public, a group

---

<sup>70</sup> Ibid, p. 46

<sup>71</sup> The 2002 National Security Strategy can be downloaded in pdf format at URL <http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.pdf>

<sup>72</sup> Shen , “Can Alliances Combat Contemporary Threats?,” p 166

of persons, or particular persons for political purposes are in any circumstances unjustifiable, whatever the considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or any other nature that may be invoked to justify them.'...The sterile political debate over who is a freedom fighter, or a terrorist obscured the fact that the tools the international community needs to fight the international trade in illicit drugs,...etc. are very similar, if not identical to those needed to fight terrorism.<sup>73</sup>

Terrorism shares similarities with international crime organizations, and is just as difficult to combat since it can't be localized within a particular state. In the 84<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting of the General Assembly on December 9 1994, the members of the United Nations reaffirmed "their unequivocal condemnation of all acts, methods and practices of terrorism, as criminal and unjustifiable, wherever and by whoever committed, including those which jeopardize the friendly relations among States and peoples and threaten the territorial integrity and security of States."<sup>74</sup>

However, this broad definition of terrorism can further be found practically unchanged in resolutions 1269 of 19 October 1999, 1368 of 12 September 2001 and 1373 of 28 September 2001. While international terrorism has been found to "constitute one of the most serious threats to international peace and security in the twenty-first century,"<sup>75</sup> it is clear that there is no real consensus on what terrorism ultimately implies, and less so on how to combat it.

At a Foreign Affairs ministerial meeting on 20 January 2003, the Security Council recognized the imminent threat of terrorist groups accessing and using nuclear, chemical, biological, and other weapons of mass destruction; it was also stated that it has been

---

<sup>73</sup> Rakmil, Victor. "Terrorism" (in Human Security and the New Diplomacy: Protecting People, Promoting Peace Rob McRae and Don Hubert, Eds. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001) p.208

<sup>74</sup> United Nations General Assembly Resolution A/RES/49/60 "Measures to Eliminate International Terrorism" URL <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/49/a49r060.htm>

<sup>75</sup> United Nations Security Council Resolution S/RES/1377 (2001) URL <http://www.securitycouncilreport.org/atf/cf/%7B65BFCF9B-6D27-4E9C-8CD3-CF6E4FF96FF9%7D/1373%20SRES1377.pdf>

increasingly easy for these groups to use sophisticated technology and resources.<sup>76</sup> While it was made clear that there is a need for the part of the international community to prevent the terrorist from making use of either, it is still not clear as to how it's supposed to be done. There is a strong discursive appeal on the part of the US to a collective security approach, but their actions speak otherwise.

---

<sup>76</sup> United Nations Security Council Resolution (S/RES/1456 (2003) URL <http://ochaonline.un.org/webpage.asp?Page=1804>