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1. Introduction

Historically, national security was perceived within the traditional framework by keeping nation-state at the centre. At the same time, the genre of foreign policy always remained traditional in nature where the emphasis was laid on conventional methods to pursue national security. Conflict control mechanism was based on the foundations of deterrence and war. Territorial wars were used as an important tool to pursue national security aims. Security was necessarily understood as a concept of equipping oneself with arms and warfare techniques to increase national strength and capability to eliminate threat in the forms of foreign aggression and invasion. In contrast to traditional security, the post-Cold War security concept concentrates upon its non-traditional dimension. Non-traditional security revolves around the human face of security where socio-economic survival and sustenance are central. Non-traditional security is also defined as human security. The post-Cold War international relations have experienced a rise in discourses and debates on the non-traditional security variable and its impact on foreign policy.

In this chapter an effort is made to examine the term security from various perspectives focussing on its centrality and evolution. It will analyze traditional as well as non-traditional concepts of security, which have influenced foreign policy.

2. Security in International Relations Theory

Security has always played a critical role in determining a country’s foreign policy. Therefore, it is necessary to define the term security. In W. B. Gallie’s (1962: 121) terms, security is ‘essentially a contested concept’. A classic attempt
to define the term provides some insights into its controversial nature. Barrie Paskins (1993: 17-35) defines security as, "a value, one among a number of evils to which we are unavoidably averse. We want security, and we fear and loathe and shun insecurity". On the other hand, Arnold Wolfers (1962: 150) argued that 'security, in any objective sense, measures the absence of threats to acquired values and in a subjective sense, the absence of fear that such values will be attacked'. This reflects the perceptual aspect of the concept. What matters ultimately for the security of an individual or a nation-state is not an absolute level of capabilities, i.e. the available security measures, but capabilities which are relative and clearly apparent to those possessed by a perceived or potential adversary. In the international arena, there has been a high degree of agreement that security implies freedom from threats to 'acquired values', but whether such threats exist at the national or international level remains a far more contentious point. From the perspective of national security policy makers, sovereignty, territorial integrity, and political independence of the state are the fundamental values and any threat to these values is considered a threat to national security. The quest to gain more security stimulated competition among states. The traditional way of looking at security limited its scope to the external security only. Thus, the need for the security became unending part of the process of securitising national borders. In the eighteenth century, Jean-Jacques Rousseau argued

"the state...always feels itself weak if there is another that is stronger. Its security and preservation demand that it make itself more powerful than its neighbours. It can increase, nourish and exercise its power only at their expense...because the grandeur of the state is purely relative it is forced to compare itself to that of the others.... It becomes small or great, weak or strong, according to whether its neighbour expands or contracts, becomes stronger or declines" (Rousseau 1755)

External threats are expected in the forms of invasion, aggression, and intrusion. Most of these threats are supposed to be of military nature. This is a traditional view of national security as most elaborately developed within the realist approach to international relations. Domestic threats such as an open challenge to
the legitimacy of the government in power, a civil strife, a civil war etc. are also considered as ‘threats’ because they challenge the governing body or the state.

For much of the twentieth century, the discipline of international relations has witnessed a lively debate between Idealists and Realists over the appropriate focus of enquiry in security studies (Hollis and Smith 1991: 17-28). During the inter-war years, between 1919 and 1939, idealism overshadowed the security debate. A defining characteristic of Idealism was that it viewed international relations from the perspective of moral values and legal norms. Idealism advocated internationalism as an answer to the World problems. This reflected the assumption that human affairs, at both the domestic and international levels, were characterized by the potential for harmony and co-operation. Such an approach promoted the importance of the principles of collective security via institutions like League of Nations, established in 1919, and through international treaties such as Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928 which denounced war as an instrument of national policy. But the events of the 1930s, highlighted by Hitler’s assault on the international order, challenged the basic tenets of idealism. By 1939, E. H. Carr (2001) had launched a sustained attack on idealism. Carr subtly criticized any attempt to ignore the elements of power. He wrote,

“Failure to recognize that power is an essential element of politics has hitherto vitiated all attempts to establish international forms of government, and confused nearly every attempt to discuss the subject. Power is an indispensable instrument of government. To internationalize government in any real sense means to internalize power; and international government is, in effect, government by that state which supplies the power necessary for the purpose of governing” (Carr 2001: 100).

Carr vehemently advocated the need for military power along with the emphasis on the concept of power. While underlining the importance of military power he argued, “The foreign policy of a country is not limited only by its aims, but also by its military strength or, more accurately, by the ratio of its military strength to that of other countries” (Carr 2001:100).
As a result, after the end of Second World War, the Cold War era helped to consolidate Realism's status as the dominant intellectual framework in World politics. Realist notion of security brought a new focus to the understanding of the term national security. It refuted the possibility of permanent international peace. Because human nature was deemed to be driven by a lust for power, war and violent conflicts were seen as perennial features of an anarchic international system. During the Cold War period, the idea of national security was largely defined in military terms. However, realists insist that the militarization of the state system is not necessarily a recipe for unending war. Instead, the pursuit of national security compels states to form alliances which, when weighed against one another in a balance of power configuration, may ensure prolonged periods of international stability. As mentioned by Stephen M. Walt (1991: 30),

“Realism depicts international affairs as a struggle for power among self interested states and is generally pessimistic about the prospects for eliminating conflict and war. Realism dominated in the Cold War years because it provided simple but powerful explanations for war, alliances, imperialism, obstacles to cooperation, and other international phenomena, and because its emphasis on competition was consistent with the central features of the American-Soviet rivalry”.

Security was conceptualized by the neo-realists differs from the one propagated by the classical realist school. The ‘neorealist’ theory advanced by Kenneth Waltz propounded that security perceived by the state is the result of each great power’s will to survive in the anarchic system. By anarchic he meant the absence of central authority to regulate international relations. And contrary to Morgenthau, he claimed that bipolarity was more stable than multipolarity (Walt 1991: 30).

Constructivists also have played an important role in conceptualizing security. Alexander Wendt (1992), Kratochwil, Koslawski (1994) and Michael Barnett are the modern theorists who elaborated constructivism. The constructivists’ approach emphasises the impact of ideas and culture unlike realism and liberalism which tend to focus more on factors such as power or trade (Walt
This shows that constructivism is especially attentive to the sources of change (Walt 1991: 30). The tendency of belief in ideas and changes made this stream of thought practical. This shows that with the varying nature of ideological grounds, the debates on security continue to evolve even today.

3. Traditional Security

The state occupies a central place in traditional security framework. In the international system, nations rely on conventional analysis of international relations and form alliances to achieve common security. In the traditional setting of world security, without the ability to ensure survival, all other values are vulnerable. The understanding of security is subjective and its orientations are not universally uniform. The subjectivity of threat perceptions determines the nature of policy outputs.

In such a situation, the only reliable means that the states perceived to guarantee security was military power. With this belief that their own military strength will make them secure, most states, therefore, attempted to build as much military might as their resources could allow. Even though a state arms itself for apparently defensive purposes, its counterparts perceive the military might as threatening. This provokes other states to arm as well. Here the argument comes true where Rousseau believed that security is a relative phenomenon (Walt 1991: 30). The provision for self-security in the military way always accelerated the efforts to find out ‘security’ measures. Some scholars also describe this syndrome as the spiral model (Jervis 1976: 34) the tendency of defence-enhancing efforts resulting in an escalating arms races that diminish the security of all. Sir Edward Grey (1925) described this process well:

The increase in armaments, that is intended in each nation to produce consciousness of strength, and a sense of security, does not produce these effects. On the contrary, it produces a consciousness of the strength of other nations and a sense of fear. Fear begets suspicion and distrust and evil imaginings of all sorts, till each government feels, that it would be criminal and a betrayal of its own country not to take every precaution, while every
government regards every precaution of every other government as evidence of hostile intent (Grey 1925:92).

This perception most often leads to arms race and occasionally war. Since suspicion exists, there is no end to the belief of insecurity. According to Snyder (1994: 461), “None can be sure that others’ intentions are peaceful, or will remain so; hence each must maintain power for defence. Since no state can understand that the accumulation of military might by others is only self-defence oriented, each might assume that it is also intended for attack. Consequently, each party’s power increments are matched by others”.

In such context, insecurity for all is the unintended result of an unrestrained arms race.

Along with this traditional idealistic interpretation of the world security there is another opinion that power occupies the central place in international relations. The traditional definition of military strength is to accumulate power and utilize the same to secure the nation. In order to maximize power, use of military force was often adopted by the states. Power was interpreted in the context of above variables. Most foreign policy leaders, who believe in traditional security, assume that power will enable them to promote and protect their countries’ national interests, and to win in strategic bargains. The tendency of states to adopt traditional security measures is needed to be answered in the light of their quest for military capability and efforts to establish peace through alliances, balance of power, and collective security.

3.1 The Quest for Military Capabilities

The main thrust of traditional security is to acquire and increase military capabilities and use the same for power projection and as a framework to guarantee state sovereignty. The security needs thus surpass the socio-economic accountabilities of a state. The increasing centrality of traditional way of pursuing national power needs large allocation of resources. The fulfilment of the said or perceived security parameters is done with all the possibilities. The unending demand for increased sophistication in security leads to further technological sophistication in weaponry production. Technological research and development
radically expands the destructiveness of national arsenal. Traditional security measures reached their height during the Second World War II. Traditional security paradigm gained further ground with the use of atom bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Within twenty years, four other countries developed the nuclear bombs. This process forced developing nations to increase military spending during the Cold War. Between 1960 and 1987, the armed forces of the developed world remained constant at a little more than 10 million, but the total in the developing world nearly doubled, growing from 8.4 to 16.4 million – or more than 60 percent of the world total (Sivard 1991: 91 and ACDA 1992: 5). The data given in the table 2.1 gives us details of military spending and the bulk of armed personnel in different regions. The data shows that from the concluding years of the Cold War till 1997, the military spending and the number of military personnel were reduced significantly. This trend is invariably same throughout the developed regions whereas in the developing regions the numbers have fluctuated. For example, the developing regions of the world i.e. East Asia, South America, Central Africa and South Asia did not reduce their military spending. The impact of traditional security is very overwhelming. In the post-Cold War era too, many of the states first tried to accomplish the traditional logistics for security under the name of 'minimum deterrence'. The dilemma whether to achieve a minimum deterrence or economic progress is still difficult for the Third World countries to decide upon. Expanding military capabilities highlighted the traditional approach to security. The effect of the increasing arms race was that even smaller states with small budgets also plunged into this vicious circle; the increasing purchase of arms from the developed countries strengthened economies of rich states. Developing nations have been the leading markets for the traffic in arms, accounting since the late 1970s for three-fourths of total trade. They ordered estimated US $ 406.7 billions of armaments in the 1980s. It is seen that the major states that monopolize arms production, often choose third world countries to earn benefits (Inter Press Service 2003). Another example is, according to the US congressional Research Service, US sales to Middle Eastern clients accounted for 76 percent of its total arms sales between 1999 and 2003 and about the same percentage of all sales to the region in that period. It also
became the dominant supplier to Latin America in the period from 1999 to 2003. Germany, due to a big transaction to South Africa, and Russia were the top two single arms sellers to Africa during 1999 to 2003, averaging at 16 percent and 15 percent respectively (Congressional Research Service 2003: 33).

The Cold War contributed to the growth and evolution of traditional security beliefs. The attainment of nuclear technology could not stop the exploration for chemical and biological weapons. The research and development in these fields further made the arms easily available for other countries. The spread of arms has reduced the guarantee of its rational use. The use of arms by recipients are often beyond the control of the supplier. Arms buyers seek weapons for compelling reasons. Many Third World leaders prize military capabilities to symbolize their country's statehood, power, and prestige in the world order or to deal with internal opposition. Traditional security was adversely against individual-oriented security. It aimed at the populist end of the security. The proponents of traditional security always created a picture of 'nation under attack' and ignored the human side of security. Sivard (1991) has given some interesting data on military spending:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.1</th>
<th>World Military Expenditure Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World military expenditure from 1960 to 1990 adds up to $21 trillion ($2,000,000,000,000) in 1987, equivalent in size to the value of all goods and services produced by and for the 5.3 billion people on the earth (in 1990) (Sivard 1991: 11).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The price of one ballistic submarine ($1,453,000,000) would double the education budget of 18 poor countries with 129,110,000 children to educate (Sivard 1991: 5).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For military objectives, governments now invest an average of $36,000 per year per member of the armed forces, thirty times more than they invest in the education of a child enrolled in school. The formidable gap between the two underscores the serious neglect of human capital, and with it, of economic development; in favour of unlimited military power (Sivard 1991: 27).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Despite some retrenchment in military spending recently, (Third World) annual outlays still take the equivalent of 180 million man-years of income vs. 56 million man-years for the developed countries (Sivard 1991: 11).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing countries have eight times as many soldiers as physicians (Sivard 1991: 5).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Since, the use of arms has been labelled differently, every time it is very difficult to analyze the rational use. The subjective perceptions of the security, which serve to accomplish the narrow intentions of the big powers, are always supported on the basis of military strength.
During the Cold War period, relations between development and military might was hardly understood by many states. Excessive military spending was the prime reason behind the demise of Soviet Union. As Ikle (1991) argues, “No other industrialized state in the world had spent so much of its national wealth on armaments and military forces for so long. Soviet militarism, in tandem with communism, destroyed the Soviet economy and thus hastened the self-destruction of the Soviet empire”. The overspending on arms creates a socio-economic imbalance. A possibility of anarchy can not be negated when the threat disappears. The demise of the Soviet Union had added a new dimension to the question of the impact of spending on the economy. Excessive military spending causes a domestic economic toll. The acceptance and the maintenance of traditional security measures implies ‘hardware security minus human security’ and guarantees the existence of statehood sometimes at the cost of human development.

3. 2 Paths to Peace: Alliances, Balance of Power and Collective Security?

Under the influence of traditional security framework, war is believed to be a path to establish peace. Threat is always preferred as a counter measure against possible insecurity and through this, threat-parity is achieved and used to establish so-called peace. The politics of alliances, balancing of power and collective security efforts to establish parity are some of the paths to establish peace. In one of his addresses, John F. Kennedy confessed that “It is an unfortunate fact that we can see only secure peace by preparing for war” this implies traditional security paradigm gives more importance to conflict for attaining peace.

States may form alliances to combine their armaments with those of other countries; shift alliance partners to maintain balance of power; or negotiate arms control and disarmaments agreements so as to reduce the threat of adversaries’ weapons. In practice, most leaders usually pursue various combinations of these approaches. Nonetheless, each represents a distinct military approach to security. To increase military capabilities through alliances is a result of realistic approach
to the World. Alliances are more economical because they facilitate the defence burden to be shared. Snyder (1991: 91) argues, "The primary benefit of alliance is obviously security...Security benefits in a mutual defence alliance include chiefly reduced probability of being attacked (deterrence), greater strength in case of an attack (defence) and prevention of ally's alliance with one's adversary (preclusion)". Though, alliance works as a shield to avert any future conflict among states, it segregates the world community into 'power spheres'. But in the true sense alliances, which are primarily based on military objectives, threaten the existence of small states. This implies, alliances, as a measure of traditional security, may invite security threats for the state itself and its allies. The preeminent risk inherent in alliances with others is that they bind one state to a commitment that later may become disadvantageous. The risks in the alliance-making practices were widely recognized by the world leaders. As George F. Kennan (1984: 238) observes,

"The relations among nations, in this imperfect world, constitute of fluid substance, always in motion, changing subtly from day to day in ways that are difficult to detect from the myopia of the passing moment, and even difficult to discern from the perspective of the future one. The situation at one particular time is never quite the same as the situation of five years later- indeed it is sometimes very significantly different, even though the stages by which this change came about are seldom visible at the given moment. This is why wise and experienced statesmen usually shy away from the commitments likely to constitute limitations on a government's behaviour at unknown dates in the future in the face of unpredictable situations".

Forming an alliance does not guarantee states from colliding with each other. In most of the cases where the alliances are defended in the name of maintaining military co-existence is doubtful because alliance enables aggressive states to aggregate resources for offensive wars. Alliances simply do not deter war – they promote it because expansionist states can act more aggressively because they can count on their allies’ assistance. As mentioned earlier alliances can create a situation where other nations may unnecessarily find it terrifying and provoke them to form counter-alliances, with the result that the security of both is
reduced. Snyder (1991: 91) says, "Peacetime alliances may occur in order to reduce the insecurity of anarchy or reduce armament costs. ... Even if the initial alliance is not directed at a specific opponent, other states will perceive it as a threat and begin to behave as enemies, perhaps by forming a counter-alliance. Not only will alliances identify friends and foes, they will create interests consistent with such relations." Sometimes, alliances are responsible for spreading war zones. For instance, if one country is engaged in war, the other members are expected to come for assistance so that alliances remain intact and strong. And above all as the realists believe that all the states are natural enemies, that there are no permanent friends and adversaries.

Balance of Power is another issue which is widely taken in to account by states to achieve security. At the core of its many meanings, is the idea that peace will result when military power is distributed so that no one state is strong enough to dominate others. If one state, or a combination of states, gains enough power to threaten others, compelling incentives exist for those threatened to discard their superficial differences and unite in a defensive alliance. The aggregation of power resulting from such collusion would, according to this conception, deter the 'would be attackers' from pursuing expansionism. Hence, from the competition of predatory and defensive rivals would emerge an equilibrium, a balance of contending factions, that would maintain the status-quo. Balance of power theory is also propounded on the premise that weakness invites attack and that countervailing power must be used to deter potential aggressors. If expansionist power drives guide every nation's actions, then all nations are potential adversaries, and each nation must strengthen its military capability to protect itself. Invariably, this reasoning rationalizes the quest for military superiority because others pursue it as well. The proponents of this theory believe that to deter an aggressor, counter-alliances are formed easily by other states. If they refuse to ally, their own vulnerability will encourage the expansionist state to attack them at a later time. Historical experiences show that the Eurocentric system, which existed from the mid-seventeenth century until World War I, even experienced critical moments. We can see that since 1600 wars broke out almost
regularly in Europe even when the balance of power existed. This shows the repeated failure of this mechanism to maintain peace.\(^2\)

The outbreak of World War I proved that balance of power no more remained a tool to restrict countries from going to war. The idealists including Woodrow Wilson hoped to replace the balance of power with the principle of Collective Security. The League of Nations embodied that principle, as it was built on the assumption that peace-loving nations could collectively deter – and if necessary, counteract – aggression. Instead of accepting war as a legitimate instrument of national policy, collective security sought to inhibit war through the threat of collective action. The theory proposed to retaliate against any aggression or attempt to establish hegemony, proposed to involve the participation of all member states, and creation of international organization to identify acts of aggression and organize a military response to them. The theme of collective security underwent similar treatment like other common security concepts. Collective security was never observed and that is why it failed to serve the purpose of peace among states. The aggression started at the beginning of the World War II was retaliated and the collective security failed to achieve peace. Japan’s aggression against Manchuria in 1931 and later on China in 1937, Italy’s invasion of Ethiopia in 1935 were widely condemned, but collective resistance was not forthcoming. Furthermore, Germany’s aggressive threats to Czechoslovakia and other European nations in the late 1930s elicited no collective response. Collective security did not prevent World War II and hence was discredited.

The Cold War experience proved vital to induce a transformation in security thinking. The concluding Cold War years underlined the necessity to bring in changes as far as the traditional conceptualization of security was concerned.

---

\(^2\) Though sometimes, classical systems may at some times have prolonged the length of peacetime between wars and possibly limited their duration and damage when they occurred (compared to the modern warfare), but a balancing of power never kept the peace. For example, several decades of war-less years existed during the balance of power in Europe (between the Congress of Vienna in 1815 and the outbreak of war across Europe in 1848, and after the Franco-Prussian War in 1871 until 1914).
Governance occupied the central place and individual became the core unit of analysis. The definition of security no more remained confined only to the state. The domestic developmental variable started proving detrimental in deciding the fate of nation’s strength and traditional security measures began to lose their ground. At this juncture the non-traditional security emerged as a contending concept to provide a base for extended debates regarding the re-defining of security concepts. The phenomenon marked widening of security concepts and inclusion of non-traditional security issues as critical factors while formulating a security policy.

4 Non-Traditional Security

The post-Cold War World has also witnessed a number of substantial changes. One of them is the rise of non-traditional issues of security occupying a pivotal place in the foreign policy. Traditional approaches to security, particularly those grounded in the realist school, are increasingly seen as inadequate to deal with new security concerns. As an outcome of the post-Cold War debates on the changing nature of security, non-traditional dimension emerged as a viable approach to understand the security dilemma of the post-Cold War era. Non-traditional security is the result of necessity to develop a broader and more comprehensive approach to security. Although states will continue to pay attention to territorial defence, other security challenges are beginning to demand greater attention. In the globalised era, nation-states aim to gain more economic benefit out of their relations with other states. This has provided a larger scope for debate of the importance of non-traditional security issues in foreign policy. Now, ‘security’ is no longer confined to the conventional definition. Today, the term security encompasses a much broader connotation. The need for understanding the newly emerged security concerns (in the form of non-traditional security needs) is necessary because of gradual but fundamental and long-term changes occurring in the international system.
4.1 Broadening of the Security Agenda

In the post-Cold War World the search for a broader framework of national security began and continues even now. The broader framework of national security includes all threats to national survival, both military and non-military, external and internal. The security in the new world order meant a security that includes protection against all major threats to human survival and well-being and not just military threats. Until now, ‘Security’- usually addressed as ‘national security’- has meant the maintenance of strong military defence against enemy invasion and attack. These narrow concepts of security have served the state well in the past, when such attack was seen as the only real threat to national survival. Present security encompasses security of resources, environment and threats caused by demographic challenges. The new approach to security believes that security in the new world order should be achieved through defence against severe environmental degradation, worldwide economic crisis, and massive human suffering. Precisely speaking, the non-military threats have become prominent with the flow of globalization, the increasing number of intra-state conflicts, and unprecedented role acquired by the non-state actors. These factors led to the emergence of supplementary approaches to state-centric security in the name of cooperative security, universal security, human security and comprehensive security. During the Cold War and even prior to that, in the interests of ‘national security’, nation-states were often engaged in a competitive struggle to enhance their own economic and military strength at the expense of other nation’s capabilities. This zero sum-competition for security was naturally biased toward unilateral solutions to critical problems. In today’s interdependent world, despite certain problems, the quest for security is rapidly becoming a positive-sum process whereby national well being is achieved jointly by all countries.

The collapse of Soviet Union has shown that even the most powerful states face multidimensional security problems which show internal factors as important as external factors often with complex external-internal linkage. The domestic
security includes ensuring economic and social security along with the resources to secure it. The line dividing internal security threats and external military threats is becoming obscure. In the changed political and economic context of the world, a state's internal political, economic, cultural and environmental conditions are as important as its military power for preserving national well-being and security. The end of the Cold War has helped in expanding the definition of security to include 'systemic security' (Buzan 1991) and global cooperation. The nature of warfare and conflict is undergoing changes and a struggle for techno-economic, political and cultural space, often conducted without military means, is increasingly acquiring prominence. In today's interdependent world, states are dependent on international society, the other states and institutions for their own well-being and national security. As a consequence, competition and conflict have lost their traditional role as the prominent guiding factors in international affairs.

In the post-Cold War period the discussion on non-traditional security was initiated by the United Nations' Development Programme (UNDP) Report 1994 UNDP (1994). This UNDP Report basically encouraged international initiatives or debates on non-traditional security and human security. Along with UNDP report, another school, which emerged to argue the criticality of new security was the so-called 'Copenhagen School'. This approach not only broadened (taking in some non-military issues to the range of threats to states), but also emphasized that non-military issues can be considered matters of security even if they are not threatening states (Buzan 1998). Karl Deutsch and his colleagues define another fundamental challenge to realist thinking. Their work on the concept of a security community has proved very influential and has recently been developed by several scholars including Emanuel Alder and Michael Barnett (1998). According to Deutsch,

---

3 The term used by Barry Buzan where he binds together the security of individuals, states and the international system.
A *security community* is a group of people that has become "integrated". By integration we mean the attainment, within a territory, of a "sense of community" and of institutions and practices strong and widespread enough to assure ... dependable expectations of "peaceful change" among its population. By sense of community we mean a belief ... that common social problems must and can be resolved by processes of peaceful change (that is, the) assurance that members will not fight each other physically, but will settle their disputes in some other way (Deutsch 1957: 5).

Precisely, a security community involves not only the absence of war but more important, the absence of the military option in the interaction of states within the security community. The Canadian (Lloyd 2003), and Japanese (Ministry of foreign Affairs, Japan, 2000) governments took up the idea of human security and formulated it in their respective foreign policies. The recent *Human Security Report* (October 2005) also underlines the importance of the non-traditional security for the formulation of the modern foreign policies. Global developments now suggest the need for another broader definition of the above-discussed elements. In the age of globalisation both co-operation and crises have become transnational in nature. The domestic economic and security considerations are also acquiring significance.

The dramatic changes in the priority among states are the driving force behind the shift from narrow military agenda of strategic studies to the broader one of international security studies. Although military threat still retains a central theoretical role in security thinking, its importance is declining in relation to non-military risks and challenges.

### 4.2 Variables of Non-Traditional Security

In today's world, international borders are becoming porous because of which they no longer fulfil their historical role as barriers to the movement of goods, ideas, and people, and as markers of the extent and power of the state (Wilson and Donnan 1998: 1). Now, in the post-Cold War era, International security extends beyond its military components. It has become transnational, global and interdependent in nature. International security needs to be secured by a plurality
of actors; the state is no longer the exclusive actor in this matter because in the twenty-first century international security has enlarged its agenda and demands that actors work together. The broadened definition of security includes variables such as human security (economic and social security components), energy security, and environmental security.

4.2.1 Human Security: Economic and Social Components

In the non-traditional security thinking human security has acquired a prominent place. Human security has become a tool to measure the intensity of non-military security parameters. The definition of the human security is provided by United Nations' Deputy Secretary-General Louise Frechette (1999) is very basic in nature, he says, “What do we mean by human security? We mean, in its most simple expression, all those things that men and women anywhere in the World cherish most: enough food for the family; adequate shelter; good health; schooling for the children; protection from violence whether inflicted by man or by nature; and a state which does not oppress its citizens but rules with their consent” (Frechette 1999). In the post-Cold War world the concept of state security has evolved into the wider concept of ‘human security’. As the General Secretary of the United Nations Kofi Annan (2000a: 43-44) says,

“the requirements of security today have come to embrace the protection of communities and individuals from internal violence. The need for a more human-centred approach to security is reinforced by the continuing dangers that weapons of mass destruction, most notably nuclear weapons, pose to humanity: their very name reveals their scope and their intended objective, if they were ever used.”

Speaking about the nature of human security in particular, he says,

“Human security, in its broadest sense, embraces far more than the absence of violent conflict. It encompasses human rights, good governance, access to education and health care and ensuring that each individual has opportunities and choices to fulfill his or her potential. Every step in this direction is also a steep towards reducing poverty, achieving economic growth and preventing conflict. Freedom from want, freedom from fear, and the freedom
of future generations to inherit a healthy natural environment -- these are the interrelated building blocks of human -- and therefore national -- security" (Annan 2000b).

The UNDP Human Development Report of 2002 (UNDP 2002) identified seven dimensions of human security: the economy, food, health, the environment, personal security, community security, and political security. Speaking on the need for the better understanding of security, Kofi Annan (2002) adds, “We must also broaden our view of what is meant by peace and security. Peace means much more than the absence of war. Human security can no longer be understood in purely military terms. Rather, it must encompass economic development, social justice, environmental protection, democratization, disarmament, and respect for human rights and the rule of law”. During and especially after the end of the Cold War, peace was linked to human rights and security expanded from national defence to encompass the protection of individuals by different agencies using non-military means. Under the new criteria, what constitutes a ‘security threat’ has grown to include global poverty, state failure, environmental degradation, small arms proliferation and transnational crime. As such security policy now concerns itself with many of the same problems as development policy. At the state level, Government of Canada has taken steps to encourage human security. Lloyd Axworthy (2003) has explained the phenomenon as,

“In essence, an effort to construct a global society where the safety of the individual is at the centre of the international priorities and a motivating force for international action; where international human rights standards and the rule of law are advanced and woven into a coherent web protecting the individual; where those who violate these standards are held fully accountable; and where our global, regional and bilateral institutions – present and future – are built and equipped to enhance and enforce these standards”

While defining the necessity of adopting a human security United Nations Commission on human Security (Commission on Human Security: 2003: 2) explains the compulsion of developing changed non-traditional security parameters as a result of new non-military threats. The report says,
"With so many dangers transmitted so rapidly in today’s interlinked world, policies and institutions must respond in new ways to protect individuals and communities and to empower them to thrive. That response cannot be effective if it comes fragmented- from those dealing with rights, those with security, those with humanitarian concerns and those with development.”

Sadako Ogata (1998), (former) United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, has classified the term Human security in the following manner,

“Several key elements make up human security. A first essential element is the possibility for all citizens to live in peace and security within their own borders. This implies the capacity of states and citizens to prevent and resolve conflicts through peaceful and nonviolent means and, after the conflict is over, the ability to effectively carry out reconciliation efforts. A second element is that people should enjoy without discrimination all rights and obligations - including human, political, social, economic and cultural rights. A third element is social inclusion - or having equal access to the political, social and economic policy making processes, as well as to draw equal benefits from them. A fourth element is that of the establishment of rule of law and the independence of the justice system. Each individual in a society should have the same rights and obligations and be subject to the same set of rules. These basic elements which are predicated on the equality of all before the law, effectively remove any risk of arbitrariness which so often manifests itself in discrimination, abuse or oppression.”

Noted Indian scholar Kanti Bajpai (2000) while speaking on the nature and the conservation of human security argues, “human security is related to the protection of individual’s personal safety and freedom from direct and indirect threats of violence” (Bajpai, 2000: 1-4). He finds the promotion of human development and good governance along with the collective use of sanctions and force (when necessary) as the central factors to manage human security. He believes that the States, international organizations, non-governmental organizations, and other groups in civil society in combination can act for better prospects of human security (Bajpai, 2000: 1-4). And as Lincoln Chen says the existence of these elements or the structures are subordinate to the importance of human security. He argues human security as one of the ultimate ends of all security concerns. And in this schema, other forms of security, such as military
security, are not ultimate goals. Rather, these other forms of security are simply means for achieving the ultimate objectives of human security (Chen 1995: 139). The definition given by George MacLean (2002) is very comprehensive in nature where he specifically uses the term ‘unstructured violence’ as a main threat to human security. MacLean concentrates on the ways to cope with the concerned threats. He says,

“In broad terms, human security shifts our focus from traditional territorial security to that of the person. Human security recognizes that an individual’s personal protection and preservation comes not just from the safeguarding of the state as a political unit, but also from access to individual welfare and quality of life. But human security does not merely ‘envelope’ matters of individual benefit (such as education, health care, protection from crime, and the like); this is because these matters could be thought of as part of the objectives of sovereign states. Rather, human security also denotes protection from the unstructured violence that often accompanies many aspects of non-territorial security, such as violence emanating from environmental scarcity, or mass migration. Therefore, just as traditional notions of territorial security involve the structured violence manifest in state warfare, human security also attends to the issue of unstructured violence. Human security, in short, involves the security of the individual in their personal surroundings, their community, and in their environment.” (MacLean 2002)

Sadako Ogata and Johan Cels (Ogata 1998) in their report of Commission on Human Security defined human security as “protecting the vital core of all human lives in ways that enhance human freedoms and human fulfilment”. Ogata and Cels further elaborate that:

“This means protecting vital freedoms – fundamental to human existence and development. Human security means protecting people from severe and pervasive threats, both natural and societal, and empowering individuals and communities to develop the capabilities for making informed choices and acting on their own behalf. ‘Vital freedoms’ refer to the inalienable fundamental rights and freedoms that are laid down in the Universal

---

4 By unstructured violence he meant the threats advanced through environmental scarcity, or mass migration
Declaration of Human Rights and other human rights instruments”
(Ogata 1998)

Another definition by Caroline Thomas (1999) has elaborated the term security in its non-traditional form. She argues that the “Human security describes a condition of existence in which basic material needs are met, and in which human dignity, including meaningful participation in the life of the community, can be realized. Such human security is indivisible; it cannot be pursued by or for one group at the expense of another” (Caroline and Wilkin 1999: 3). While material sufficiency lies at the core of human security, in addition to this, the concept also encompasses non-material dimensions to form a qualitative whole. The quantitative aspect refers to material sufficiency. She continues and says,

“...the pursuit of human security must have at its core the satisfaction of basic material needs of all humankind. At the most basic level, food, shelter, education and health care are essential for the survival of human beings. The qualitative aspect of human security is the achievement of human dignity, which incorporates personal autonomy, control over one’s life and unhindered participation in the life of the community. Emancipation from oppressive power structures be they global, national or local in origin and scope, is necessary for human security. Human security is oriented towards an active and substantive notion of democracy, one that ensures the opportunity of all for participation in the decisions that affect their lives. Therefore it is engaged directly with discussions of democracy at all levels, from the local to the global.” (Caroline and Wilkin 1999: 3)

Further, Ramesh Thakur (1997: 53-54), Vice Rector of the Peace and Security of United Nations University adds to the point that Caroline Thomas elaborated, “Human security refers to the quality of life of the people of a society or polity. Anything that degrades their quality of life – demographic pressures, diminished access to stock or resources, and so on – is a security threat. Conversely, anything which can upgrade their quality of life – economic growth, improved access to resources, social and political empowerment, and so on – is an enhancement of human security.” Achieving the human security is a critical parameter to attain the highest level of national security. As Barry Buzan says, “States in which society and government are at odds are weak states; states that are coherent in
socio-political terms are strong. Reducing contradiction between the states and societal security is thus a precondition for successful ‘national’ security policy.” (Buzan 1998)

4.2.2 Security against Non-Military Violence and Crime

The non-Military violence is comprised of problems that may arise over the issues of ethnicity, religious fundamentalism and terrorism. It is critical for a modern state to control non-military violence. Ethnic conflict in transition countries interrupts the process of economic and political reform. Political and cultural entities may align along the ethnocentric, theocratic, and linguistic lines. This may spur tensions between and among various ethnic groups, and between them and established governments. As evidenced by the genocide in Bosnia, the Great Lakes region of Africa, and the former Zaire, ethnic-based conflict is often brutal and intractable. As a consequence, social protection system in a transition country emerging from ethnic conflict is both in need of reform and needs to deal with the social effects.

Terrorism, drug trafficking, and other forms of transnational crimes seem to be growing rapidly as criminal groups and individuals take advantage of advances in global communications, transportation, finance, and other favourable circumstances. The potential for such groups to have access to and to use weapons that can cause large numbers of casualties is constantly increasing. Countering international crime will become an increasingly important dimension of new security policy. Religious fundamentalism has also emerged as a non-military force to wage an open conflict with the state. The varying interpretations of religious beliefs usually originate in response to changes in social environment, which people seek to understand within the framework of their existing beliefs. It is also very important to note that the religious fundamentalism sparked out of this process always culminated in small-scale violence such as religious skirmishes, later resulted into a platform for terrorism. In this sense terrorism will continue to be a global challenge so long as groups and individuals oppose established political, economic, and social processes due to perceived
ethnic, religious, nationalist, political, and other forms of discrimination. In some
cases, the use of extreme violence for some identifiable goal will be more
criminal and less political than in the past, blurring the line between terrorism and
common crime. The factors like ethnicity, religious fundamentalism, and
terrorism are interconnected because terrorism is energized by ideologically
motivated fanatics, extremists and minorities at the periphery of society. Easier
accessibility to nuclear and biological weapons has further increased the
sensitivity of the matter.

4. 2. 3 Energy Security

The events of last few decades have shown the vulnerability of today’s global
ergy economy. Dependence on oil has continued to expand in the last decade,
and with that growth has demanded even greater reliance on the enormous
petroleum reserves in the Persian Gulf. Here energy security implies mainly the
question of availability of resources to sustain one’s economy. Energy security is
a broad term, which includes security of oil, natural gas, coal, electricity etc. In
the aftermath of the events of 11 September 2001 and the current Iraqi situation,
it is now widely recognised that volatility in the oil market poses significant risks
to economies. Any disruption in Middle Eastern oil supplies as a result of local
warfare, terrorism, or overthrow of governments by radical fundamentalists
would lead to dramatic oil price increases disrupting the global economy.
Increasing reliance on oil and other fossil fuels has created three kinds of energy
insecurity: the political insecurity that results from uneven distribution of oil
reserves around the globe, the economic insecurity that comes from dependence
on a fuel whose price swings wildly in the spot market as a result of global
events, and ecological instability in the form of potentially catastrophic climate
change stemming from the build-up of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. The
roots of these problems are intertwined, and the solution is ultimately the same:
an overhaul of today’s energy system. The world is now consuming 74 million
barrels of oil daily—providing 40 percent of the world’s energy. Due to its
geographic concentration, 57 percent of the world’s oil now moves across
international borders, with nearly half of that total coming from the Middle East
and North Africa. Despite the global oil shocks of the 1973 Arab oil embargo, the 1980 Iranian Revolution, and the 1990 Gulf War, world oil use increased at an a rapid pace in the 1990s, up 13 percent during the decade. These events made abundantly clear the direct link between energy supplies and national security. By 2020, world oil demand is projected to increase by nearly 44 million b/d and of this increased demand:

- Almost 60 percent of the incremental demand will be in developing countries;
- 60 percent of the new demand will be in the transportation sector;
- OPEC members will supply 63 percent of the new demand;
- 44 percent of the new demand is set to come from the Persian Gulf region. (USDE 2002)

This could affect every country in today’s globalised World. Oil is still readily available in international markets, but prices have doubled from levels that helped spur rapid economic growth through much of the 1990s. With the entry into a new energy era, there is a need to focus on marshaling capital to develop adequate resources and infrastructure to meet rising demand for energy, in a manner that is consistent with environmental goals.

4.2.4 Environmental Security

If political, social, cultural, religious, and most importantly economic systems are to remain secure and viable, environment must also remain secure and viable. At current growth rates, the earth’s population will double by the year 2100. The availability of cheap capital, plentiful energy, advanced technology, and strong political institutions can minimize the environmental impacts of a growing population, but the fact remains that these resources are limited. This makes global environmental conditions a legitimate security concern for all countries. Environmental security is an element of regional and national security. It encompasses the mitigation and prevention of energy threats, including threats to resources and supply lines, and environmental risks and related stresses that directly contribute to political and economic instability. Environmental security
reflects the ability of a nation or a society to withstand environmental asset scarcity, environmental risks or adverse changes, or environment-related tensions or conflicts. Most ecologists believe that exploding populations will put unsustainable stress on regional ecosystems. Environmental exhaustion will mean greater inter-state competition for scarce resources. Most scientists believe that sometime in the next 50 years there will be enough man-made carbon dioxide, chlorofluorocarbons, and methane in the air to warm the Earth three to eight degrees Fahrenheit (Matthews 1989: 162-63). The security of individuals, communities, nations, and the entire global community is increasingly jeopardized by unpremeditated, non-military environmental threats. These threats are self-generated. According to Maurice Strong, a highly respected environmental diplomat, the global community is at a critical juncture when nothing less than the survival of the planet as a sustainable home is at stake (Strong 1991: 287). The description found in Finger’s article (1991) about World Watch Institutes’ statement reads as follows, “the earth’s forests are shrinking; its deserts are expanding and soil eroding, all at record rates. Each year thousands of plant and animal species disappear, many before they are named and catalogued. The Ozone layer in the upper atmosphere that protects us from ultra violet radiation is thinning. The very temperature of the earth appears to be rising, posing a threat of unknown dimensions to virtually all life support systems” (Finger 1991: 9)

This threat is recognized to be critical but it took several centuries to evolve. It is also a reflection of the peculiar characteristic of environmental security which G. Prins (1993) describes as ‘threats without enemies’, which is by its very nature difficult to visualize and therefore to mobilize against. Although military security has not vanished as a key element of national security, ‘it has certainly declined relative to the issues of economic energy and environmental security’ (Romn 1993: 1). The environment in short ‘is very much on the security agenda’ (Buzan 1998: 258). The health of the earth has to be preserved because if the functioning integrity of the earth is jeopardized, the search for other securities becomes futile. The security of man cannot be achieved if the security of the earth is destroyed.
G. Prins (1993) argues that security must be wholly reconceptualised to make it compatible with ecological rationality (Prins 1993). The term economic rationality, suggested by Prins, emphasizes mutual dependence and therefore the realization that threats do not lie outside. As Gleick (1989) argues, it is something rather to be sought for, and if unsuccessful, the era of the Cold War could soon be replaced by the era of environmental conflicts (Gleick 1989: 309). In this newly emerged security needs natural disasters of all types will continue to occur, often with little or no warning. Global awareness of the human consequences will keep pressure on governments and leaders to respond. Meanwhile, mankind’s global activities — particularly population growth, resource consumption, pollution, urbanization, industrialization, ‘desertification,’ and deforestation will increasingly impact climate and weather patterns, strain fragile ecosystems, and put more pressure on health and social support systems. This makes environmental security a serious concern for the states in the post-Cold War era.

5. Traditional and Non-Traditional Security in Foreign Policy

The non-traditional security variables are playing an important role in post-Cold War international politics. Most of the states now factor non-traditional security into their foreign policy. In the context of such developments, some questions the validity of such changed perceptions of security and their role in preventing war and conflicts. The post-Cold War world, which saw the emergence of non-traditional security issues, also experienced conflicts in the Gulf and Baltic regions. The Persian Gulf had been the most sensitive region to such conflicts. However, one can argue that the discourse on foreign policy goals has changed significantly over the last decade. A more pro-active role of the UN Security Council as well as the setting up of new international institutions and regional economic regimes (SAFTA, GATT-WTO, EU etc.) proves that this new discourse has a significant impact on the post-Cold War developments.

Developed countries like Canada, Japan and Switzerland are openly advocating for the non-traditional security framework. These countries have incorporated Human Security as one of their core principles and facilitated a more cooperative
international security policy. Another factor, which contributed towards such understanding, was the domestic linkages of external policy matters. Europe’s non-traditional security encompasses:

- "A set of seven principles for operations in situations of severe insecurity that apply to both ends and means. These principles are: the primacy of human rights, clear political authority, multilateralism, a bottom-up approach, regional focus, the use of legal instruments, and the appropriate use of force. The report puts particular emphasis on the bottom-up approach; on communication, consultation, dialogue and partnership with local population in order to improve early warning, intelligence gathering, and mobilization of local support, implementation and sustainability.

- A ‘Human Security Response Force’, initially composed of 15,000 men and women, of whom at least one third would be civilian (police, legal experts, development and humanitarian specialists, administrators, etc.). The Force would be drawn from dedicated troops and civilian capabilities already made available by member states as well as a proposed ‘Human Security Volunteer Service’.

- A new legal framework to govern both decisions to intervene and operations on the ground. This would build on the domestic law of host states, the domestic law of sending states, international criminal law, international human rights law and international humanitarian law.” (SGESC 2004)

As the wave of non-traditional security started engulfing smaller and poor developing countries, the phenomenon, which was initiated by the UNDP document (1994) soon turned into a force. In his key note address at Fourth United Nations Conference on Disarmament Issues in Kyoto, Bangladeshi Ambassador Anwarul Karim Chowdhury (1999) argued “The developments of the decade of 1990s throughout the world following the end of Cold War have brought to the fore very clearly that many conflicts and their causes are within nations rather than between nations. For most people of the world, a sense of insecurity comes not so much from the traditional security concerns, but from the concerns about their survival, self-preservation and well-being in a day to day
context.” For the developing countries like India and China the non-traditional security paradigm emerged as a prime policy orientation. Most of the Third World countries also understood the vitality of the changed security parameters and incorporated the same in their foreign policies.

**Conclusion**

The above discussion indicates that traditional thinking has dominated the Cold War period but it began changing with the non-traditional forces playing a major role in the arena of international relations. Post-Cold War era saw the emergence of this changed paradigm in the foreign policies of some major powers. The case study of Chinese foreign policy is significant to underline such transformation and its impact on foreign policy. Since its inception, People’s Republic of China inherited its political doctrines from communist ideology, which continued to affect the foreign policy decisions until the economic opening in 1978. With the economic reforms occupying the centre stage, the transformation in foreign policy and changes in the traditional understanding of security started becoming visible.

In order to comprehend the dynamics of such transformation from traditional thinking to non-traditional thinking in China’s security policy, it is necessary to focus on the shaping of security policy in Chinese history. The following chapter discusses the changing bases of security policy in China. It takes a historical overview of China’s security policy from pre-Imperial period till 1991, i.e. the end of Cold War.