Chapter-1

CONCEPT OF SECURITY:
A FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS
1.1. The Concept of Security

The concept of security plays a vital role in formulating the domestic and foreign policy of a nation. It has broader connotation than the terms, self-preservation, survival, defence-preparedness, guarding one's frontiers etc., though they are often interchangeably used. It relates not only to the ultimate desire of the survival of State but also to live without serious external threat to its interests or values that are regarded as important or vital.¹

The policies that the States follow to promote their security rest on a series of judgements and choices. In the first place, the State should find out the vital interests and prepare to preserve it.² In the second place security-judgements should be taken with proper consideration of the changing conditions of the State, its relationship with other States and their intentions and capabilities. In the third place, the degree of threats for a State should be properly studied while making policies relating to security. Even while facing similar threats, States differ in their security-arrangements; some tend to spend relatively high while others relatively low proportion of their resources on security.³ In the fourth place, methods for ensuring security differ from State to State. Dangers may be warded off

---


or countered through conflicts or peaceful means. When some States prefer peaceful negotiations and co-operation, others resort to war, conflict alliance, and counter-alliance for preserving their security.\(^4\)

In a conflict situation, an actor with enough power attains a dominating position in the power politics and feels secure thereby.\(^5\) In some other situations, co-operation replaces confrontation in resolving conflicts of interest.\(^6\) Such cooperative endeavors minimize the probability of use of power and helps in sorting out the differences among the countries through peaceful negotiations, positive policies, and programmes, which lead to a state of peace and ultimately make everybody feel immensely secure.

In common parlance, concept of security is identified military preponderance. However, this is a narrow concept. Recently, it has undergone a qualitative change. Besides military security, now it includes political, economic, environmental and socio-psychological security. In the present context, it is not possible to maintain security solely through military preponderance. Robert McNamara highlights this aspect of

---

\(^3\) Ibid.

\(^4\) Ibid. This line of arguments are also expressed by Barry Buzan's, *People, States and Fear*, (Great Britain: Wheatsheaf Books, 1989), and Gregory Flynn, *The Internal Fabric of Western Security*, (Allanheld: Osmun & Co, 1981).

\(^5\) See Buzan, *People, States and Fear*, op. cit.,
security when he says: "It is not a military force though it may involve it. Security is not traditional military activity though it may encompass it".7 Thus the objective of security now has been "all round development focussing national attention on political and economic power". The latter, in particular, in the context of the developing countries, is an essential ingredient of security".8 Today security concerns encompass not only the defence of the territory but also the problem of access to raw materials at reasonable prices and how to alter and satisfy the expectations of social and economic stability.9 In the post Second World War, particularly in 1980s unstable economic conditions of a state posed a threat to the concept of domestic security. Higher the expectations of the people, more the threats to the domestic concept of security in the industrial world. Developments during the post war period have enlarged the problem of security within industrial societies to include not only the question of physical but also questions of individual well-being such as job security, maintenance of standard of living, health care and retirement pensions. Though these problems are not new to the government but they are now

---


8 Ibid.

perceived as security problems by the large segments of Western population.\textsuperscript{10}

Besides military and economic aspects of security, political dimensions also play a vital role in the policy of national security. Domestic and foreign policies of a nation are largely influenced by it.\textsuperscript{11} Political instability, class and community conflicts, secessionist tendencies of states shatter the internal fabric of security. Thus security involves not only freedom from physical danger but also from psychological danger and is therefore a subjective concept.\textsuperscript{12} In the concept of security, national and international security is intertwined in such a manner that it is too difficult to differentiate one from the other. In the present context, international security is getting prominence in bi-polar conflictual world is heading towards a multi-polar consensus world. Instead of warfare, peace is the prime mover of nations. In a broader canvass, international security encompasses regional security, international strategic doctrines, and political, economic and socio-psychological security of nations.\textsuperscript{13} Its

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{10} Ibid., p. 5.
\end{itemize}
objective is global peace and all round development of the world. These views on security are expressed by the writings of the idealist thinkers.

Nevertheless, political realists think that international security is to be understood on the basis of actions and interest of nations. They put least emphasis on international problems, humanitarian issues, and global security problems. They clearly discount the questions of inter-group relations at levels other than the state, issues relating to the economic, political and socio-psychological problems of the world.¹⁴

In the present world particularly after 1985 when Gorbachev assumed power, the concept of international security was given a new twist. It sought to blend political realism with idealism and de-ideologize the socio-political matrix in which concept of security is embedded¹⁵. Attempts were made to solve individual and national security problems through international security measures.¹⁵

For a better understanding of this novel concept of security, one should analyse the various approaches to the security. In the analysis of


security, the realist model of international politics, conceived broadly as a struggle for power, had its relevance in the polarized environment of the Second World War. During the subsequent Cold War days such realism determined the course of super power politics. Such was the sway of realist paradigm that states in the international arena were perceived to be locked in perennial power struggles, and the concern for security was conceived of as a derivative of power.\footnote{Buzan, op. cit., p. 7.}

Idealists rejected this realist model, but emphasized more on arms control, disarmament, and international cooperation. Thus their approach to security indirectly attested the realist contention that security was a mere derivative of the power-struggles perennially going on at the international level.\footnote{Ibid., p. 7.}

With such tentative appreciation of the concept of security, now attempts has been made to discuss various approaches to security in details. The approaches to "security" can be broadly classified under two headings: classical approaches to security and rational scientific approaches to security.
1.2. Classical Approach to Security

Classical approach is otherwise known as traditional approach. This approach analyses security from normative, qualitative and value-judgement point of view. This approach was adopted by most of the scholars until scientific approach made its appearance. It nourished two important streams of thought: realism and idealism, which contributed greatly to the understanding of the nature, determinants and dynamics of the concept of security.

1.2.i. Realism

Realism, which is the prime mover of the security paradigm, emerges out of the individual’s fear psychosis that others are trying to destroy him for which he must take protective measures.\(^ {18}\) This approach is developed under the basic assumption that rivalry and strife among nations continue in some form or the other. As it emphasizes on the struggle for power or the contest for powers, most of the nations revolve around this power paradigm for protecting their security. They adopt various means like balance of power, deterrence for effective check of the contest for power. Hans J. Morgenthau; George F. Kennan; Reinhold

Niebuhr; Stanley Hoffman; Arnold Wolfers; E. H. Carr; Hedley Bull and Raymond Aron are the leading advocates of the realist school of thought.

The best exposition of realistic theory of international politics has been given by Hans J. Morgenthau. Security is the prime concern in his theory. He says, "international politics like all politics is a struggle for power. Whatever be the ultimate aim of international politics, power is always supreme". It is obvious that a nation can be secured if it enjoys power. Power occupies a cardinal position in the realist security-paradigm as it helps in preserving security, which is a part of national interest. The struggle for power leads to the balance which nations try for their protection against others' attack. Kenneth Thompson and Hans J. Morgenthau laid stress on balance of power. They tend to view balance of power as an effort by the nations to increase their strength at least to equal level with other nations if not superior to other nations' strength to counteract the power of other nations. Balance of power also helps to protect the vital interest of nations by adopting various methods like war

---


and aggression.\textsuperscript{22} It is obvious that security is the prime concern as it is the vital interest of nations.\textsuperscript{23} A country ignoring the balance of power is poorly armed; thus its security is at stake, as it cannot check the attack of belligerent nations.

The idea of equilibrium is the basis of balance of power. But in reality nations prefer preponderance, not equilibrium of power. They prefer disequilibrium as it works out in their favour. Realists hold that it is in the interest of every nation to prevent other nations to be more powerful than itself as it may bring threats for its security and survival.\textsuperscript{24} Morgenthau argues in favour of national interest at the cost of morality as it helps in ensuring security. On the other hand, George Kennan tries to make a striking balance between national interest and morality ingrained in our civilization for conducting foreign policy of a nation.\textsuperscript{25}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{23} Dyke, \textit{International Politics}, op. cit., p. 221.
\end{itemize}
analysis, it is reflected that Kennan supported the idea of moral relativism and Morgenthau the idea of transcendental relativism.  

Raymond Aron emphasizes on maximum security of a nation as it helps in protecting a nation and simultaneously increases its prestige by helping less powerful nations as the leaders of the coalition. In other words "to want the maximum of security means to want the maximum of power which in turn means the greatest number of allies the fewest possible enemies".  

A great power also does not ignore the significance of ideology. They help their allies on ideological grounds and pave the way for opposite ideological nations to make counter allies in the struggle for power. Aron maintains that most of the conflicts and rivalry continues, as most of the nations do not agree either to a common law or compromises. However, Aron differs with Morgenthau and others in his analysis and distinguishes between power as a means and power as an end.

---


Prominent realist Quincy Wright examines that since World War II, states had relied more on military force for preserving their security than international law and organization.\textsuperscript{29} Studies of the course of public opinion also supported this conclusion. Since World War II, nationalism and state sovereignty and security overshadowed internationalism and world community. International problems were solved militarily than peaceful means. According to Wright, realism, which defined national interest in terms of power, represented short-term national policies, which would be helpful for the fulfillment of immediate requirements of nations.\textsuperscript{30} Balance of power as a method for ensuring security cannot prevent nuclear war prematurely as balance of military power always required occasional wars to make their operation effective. As Wright put in this way

\begin{quote}
\textit{in actual aggression impossible, the development of military geniuses, military interventions, military alliances or effective military preparation has always in time stimulated some states to attempt to break the balance of power, especially if a long peace has induced some states to relax military preparation, to ally themselves with the potential aggressor, or to pursue policies of permanent neutrality, thus reducing the potential exposition to the aggressor.}\textsuperscript{31}
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{30} Quincy Wright, "Realism and Idealism in International Politics", \textit{World Politics}, (October 1954), pp. 126-127.
Hedley Bull critically reviewed one of the strategic experts, Noel-Baker, for his theory of collective security. He, in fact, rejected it and gave his own theory in stead. Unlike other realists, he argued against excessive self-interest in approaches to security. He tried to introduce a link between common interest and national security. He pointed out that "the military balance is itself most important source of security, and it is not necessarily made more important by being reduced to a lower level in terms of strategic or limited war forces". He argued that "there is no necessary presumption in favour of disarmament rather than rearmament in the design of a system of arms control". His writing on arms control suggest that he considered military balance very important for the preservation of security, especially when the world is under the shadow of a nuclear holocaust. In the 1980s, he became concerned about the defence policies of super powers and stressed more on armaments than arms control to enhance their security. Hedley Bull analysis on arms control outlined five ideas, which would be helpful for preserving security. These are:

- Arms control is not an end in itself but a means to an end: security against nuclear war;

---

31 Quincy Wright, op.cit., p. 22.
33 Ibid., pp. 37-62.
34 Ibid., p. 55.
- Arms control rests on the assumption that there is some perceived area of common interest between the antagonistic powers;

- Arms control and defence strategy are not mutually contradictory by nature and must be developed in harmony with an overall security policy;

- Arms control embraces a wider area of military policy than simply that which is covered by formal agreements. The most important immediate goal of arms control is to stabilise the relationship of mutual deterrence between the super powers.\(^\text{35}\)

Nevertheless, he was very much sceptical about the response of the super powers to arms-control as they wanted to spread their ideological and military hegemony over the rest of the world.

Arnold Wolfers believes that life of the individuals and national community can be saved by sacrificing moral values. But the advent of nuclear has made the situation worse and it is doubtful whether the security of nations can be protected through war which is detrimental for human existence ultimately throw human race to catastrophe.\(^\text{36}\) Wolfers emphasized on the concept of national security and critically analysed the many dimensional complexities of this concept. He characterized security


\[^{36}\text{Arnold Wolfers, "Statesmanship and Moral Choice", World Politics, (January 1949), pp. 1763-94.}\]
as an ambiguous symbol – at one point he argues that it does not have any precise meaning.37

Stanley Hoffman compared the present power struggle in politics for ensuring security with a game of ‘roulette in a cellar’, and noted that “as long as the competition goes on, the player cannot be asked to behave as if it were over”. He argued that it was absurd to want states to give up their separate interests merely because they had a common interest—divergently perceived—in survival or in a modicum of order. But it is not absurd for states to refrain from pursuing separate interest with means that are capable of throwing not only their immediate rivals but all bystanders and themselves to abyss”.38

1. 2.ii. Neo-Realism

Neo-realism is a synthesis between classical realism and elements of various critiques of realism. Modern neo-realists emphasize on international system and the structure than the nation states in their


analysis of power paradigm. The leading advocates of Neo-realism are Kenneth Waltz, Robert Gilpin, Barry Buzan and Bjørn Møller.

Kenneth Waltz's structural realism reflected that in the structure of international system, states, though important, are not the only actors. It is obvious that national interest is the prime concern of the states in taking important decisions including decisions on national security. But this self-help attitude of the states shatters the fabric of the system.\(^{39}\) Waltz argued that this anarchy was a lesser evil than the hierarchical structure, such as collective security, world government, which regulated balance of power but often favoured the powerful nations. He argued in favour of nuclear revolution and even he rejoiced at the prospects of nuclear proliferation as he felt "it restrains and imparts a sense of caution among those states that are in possession" and such kind of a nuclear deterrence, in the ultimate analysis helped in preserving security rather than endangering it. In his opinion there is an important correlation between degree of freedom and security. Higher the freedom, more the social threats to the individuals and thus individual security was threatened. In the same way, freedom of the states leads to insecurity, as that will lead to a state of chaos where states will be groping for direction.

Neo-realists like Robert Gilpin would seek a terrain away from the realists' obsession with power. Even he substantially modifies the realists' overall conceptual position of the state. He would call a state a 'coalition of coalitions' rather than a unitary actor as was emphasized in earlier times and even go to the extent of banishing the concept of state from the realm of conceptual possibility. He ridicules the realists' weakness for status quo and situates the problematic of security against such a backdrop where status quoist states bent on preserving the status quo would seek power for the sake of it in overtly military terms. Gilpin rather emphasizes on economic factors. He argues that calculation of cost and benefits very often determines the locus of decision-making of nations in preparation for war and peace. The recognition of economy as the most important ingredient of power makes Gilpin's neo-realist study sounds very logical in the context of happenings all round the globe right now. His concern for security, therefore, has more to do with strengthening of economic factors and considerations of them than the preparedness of war strictly in military-power terms.

---


Barry Buzan analyses the concept of security holistically. According to Buzan, security is a complex combination of individual, national and international security, which he considers as three levels in his analysis of security paradigm. He discusses security in relation to specific threats. He emphasizes on social threats that are intertwined in human environment with unavoidable social, political and economic consequences. Freedom is the most important factor that regulates the social security of a man. To overcome the threats that spring up from freedom and to maintain adequate level of security against social threats, people seek the mechanism of the state. The paradox is that, the state, instead of ensuring individual security, becomes a source of social threat against the individual because of its so called 'defence dilemma'. The objective of the state is to guarantee security to its citizens for which it seeks to go nuclear in the modern age, which ultimately leads to their extinction. Thus states instead of acting as a vehicle of individual security acts as a source of insecurity. In his opinion, national security depends upon the relationship between the nation and the state. The vulnerability of national security depends upon the components of the state, i.e. the institution of state and physical base of it. The different character of the components, which constitute the state, suggests that threats to the state can come in variety of ways. They can be military, political and ecological. In the same way they can be averted by a variety of means among which military power may not be considered as the most important one.42 Thus he tries to

42 Buzan, People, States and Fear, op. cit., p. 20, pp. 24-92.
modify the conceptual position of realists and their over-emphasis on power paradigm.

According to Buzan, the two major systems, which constitute the security environment of the state, are: international political system and international economic system, which he characterizes as 'anarchical'. He distinguishes between immature and mature anarchies. The former variety resembles the popular image of anarchy; the latter seems to be an utopian concept of anarchy where "the benefits of fragmentation can be enjoyed without the costs of continuous struggle and instability". Hence such mature anarchy will lead to a better existence of the state system by mutual respect and understanding.\(^{43}\) This condition of anarchy suggests that the security concerns of the subsystems do not spread uniformly throughout the system and complex patterns of alignments seek to promise security at different levels. He calls these arrangements as 'security complexes'. He defines a "security complex" as a group of states whose primary security concern link together with their national securities so closely that their individual security cannot be considered in isolation of the overall security arrangements.\(^{44}\)

\(^{43}\) Ibid., p. 96.

\(^{44}\) Ibid., p. 106, 126.
Bjørn Møller emphasizes a new type of defence structure 'Non-Offensive Defence' (NOD) for ensuring security of nations, which is at stake. He argues in favour of it as it leads to arms control and disarmament, increased crisis stability and the elimination of incentives for preventive war and pre-emptive attack. He compared Non-Offensive Defence (NOD) with military strategy and elaborates its feature in the context of military, maritime forces and nuclear strategy. He analysed its implication in making alliances in general and NATO in particular and considered NOD as a corollary of 'common security'.

1.3. Collective Security: Prospects and Peril

Collective security plays a significant role in preserving global peace and security. It promises peace by preventing wars, settling international disputes and discouraging warmongers. In the present world the United Nations — the regulator of 'collective security measures' — is stressing more on disarmament programmes as it feels collective security and disarmament programmes are inter-related and should go together. Benjamin Cohen states in U.N. General Assembly:

"I should like to stress the fact that there is an intimate relationship between a programme of collective security and a programme of disarmament. The two by their nature go hand in hand. In the disarmament field, we look to the day

---

when no nation will have armed forces or armaments, which could pose a threat to a neighbor. In the collective security field, we look to the day when nations will not rely so much on their own forces as on the United Nations for their security. If states are assured that in case of attack they will not stand alone, they will need fewer arms for their defence. As progress is made in disarmament, the task of building collective security becomes simpler. The two march together.... disarmament and collective security are the two great enterprises for peace that this General Assembly has before it."  

In the recent times, the UN took collective measures when Iraq illegally occupied Kuwait and succeeded in resolving this crisis. Before the existence of the UN, the League of Nations also tried its best for the settlement of problems collectively. In some of the disputes before it, especially in the early years, it rendered useful service. But in every major case involving open defiance of the covenant by great powers its security structure did not match to the test. It did not play that much effective role in Manchurian crisis, Poland crisis at the beginning of the Second World War and in Ethiopian crisis. However, the fact that collective security measures contribute to the maintaining of peace can never be denied.

The analysis of the theory and practice of collective security reveals that it wants to preserve status quo. Walter Lippmann rightly considers it as the 'custodian of status quo'. Collective security measure aims at observing peace by preventing wars, suppressing aggression by collective

---

efforts but ignores the fact that *status quo*, which it wants to preserve, is unjust and must be replaced by peaceful means. The dark side of the collective security measure is that instead of preventing war, it universalizes war by converting local and regional wars to world war. It does so not by welcoming small and medium size nations to power struggle but also by preparing the people of a powerful nation with scientific technology to eliminate another nation.\(^47\) Thus, the basic purpose of collective security— to maintain peace and security— gets defeated. In the nuclear world, collective security measure gets a new turn and twist. It is too difficult to control a powerful nation which may cause nuclear war leading to the extinction of the world.

Secondly, the victim of an aggression may be completely destroyed before this collective measure is taken. Collective security cannot be effective unless it takes a bold and impartial step in preventing wars by not dancing to the tune of powerful nations. Its objective should be ‘security through disarmament’ and not by war to counter another war, which may breed violence, thus jeopardize security.

1.4. Security and the Paradigm of Idealism

The concept of security gets a new dimension by the exponents of idealism who regard realists view of 'power politics' as a 'passing phase of history'.

The idealists outrightly rejected their ideas and came forward with a new idea that visualized a new order free from 'power politics, immorality and violence'. The basic objective of this theory is to look after the interests of various groups, nations and ensure the welfare of the entire humankind. In the year 1795, Condorcet wrote a treatise which elaborated the main ideas of idealism in international politics. He visualized a New World order free from war, violence, inequality, and tyranny and based on peace, amity and mutual cooperation.

In the modern age Kant, Tolstoy, Gandhi, Woodrow Wilson are considered as the chief exponents of idealism. Kant insisted on peace which he considered as pre-requisite for human kind's ultimate societal and moral progress. He condemned war, tried to eliminate it as it breeds violence. In his opinion, individuals should work for peace so should states. Kant regarded an end to war as something, which was not only desirable but whose historical progress was making peace increasingly realizable. He thought that the major force in history was the tension between humankind's desire to satisfy its own wants, without regard to the
well being of others, and the realization that it is only through cooperation with others that it can have any real chance for happiness. As civilization develops, said Kant, people see increasingly clearly the truth that they must cooperate with one another, even if this means denial of their own passion and desires.\footnote{48}

Kant argued in favour of peaceful relationship between states and despised war, as it runs counter to the most desirable goal of survival of the mankind. In case of war, state would spend a lot of money for that, but if it were defeated, it would have to face the horrors of conquest and humiliation of defeat. Kant's ideas of perpetual peace had a tremendous impact all over the world. It gave a powerful stimulus to much of the nineteenth century thinking on how to limit and ultimately eliminate war on both sides of the Atlantic.\footnote{49} Thus Kant was a true champion of peace and tried to ensure security of the world through peaceful means.

Tolstoy was the champion of 'pacifism' and a great preacher of morality. His study of peace lies chiefly in his commitment to pacifism. He supported the idea of total non-resistance than passive resistance to violence. Tolstoy who was regarded as a 'Christian Anarchist' criticized state vehemently for producing war, legitimizing violence and endangering

\footnote{49}{Ibid., p. 518.}
the existence of mankind. State propagates false values like inequality, cruelty, and brutality, and suppresses noble virtues by its coercive structure. "If state compelled the individual to do violence, then the individual should peaceably but decisively go on strike against it until the state ceased to exist". Tolstoy was criticized by realists as he denied State its power and by Christians who admitted moral validity of much that he had to say but saw the impracticability of its realization. For without State it is impossible to think of social existence. Because of the State, there could be order based on law, morality and education. Tolstoy, who was a believer of transcendental and supernatural power, hoped for the change of the world through changes in the human heart. Though his ideas seemed to be utopian, he was an ardent advocate of peace who strived his best to guarantee the security of the entire world through peace.

Mahatma Gandhi was a true champion of non-violence and peace. Though he did not evolve a complete theory of security, the twin principle of truth and non-violence (satya and ahimsa) formed the core of Gandhi's philosophy. Gandhi said that truth and non-violence could bring about a total transformation in the world. Like other idealists, he supported the eternal idea of peace and denounced violence and immorality, as they


51 Ibid., p. 466.
corrupt human relationship and souls of the people of the world. He wanted to preserve peace through mutual respect and mutual promotion of each other’s interest. He wanted to fight against the force of an invading army with the force of love but he wished for a moral victory not by reconciling with aggressor but by forcing him to surrender to his eternal principle of non-violence and peace. In this context Gandhi said: “Peace, I want, among all mankind, but I don’t want peace at any cost and certainly not by placating aggression”. The idea of Shanti Sena (Peace Army) which was his brain-child was effective in containing the Chinese incursion into Tibet as well as in other conflicts. He also proposed the concept of ‘civilian based defence’ which has more relevance in the present world. This is considered by many including strategic thinkers as the panacea to save the world from nuclear catastrophe, for it is the only form of defence which neither threatens the attacking party by provoking them to attack, nor calls for militarization of society. Gandhi extended his idea of non-violence and peace to national and international defence and strived for preserving security through these weapons.

53 Bombay Chronicle, August 9, 1942.
Woodrow Wilson brought a renaissance in the world with his ideas of federalism, which laid the foundation stone of 'League of Nations'. He is the founding father of 'modern idealism', which he thought could be reflected in the world order and federalist traditions and advocated the abolition of states in favour of 'world government', peace societies, peace movements and other such organizations those are influenced by his ideas. He stressed on 'world government' and strived for replacing occidental with oriental cosmology. Thus Wilsonian ideas of peace have much more relevance in the present world for creating a New World Order and preserving global security. In the words of Ruth C. Reynolds:

“He bequeathed his generation, and following generations, with a faith that such an order might be possible, and in the United Nations, much of Wilson’s work and idealism came to fruition”.

1.5. Institutional Approach to Security

In the present time, various institutions, peace movements and organizations are devoted to the achievement of peace and security. They facilitate in disseminating these ideas all over the world, promoting cooperation and multilateral relations among various nations. This is an important approach to the concept of security. Various institutional frameworks which aimed at universal peace are discussed below.

---

55 Møller, Common Security and Non-Offensive Defence, op.cit., pp. 11.
1.5.i. Non-Alignment Movement and Security

The Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) is an anti-imperialist and anti-colonial movement, which strives towards peaceful co-existence and international security. When the entire world is under the spell of nuclear war, NAM is playing a decisive role in sorting out regional and super power conflicts and thereby has had a dampening influence on the East-West crisis. It has also challenged the regressive forces, those that are trying to destabilize the world and disturbing the oneness of humanity. Its effective role and sincere efforts in solving Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Angola, Kampuchea and other West Asian problems is really worth praising. The political declaration adopted by the Delhi Conference stressed on this aspect: "It is a struggle against imperialism, apartheid, racism including Zionism and against all forms of foreign aggression, occupation, domination, interference or hegemony as well as against great power and bloc policies." Apart from maintaining peace "it is also striving for the establishment of a New World Order based on respect for independence, equality and cooperation".

---


59 Ibid.
NAM has really restructured the social, political and economic set up of the world. In the economic sphere it has tried for the establishment of a New International Economic Order (NIEO) which has saved the Third World, particularly Afro-Asian countries from colonialism and neo-colonialism. In 1961, Non-Aligned Summit at Belgrade tried to remove the economic disparities, which they inherited from colonialism and imperialism. It also tried to bridge the gap between developed and developing nations by accelerating the growth of economic, industrial and agricultural sectors of the Third World.

NAM has also stressed on the political dimension of security. It has encouraged super-powers and other important powers for the solution of the military, economic and other issues through summit diplomacy. It has also accelerated the pace for concluding various treaties, particularly during Cold War and new Cold War period, which ushered in a new phase of détente. From the above analysis, it is clear that this movement gave a new direction to the concept of security as it emphasizes military, political, economic and social security of the world. Now scholars like Galtung, Robert Gilpin and Paul Kennedy are successful in conceptualizing this dimension of security.60

1.5.ii. The United Nations and Security

The United Nations was formed after the Second World War to avert future wars and to maintain global peace and security. This world organization has been working successfully for last fifty years in promoting peace, security and human welfare.

The purpose of the United Nations is:

1. "To maintain international peace and security, and to that end, to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace;

2. To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;

3. To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural or humanitarian character and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion; and
4. To be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends".61

*An Agenda for Peace* was prepared at the level of Heads of State and Government at the level of U.N. Security Council meeting in January 1992. The report summarized the United Nations' approach to peace, security and the implications of its involvement in regional and intra-state conflicts. The then Secretary-General Boutros-Boutros Ghali defined three important functions that the Security Council asked him to address.

1. **Preventive Diplomacy** – It is action to prevent disputes from arising between parties, to prevent existing disputes from escalating into conflicts and to limit the spread of the latter.

2. **Peace Making** – It is a technique that expands the possibilities for both the prevention of conflict and the making of peace.

3. **Peace Enforcement** - which enforces peace in case of needs.62

Preventive diplomacy seeks to resolve disputes before violence breaks out. Peace making, peace keeping and peace enforcement are

---


essential to halt conflict and to preserve peace, once it is attained. If it is successful it leads to 'post conflict peace building', which helps in preventing the recurrence of conflicts between states. It encompasses more than the reconstruction of peace after the cessation of hostilities. It is related to the developmental efforts — political, economic, socio-cultural— of the U.N. Its prime-motive is to settle down conflicts of various magnitudes amicably and to open up the path for socio-economic development of nations by reinforcing ever-lasting peace. It strives for restoring civil society through its efforts in revamping its polity, economy and settling the migration problem.63

Preventive Diplomacy is playing a vital role in the present world for the solution of international conflicts. Mutual confidence and good faith are essential to reducing the likelihood of conflicts between states.64 United Nations use good offices, good missions, despatching special envoys to tense areas and bringing parties to a conflict to the negotiating table for this purpose. It is the most effective technique of United Nations for tackling variety of challenges, which it faces in its day to day activities.


More than one hundred missions of representation, fact finding and good will offices were undertaken by U.N. The U.N. Secretary General and other diplomats have travelled extensively to extend good offices and represent the organization throughout the world. It played a positive role for the solution of South African problem and ensuring peace in that country. In the first time in the U.N. history military units have been deployed as a measure of preventive diplomacy in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. “Under United Nations auspices, Greece and former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia are engaged in talks intended to reduce tensions brought about by the recognition of the independence of the latter”.

Various Humanitarian assistance programmes of the UN help in maintaining an atmosphere of peace world-wide by catering to the basic needs of the people in moments of crisis. The “Joint U.N.-South Africa Development Community Drought Emergency, in South Africa Programme” played a significant role in mitigating the effects of drought, famine and migration problem. Its effective role in solving natural calamities and other natural disasters are really worth praising.

---

65 U.N. Report, on An Agenda for Peace, op.cit., p. 97.
66 Ibid., p. 99.
In many respects *An Agenda for Peace* was an effort to identify the new requirements of peace keeping and new role of United Nations in the quest of international peace and security. The functions of the peacekeepers have already undergone a change. Nowadays, they have been working as a police force rather than an army for helping people and keeping order, so that government mechanisms will function smoothly. Founding fathers of the United Nations Charter rightly made the UN system flexible enough to accommodate the wider role of peace-keeping upon which the ‘New Collective Security’ system now operates.\(^{67}\)

The United Nations has taken collective action against aggression only on two occasions – Korea in 1950 and Kuwait in 1991. Except for Kuwaiti case, the United Nations has faced problems with different variations since the end of the cold war for which there is no provision in the U.N. Charter. In the recent time, it is very difficult to distinguish between the functions of peace making and peace keeping. U.N. operation in the Congo in 1960 was the example of peace making in the traditional sense. With the end of the Cold War, the peace-making model has been stretched as U.N. has involved itself in various operations in Somalia, Cambodia, the former Yugoslav, Mozambique, Angola and

Afghanistan with variety of missions to project humanitarian and programmes and to preserve peace and security.\(^{68}\)

1.6. New Collective Security

The 'New Collective Security' stresses on both conceptual and practical levels for its operation. In the practical level, it emphasizes on three important aspects: United Nations operational capacity; stable source of funding; and well trained troops for peace keeping operation.

In the conceptual level, it tries to solve the security problems particularly transnational issues that are economic, social and ethical in nature. Nowadays, economic, political and social security has more relevance than military security in the traditional sense of the term. Paul Kennedy has rightly elaborated these aspects of security in *Rise and Fall of Great Powers*.\(^{69}\) The United Nations security approach should be broad based for ensuring ever-lasting peace and security.

---

\(^{68}\) Ibid., p. 178.

\(^{69}\) Ibid., p. 197.
1.7. The Rationalist Perspective

Concept of security could be analyzed through 'system' and 'rational' approaches, as they would provide scientific insight into the complex and wider issues involved in it.

1.7.i. The Systems Approach

The systems approach holds that international politics was full of anarchy. There was chaos, confusions, no fixed patterns to govern it. In this environment states used to fend for themselves as they pursued their contradictory interests. The need for a system was the need of the time to systematize the activities of the states and to study intricate issues in a scientific manner. Thus the idea of system emerged from out of the chaos, which sought to bring about order and harmony.

Thus "a system is considered to exist in an environment and to be composed of parts which, through interaction, are in relation to each other". In this sense, there are discernable regular patterns of action. As conflicts are inevitable in international politics and the 'games nation play'

---


with certain fixed patterns and principles, international system helps in conducting this game. But the management of conflicts is more important than the conflict itself as it ensures peace and security.

1.7.ii. The Rational Approach

The rational approach to security includes various models. Models could be mutually contradictory, while some of the models advocate building up of arms to secure peace, some others emphasize on complete disarmament. Some may argue in favour of perpetuating conflict at a low scale, others may stand for attempting decisions at a domestic level to pre-empt conflict. Attempts have been made to assess some of the significant models of security below.

Deterrence is one of the most important theoretical concept of security, in which one party tries to influence the behaviour of another in a desired direction. It rests directly upon threats, sanctions or deprivation. Thus it deters the opposition from initiating armed actions and restraining escalation in case of war. The far-reaching consequences of deterrence are as follows:

- It views the world order in terms of allies and opponents. It emphasizes military build up and war for preserving security.

---

Its prime motive is to prevent opponents from attack. For this, it keeps a vigilant eye on the opponents’ moves, political behaviours and above all military strategies.

Deterrence emphasizes on the capability of the attacker. It should be convinced about the potentiality of the other side and his motive to use force in case of war.

In this game of deterrence, each side tries to win against the other; convincing other that it has potentiality to win.  

According to Phil Williams, the basic requirements for the functioning of the concept of deterrence are communication, capability and credibility. In case of absence of any one of those requirements, deterrence would not be effective and it would lead to a war. Ultimately the security would be at stake. With the advent of nuclear age, traditional deterrence was replaced by ‘nuclear deterrence’. The conflicts were not confined to states or between two powerful states, but extended to blocs. In 1960’s bloc antagonism was intensified by both the super powers. Both the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Pact


74 Phil Williams, op. cit., p. 70.
(dismantled now) amassed sophisticated nuclear arms and weapons like Intercontinental Ballistic Missile (ICBM) and Sea Launched Ballistic Missiles (SLBM) to deter each other. Thus Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD) restrained both the power hungers from nuclear war and played a positive role in ensuring security. Robert McNamara, the then U.S. Secretary of Defence stressed on MAD and analysed its effective role in deterrence. As the basic premise of nuclear deterrence is that its opponent cannot win a nuclear war, so to materialize this assurance power hungry nation tries for continuous development and military technology, improved methods of conducting war and increased killing capabilities.\(^{75}\)

During the 1970s and early 1980s both the power blocs had sophisticated missiles, hydrogen bombs, long-range strategic bombers and other nuclear means for maintaining strategic purity. Higher the options of nuclear deterrence; more acute the arms race. In 1980’s arms race between two super powers reached at its height, U.S.A. started its Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI) programme. During this time it increased its nuclear capabilities, MX missile programmes, the Trident, SLBM programmes. Similarly, Soviet Union started its missile programmes i.e.,

\(^{75}\) Buzan (ed.), op. cit., p. 25.
(ICBM) to counter the nuclear capability of U.S.A. and to deter U.S.A. from its imperialistic design.

The most important premises of deterrence, which restrained rational actors like super powers from nuclear attack was the cost-benefit considerations, horrors and irreparable damage which it would cause to civilian population, the possibility of escalating nuclear war beyond bounds which was a irrational and unethical. Following figure shows the reasons for a rational actor not to go for nuclear war.
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Soviet perception of nuclear deterrence was different from the American one. In the opinion of Soviet strategic thinkers, even though U.S.A. stressed more on the concept of nuclear sufficiency, but in real sense, its capabilities were developed beyond this which could be identified with ‘deterrence through punishment’. Even U.S.A. was not ready to compromise with its S.D.I. programmes at the time of negotiation with USSR. The most dangerous part of nuclear arms race was that the surplus nuclear weapons were used for political bargaining which impeded the peaceful negotiations between the super powers. Soviet strategists thought that real operation of deterrence could be possible only through close inspection, fair evaluation and due application to mutuality.77

In late 1980s this nuclear deterrence was given a new twist. Gorbachev, the then leader of USSR came forward with his new concept of security, i.e. comprehensive universal security including delegitimization of the use of nuclear weapons as a viable alternative to the theory of nuclear deterrence.

Disarmament and Arms Control are the two important theories of the concept of security. At the outset, both seem to be straightforward approaches to the problems of peace and security, but in reality they are too complex with far-reaching consequences.\(^78\) The most accepted definition of both the theories are given by Hedley Bull:

"disarmament is the reduction or abolition of armaments; it may be unilateral or multilateral; general or local; comprehensive or partial, controlled or uncontrolled. Arms control on the other hand is restraint internationally exercised upon armaments policy, whether in respect of the level of armaments, their character deployment or use."\(^79\)

Though the term 'disarmament' and 'arms control' are used interchangeably but both are not synonymous. Disarmament is related to reduction in armaments whereas arms control refers to restraint. One thing common about both is that there can be disarmament and arms control without formal agreement, arms control encompasses wider range of issues than the reduction of armament. Another important difference is that disarmament is the older but arms control is newer approach.\(^80\)

Elimination of war and maintenance of peace and security are the catchwords of the disarmament programmes. The nation of disarmament springs up from the threat perception, which arises out of a situation of

\(^{78}\) Ken Booth, "Disarmament and Arms Control", in John Baylis, et.al. op.cit. p. 89.


\(^{80}\) Ibid., p. 89.
armed hostility. Each nation perceives the other as a threat to the national security and such perception is akin to the estimated capability and estimated intent of the opposition. Higher the capability and higher the intent of the opposition, the more the threat perception to a nation, but with the absence of anyone, threat perception diminishes drastically. The problem is that to come out of this 'arms tension circle' threat perception should be reduced. It could only possible through the reduction of both military capability and estimated military intent.\textsuperscript{81}

Taking this threat perception into consideration, David Singer mentions three approaches to the theory of disarmament.\textsuperscript{82}

1. Tension – First approach, otherwise known as UNESCO approach attempts to reduce tension through education, understanding and by changing the attitudes of the people. It believes that changing attitudes would be helpful in decreasing inter-governmental tension. It rejects the need for armaments. David Singer does not accept this approach as it has little merit.

2. Political Settlement Approach – This approach believes that arms tension circle which causes threat perception can be eliminated through the proper settlement of underlying political problems. In


\textsuperscript{82} Ibid., p. 174.
this connection, Walter Lippmann says, "The power will not and cannot disarm while they are in conflict on vital issues". Similar views are also expressed by the writings of Morgenthau, Kennan, and de Madriaga. Singer sees little merit in this approach as it undermines the role of weapons in threat perception.\footnote{Ken Booth, "Disarmament and Arms Control", in John Baylis, et.al., op. cit., p. 98.}

3. Armament First Approach – This approach favours disarmament. It believes that tension can be reduced and political conflicts can be resolved when the process of disarmament begins.

Scholars of the \textit{Gradualist School} argue that elimination of weapons should be done in a careful and controlled manner, which would generate an atmosphere of trust between the countries involved. They stressed on the Graduated Reciprocation in Tension Reduction (GRIT) scheme. David Singer, E. Osgood and L. B. Sohn are the exponents of this school of thought. But the scholars of 'armament-first school' believe that "the way to disarm is to disarm". When the States are serious and the environment for multilateral treaty is ready, the process of disarmament should begin.\footnote{Ibid, p. 98.}
The popularity of this disarmament theory is clearly revealed from its history. The first disarmament agreement took place in 1817 between UK and USA which resulted in US-Canadian border becoming the largest demilitarized border in the world and thereafter large number of agreements have been taking place every year. This theory is acceptable internationally as it is supported by social, ethical and economic arguments. Socially, it argues that military power if not restrained and controlled properly is a threat to the society thus disarmament is the best way for preserving security. Ethically it supports the view of pacifists that preparation for war is not justifiable. Economically it is not advisable to go for armaments, as it would incur heavy cost.\textsuperscript{85} However, the critics of disarmaments do not agree with the above arguments and support the arguments for armaments for preserving security. But the real problem of this disarmament is the problems of inspection, verification, and enforcement. American and the Russian scholars have their own opinions on it and they do not agree with each other. But this problem could be solved only through unanimous decision and common approach to it.

The theory of arms control plays an important role in the concept of security. At the end of 1950s this theory assumed prominence as it provided the stimulus for the development of 'arms control'. Hedley Bull has described the central idea of this theory as follows:

\textsuperscript{85} Ibid, p. 98.
"Arms control is a concern about the dangers of nuclear war, and a dissatisfaction with existing policies; a suspicion of the goal of negotiated general and comprehensive disarmament agreement; an insistence upon the unity of strategy and arms control; a broadening of the scope of the subject and a perception of the links between varieties of military activity hitherto thought separate, a criticism of the assumption that disarmament (arms reduction) should be the objective of arms control policy; and a determination to destroy the illusion of disarmament discussion while remaining optimistic about the contribution of the social sciences to improving the prospects of peace and security."

The strategic experts Schelling and Halperin also emphasized on this theory. According to them, it reduces the scope of war and violence and recognizes the common interest and helps in developing a friendly and healthy relationship between potential enemies. It is clear from the above discussion that national interest is the prime mover of this theory and the participants of the arms race believe that it is economically wasteful or strategically self defeating to develop a particular weapon system. It is wise to go for arms control, as it does not require the same degree of mutual trust line disarmament because it affects small sector of nation’s armory. Secondly, it does not involve the complication of inspection, verification and other problems.

---

86 Ibid, p.100.
But there are two divergent views about the international conditions for this arms control measures. Some scholars believe that without political settlement there will be no arms control as it involves greater risk if war breaks out and the national distrust of uncertainty makes the international actors more skeptic. Others believe that arms control must precede political settlement as it ensures a right type of environment for mutual agreements for the solution of the political problems.\textsuperscript{88} It is obvious that national interest is the most important factor for arms control proposals, but military security is the most important consideration for Soviets particularly during Khrushchev era. Lincoln P. Bloomfield emphasized on strategic, economic, external political and internal leadership as four important areas, which had an impact on the erstwhile Soviet disarmament policies. They conclude that:

"the military strategic factor best accounts for both the stability and fluctuations in Soviet policy towards arms control. Moscow's deep concern to avoid general war and its acquisition of a credible minimum deterrent account in large part for the fixed elements among Soviet interests and policies on arms control, while the changing balance between Soviet and US strategic forces appear to have been the key factor in inducing the shifts in Soviet arms control policies throughout the decade".\textsuperscript{89}


\textsuperscript{89} Summarized by Paul R. Benett, \textit{The Soviet Union and Arms Control}, (New York: Praeger, 1989).
Another important theory which has been developed during the past few decades is the decision-making theory which is associated in the names of Richard C. Snyder, H. W. Bruck and Burton Sapin. These writers tried to provide a theoretical framework to the complex question of international politics. This theory has utmost relevance for the analysis of the concept of security. This theory provides deep insights into the complex problems of security and helps the decision-makers in taking right decision, which is essential for international actor. In the words of Robinson, “It is a social process that selects a problem for decision (i.e. choice) and produces a limited number of alternatives, from amongst which a particular alternative is selected for implementation and execution”.90 This theory insists that the behaviour of the decision-makers should be treated as “actors in a situation”. It also emphasizes on the perception of the situation by the actors as the most important basis of the decision. The situation, which includes both internal, and external factors motivate the decision-makers to take various steps for security reasons. Sprout and Sprout emphasize on the post-decisional results and compare

the judgement of the decision-makers with those of outsiders.\textsuperscript{91} They justify the action of the decision-makers not by the decision-makers' perception of the situation but by the effective action taken by the actors to safeguard the national security. Another important factor is the personality of the decision-makers, which can never be undermined. It involves courage, conviction, intelligence and the studies of security policies before taking an important decision on security. It is obvious that the security policies of Henry Truman and John Kennedy were different than that of Joseph Stalin or Nikita Khrushchev.

The recent contribution to an understanding of this theory has been made by John Burton. In his opinion, the attitude of decision-makers is determined by the ideology of a country, the manner in which change is received, the knowledge of the leaders about international situation, past memory of the community as well as experience and the study of foreign policies of a nation. Some writers like Niou, Ordeshook and Rose emphasize on the people's preference than leaders decisions in this theory. According to them, stable or unstable international system emerges not by the decision of leaders but by the preference of the people. If it is assumed that nations seek peace or conflict, then that goals are the logical result of the operation of international political system.

Because nations do not want to assume that a particular system leads to peace and others lead to conflict. Thus their motives begin with more fundamental objectives and derive the circumstances under which peace or conflict will prevail as the logical consequence of the relationship among States.\textsuperscript{92} Most of the decision-makers of the security are guided by this idea while formulating security policies for a nation. Rosenau stresses on the reasoning and motivation as important factors in the analysis of decision-making. In his opinion, some analysts stress on the rationality which provides the requisite stimuli for decision-making. According to some others, personality traits, private prejudices of the officials play a decisive role in the process of decision-making.\textsuperscript{93}

Game Theory and Bargaining Theory are two important theories in international policies that play a decisive role for the analysis of the concept of security. Game theory assumes that international politics is a game of power politics among international actors. As the game in international politics is inevitable, so the States try to advance their interests offensively or defensively but in either case, the players must weigh carefully the alternative means of achieving their objectives and then choose the option that will maximize their gains and minimize their


\textsuperscript{93} James N. Rosenau, \textit{The Scientific Study of Foreign Policy}, (London: Frances Pinter, 1979), pp. 304-305.
losses, as well as their risks and costs. In international politics, there are lots of games going on, such as adversary games in which two or more States engaged in conflict, alignment game in which States seek helps from other States and attract allies away from their opponents through de-alignment or realignment. Arms competition or preparedness game continues as each nation tries to safeguard its security by resisting the attack of the opponents or by gaining superiority over other nations. This theory has five important concepts – the first is the concept of strategy. This emphasizes on the skillful plan of an international actor to maximize his chance of victory over the opponents. This strategy takes into account the potential behaviour of the opponents and helps the State in applying rationality before taking an important decision. It is clear that the strategy is chalked out taking the potentiality of the opponents. Thus, this theory assumes an ‘opponent’ which is the second important concept of this theory. Third concept is ‘pay off’ which evaluates the worth of this game. The fourth concept is a rule that regulates the game. In social and international situations, rules are the laws governed by geographical, social, economic, biological and psychological considerations. The fifth concept of this game is information, which is essential for making a sound


strategy. Game theory be it two persons game or n-person game is guided by the above concepts and the crux of this theory is nothing but to safeguard its security. It is simply an innovative way for the survival of the State.

Bargaining theory is the extension of the orthodox game theory. But it is usually applied in the field of international negotiations. As international negotiations play a decisive role for the solution of international conflicts, so the bargaining theory has much relevance. There have been three approaches adopted for the development of the theories of negotiations. First approach is known as the orthodox approach, which requires that preferences of the negotiating party must remain constant and no way it should be compromised. But some writers argue that there must be some sort of change in the process of negotiation. On the basis of this possibility, second kind of approach has been developed. The third approach to negotiations expounded by Joseph Nogee. The basic premise of this approach is that negotiation is the last thing that a party wants to reach. No party ever wants to break off the negotiations either by withdrawing from it or by compelling the other party

---

to go out of it. So, the only way is to find out a strategy, which would be acceptable by both the parties. Thus, this theory helps the international actor in this critical situation and compels the nation to go for a right type of negotiation. This theory can hardly be applied in a situation characterized by pure conflict or/and pure co-operation. In a pure conflict situation, the participants do not have common interest, they go for straightforward contest of physical strength. So, this theory is meaningless. It has relevance when the conflict is not pure, though they have conflicts on certain specific issues, but they have one common interest i.e. the avoidance of the use of force, which is the driving force behind this theory. In the situation of pure co-operation, they go for joint planning for common benefit. Thus it does not have any relevance. The relevance of this bargaining theory is only in mixed situation i.e. situation in between pure conflict and pure cooperation. But the most important aspect of this theory is the protection of national interest. As security interests dominate over other interests, so the need for this theory is a must in international politics.

Security is always the prime concern of a nation for which each nation tries to manage the crisis effectively, which arises out of its interactions with other nations. In the nuclear age crisis management is

---

indispensable; otherwise national security will be at stake. Conflict is inevitable in international politics and this ultimately leads to settlement,99 but in this game of conflict winner is always in a better position to bargain and usually the loser compromises with the winner. So, nations in general and super powers in particular took deliberate moves to counter or control the risks of war for security reasons. Decisions are made in rational and calculating manner as possible to overcome this crisis.100 In the post Cold War period, both the sides recognize the significance of national security for which each nation takes ration steps of not entering into conflict where the security of both the nations will be at danger. The best example of crisis management are Cuban missile crisis and Berlin crisis where situational factors influenced the outcome of super power confrontations probably to a greater extent that it was acknowledged.101

In the crisis management theory there are three major tenets. First tenet is limiting one's objective. There must be rational bargaining otherwise the crisis cannot be overcome. Second tenet is that two powers

---

98 This idea is also expressed by Mahendra Kumar, *Theoretical Aspects of International Politics*, (Delhi: Shiva Lal Agarwala and Company, 1985), pp. 187-88.


100 Phil Williams, "Crisis Management", in John Baylis, et al., op. cit., p.164.
should try to solve the crisis on terms that are satisfactory without considering gains and loss. The third tenet is that two powers should try to keep the situation under the control, which would provide them freedom of choice for the solution of the crisis.\textsuperscript{102}

From the above analysis, it is clear that crisis management is a strange mixture of ruthless and moderation, determination and prudence, intransigence and accommodation.\textsuperscript{103} International actors particularly USA and erstwhile USSR applied these qualities in a judicious way for preserving their national security.

As discussed, besides military security, there are other areas—economic, environmental, societal—in which security threats are perceived. In the present world, particularly after the end of the Cold War, these relatively newer sectors have much significance.\textsuperscript{104} Post-structuralists have also stressed on the expansion of this concept of security. It is argued by Ole Wæver that the security is a discursive practice, so the concept of security cannot be confined to military domain.

The most important point is not to establish an objective relationship


\textsuperscript{102} Phil Williams, op. cit., p. 166.

\textsuperscript{103} Ibid., p. 169.
between the concept and possible domains of security, but "to study
whether and how this issue can be securitized". He argues in favour of
problematizing the possible and relationship between the state and the
other, asking whether security politics has to be built on a conquest of the
other.105

1.8. Economic Security

Economic security concerns "access to the resources, finance and
market necessary to sustain acceptable levels of welfare and state
power".106 The Third World countries are more economically insecure
than the developed nations. These countries are unable to meet the needs
of the people as they have been exploited by the centre (centre-periphery
model). Nations like Sudan, Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Liberia are still
struggling to better up their economy. Nations like Brazil, Argentina,
Tanzania are unable to resist the pressure of outside institutions in return
for needed supplies of capital. The centre-periphery relation is still
imbalance where periphery occupies a weak position in global market
whose prices, trade, finance and technical evolution are controlled by the

104 Barry Buzan, "Rethinking Security After the Cold War", Nordic Journal of
105 Lene Hansen, "A Case for Seduction? Evaluating the post-structuralist
106 Barry Buzan, "New Patterns of Global Security in the Twenty-First Century",
centre. There is hardly any hope for periphery to overcome this problem because of declining commodity prices, divergence of interests among the developing nations, strategy by the centre to divide and rule, debt crisis of developing nations, lack of facilities to utilize cheap labour in a productive way.¹⁰⁷

Some scholars argue that the plight of the Third World countries arose from their dependent economic position which they had inherited from their colonial past. Others view that these countries are politically independent but penetrated by outside market and political interests and problems in leadership and society whose traditions, skills, resources and internal divisions often impeded the development of a modern political economy.¹⁰⁸

Besides the economic insecurity of the third world, economic crisis have been faced by developing nations. Of course with the introduction of liberalization in world economy and followed by disintegration of Soviet Union, rise of Japan, Germany as economic powers for global leadership and burden sharing have tremendous impact on economic security.


The contemporary economic security is dominated by the strong globalizing tendencies. Now nations are trying their best to integrate with new Liberal International Economic Order (LIEO). The costs of world wide shipping and communication are very low. Now many firms and markets operate globally. It is the global economic system which marginalizes the powers of the states. Now the financial institutions like G7, the World Bank, World Trade Organisation (WTO), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), are playing significant role. Particularly these developments change the discourse in economic security by putting importance on liberal agenda in the area of trade, production and finance. Liberal ascendance means the contemporary discourse on economic security concerns about instability and inequality. Instability is due to relative economic decline of US and about the domestic and international management problems arising from the integration and liberalization of world economy. Concerns about inequality questions the role of the State in the domestic level and takes into consideration the problems of Third World States.  

The decline of USA is due to its unfamiliarity with the pains of economic interdependence. By the 1970s US economy faced crisis and began to feel threatened by dependence on imported oil, trade deficits and pressure

---

on the dollar.\textsuperscript{110} In the 1970s, another important problem relating to economic security was the problem of integration and liberalization of global economy in trade and particularly in finance sector. Due to excessive competition in global market and presence of Transnational Corporations (TNC), in financial markets in this liberalization phase, unemployment and de-industrialization became a threat to both welfare and sovereignty of nation, those were unable to do well within it.

Secondly, the problem of systemic crisis arose in States due to adaptability of nations to the emerging global and trading financial system for maintaining stability and smooth functioning.\textsuperscript{111} Thirdly, the need for aid to poor States and economically crippled socialist States has not been taken seriously by the economic powerful nations on liberal economic agenda was overshadowed socialist thinking in economy during this phase.\textsuperscript{112}

The above mentioned problems, if not tackled properly, may create serious crisis. In the worlds of Buzan et.al.,

"the crisis may not come to pass, but the prospect of it and awareness of its possibility provide the basis for securitization of system-level regimes, consultative


\textsuperscript{111} Ibid, p.97.

\textsuperscript{112} Donal Hellman, op. cit., pp. 303-304. For liberal economic agenda, see Barry Buzan, Ole Wæver, Jaap de Wilde, op.cit., p. 98.
mechanisms, and organizations that sustain the LIEO. A major economic breakdown would have repercussions not only on the economic sector but also in terms of political and military security. Attempting to prevent such a breakdown and to retain the known productive efficiencies of the LIEO is the main globalizing dynamic for economic security".113

There is a strong connection between global concerns about security of the LIEO and security set up at the regional level. Economic regionalism has gained its popularity as a result of integration in the European Union since 1980s and the formation of North American Free Trade Association (NAFTA). Other regional set ups like Association of South East Asian- Nations (ASEAN), Asian Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), linking Australia and North America, the Southern core common market (MERCOSUR) covering the southern core of South America, Asian Free Trade Area in South East Asia, ECOWAS in West Africa, SAARC in South Asia, the South African Development Community (SADC) in South Africa, the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) covering the former Soviet Union are trying to play a significant role in the process of regional integration.

Now the most pertinent question comes to the mind of a researcher – why do economic regionalism is strong when there is a globalizing tendencies. The answer is that the economic regionalism is a response to globalization. It helps the nation in their day to day operation. The logic of

113 Barry Buzan, Old Waever, Jaap de Wilde, op.cit., p.112.
economic regionalism can be considered as a response to manage the threats emanating from globalization. In the words of Buzan et.al.,

"Unlike the situation in 1930s, most contemporary regional blocs have fairly liberal internal trading structures and in many ways are open to world markets. Their purpose is to reduce the pressures of an open global economy without sacrificing all economics of scale and to try to reduce the over-stretched management demands of an open global economy by moving many of those demands to a more intimate regional scale".\(^{114}\)

Another important part of economic regionalism is the desire to preserve societal security. In this line one can see the Islamic economics as a separate type which has regionalizing tendencies. Some realists have also viewed regionalization as an effort to be in the super powers race, but it has lost its relevance after the disintegration of USSR which led to the demise of second Cold War.

As discussed, the concept of economic security is related to military, political, environmental and societal security and it is too difficult to separate it. This over spill quality means that has been talked about economic security is also related to the survival in other sectors, not the economic one.\(^{115}\)

\(^{114}\) ibid., pp.113-114.

\(^{115}\) Ibid., p.116.
But liberals have attempted to separate the economic sector from politics and other sectors which is helpful to understand the concept of security from the perspective of wider security agenda. But still there are problems as we mentioned in this economic security. It can only be solved through concerted efforts of countries on the basis of multilateral constructive and mutual co-operation.

1.9. Environmental Security

Environmental security which is called the 'ultimate security issue' has broadened the security agenda further. Though security experts like Walt rejects the expansion of this concept to include inter alia AIDS, the drug problem and ecological hazards, because they think that this could destroy the coherence of the security paradigm. But the demands of the people of the developed and developing nations to save the world from environmental degradation, resource depletion and environmental change which causes social turmoil either within a country or with neighbouring countries draw the attention of security experts to give importance to 'environmental security' in the new framework for security analysis.\(^{117}\)


A wide range of problems and issues are included within the environmental security agenda: disruption of eco-systems which include climate change, bio diversity, deforestation, desertification and other forms of erosion, depletion of the ozone layer and various kinds of pollution. Energy problems include depletion of natural resources such as fossils, fuels and forests. To this can be added various forms of pollution including management disasters (related in particular to nuclear energy, oil transportation and chemical industries); and scarcities and uneven distribution.

*Population Problems:* It is the most important problem, which threatens to overload the earth's carrying capacity. This population growth produces epidemics of dangerous diseases and crates enormous problems like poor health conditions; declining literacy rates; politically and socially uncontrolled migration including the problem of urbanization.

*Food problems* include poverty, famine, over consumption, loss of fertile soil and water resources; epidemic and poor health conditions and scarcities and uneven distribution. *Economic problems* include the protection of unsustainable production modes, societal instability and structural asymmetries and inequality.
Civil strife includes war related environmental damage and violence related to environmental degradation.\textsuperscript{118} In the view of Homer Dixon – "environmental securities are already leading to violent confrontations and there are early signs of increasing conflict in the coming decade, either induced or aggravated by ecological scarcities."\textsuperscript{119}

In theory, environmental security threats can be either natural or manmade. A volcanic explosion which devastated the island of Mont Serrat in 1997, earthquakes in various parts of the world and other natural calamities are the examples of natural threats to mankind whereas Exxon Valdez accident, Chernobyl or French nuclear testing on Muroroa are manmade.

National governments and international communities are taking up several measures to reduce the death and destruction caused by such events; for example, through Satellite monitoring weather patterns and data relating to earthquake activity and tidal waves on the pacific region.

The focus on environmental security is on the environmental changes, which question the survival of the planet as a sustainable home. There are certain environmental problems like the earth's forests are shrinking; its deserts are expanding; soil eroding at record rates;

\textsuperscript{118} Barry Buzan, et.al., have elaborated the above mentioned problems in the environmental security agenda, op. cit., pp. 74-75.

thousands of plants and animal species disappear; the ozone layer in the upper atmosphere that protects us from ultraviolet radiation is thinning; the earth’s temperature is increasing, posing a threat to all like support systems.\textsuperscript{120}

There are many issues where the attitudes of States vary widely and in many instances ecological decay is due to politics of States. Powerful national and international commercial interests have to be accommodated.\textsuperscript{121}

Some States are more sensitive to these environmental issues than others and therefore, take lead role in this environmental diplomacy. Australia took the lead role in creating an international environment regime for Antarctica, as did Sweden to create an international legal regime to prevent trans-boundary pollution through ‘acid rain’. Besides States, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO) are playing significant role for environmental security. The shining example was green peace, which played a decisive role in the efforts to preserve the declining number of whale in the oceans of the world.


Environmental security is the most sensitive part of the whole security system, which cannot be preserved by the efforts of some States only. International community including NGOs must come forward to take serious international actions either at global or at regional level to deal with the problem effectively or soon it will lead to environmental conflict.

1.10. Societal Security

Societal security is the most prominent issue in the present world. It is “about the threats and vulnerabilities that affect patterns of communal identity and culture”. A wide range of problems and issues are included within it. But the most common issues that have been considered as threats to societal security are outlined here.

The first problem is the issue of migration, which dilutes and changes the identity of one community with the influx of other people (e.g. Chinese migration into Tibet, Russian migration into Estonia). The second

problem is the issue of horizontal competition, which changes the ways of a community because of cultural and linguistic influence from neighbouring culture. The third issue, which is a threat to societal security, is the issue of vertical competition where people lose their identity and identify with wider or narrower identities because there is either an integrating project (e.g. Yugoslavia, the EU) or a secessionist "regionalist" project (e.g., Quebec, Catalonia). The fourth issue relating to societal security could be de population, whether by plague, war, famine, natural catastrophe or policies of extermination.123

The focus of societal security is on the ‘sustainability within acceptable conditions for evolution, of traditional patterns of language, culture and religions and national identity and custom. But there is a class called elite those are the product of the globalizing economy of the information age, do not identify with rest of the people and values of the nation state. The emotional attachment to the nation state is weakened for this group. In some cases, these elite with cosmopolitan attitude owe their loyalty to MNCs, where they are working as its substitute. In most cases, pure individualism prevails. In numerous instances the conflict goes between cosmopolitan, liberal, internalized part of society and more locally tied communitarian resistance. In this context, Buzan et. al., said

“Much of societal security in the richest part of the world is related to this possibly over-arching conflict, that is, the opposition is more between universalizing and particularizing cultures than

123 Barry Buzan, et.al., op.cit., p.121.
between different particularizing cultures (Hassner 1996). In less privileged parts of the world, the patterns are different, either because wider segments expect to gain from internalization (e.g. EU support in southern Europe) or because much of the elite takes part in nationalist operations (the former Yugoslav area).”

124

Besides the above mentioned conflict, “the clash of civilizational identities is as strong on the other side of Islam, where it about Hindu civilization, as between Islam and the West.”125 As already discussed, various sectors of security, but in the present world security experts also have not undermined ‘Humanitarian Security’ and ‘Security Communities’. Humanitarian Security concerns ‘inter-state relations, contacts among the people of various states for good relations, mutual trust and understanding and rational solution to the problems of the world.

Security community concerns ‘one in which there is real reassurance that the members of the community will not fight each other physically, but will settle their disputes in some other way.’

According to Karl Deutsch, the factors for successful security community are, first a high co-relation of certain shared values such as democracy, social market economies and respect for the rule of the law

124 Ibid., p. 138.
and second, a degree of mutual understanding, solidarity and responsiveness among the states that made up the political community.\textsuperscript{126}

From the above analysis, one can conclude that the concept of security has broadened its purview and it is not confined to military security issues which would definitely create misunderstanding to those who are associated with this wider agenda. True security requires government, NGOs and international organizations to address such objectives as social economic justice, political freedom and the protection of the planetary eco-system.