CHAPTER I
SECURITY - THE CONCEPT:
MEANING, THREATS AND INTERDEPENDENCE
As the twentieth century draws to a close, our world is beset with great difficulty. The complexity and severity of the present crisis is widespread and deep-rooted. A severe deterioration is taking place in the quality of life, for both nature and humanity. Every morning newspapers carry headlines on racial violence, casteist and communal riots. Everyday reports come in on police atrocities, custody deaths, excesses on civil liberties and denial of human rights. Every other day commodity prices go up, world market faces recession. We witness unemployment rate going up; educated and skilled labour goes without adequate job, what to say of unskilled illiterate labourers. There is paucity of even basic necessities such as proper medical care, housing, pure drinking water and food. These are the maladies an individual faces today. Though it is more true to most of developing and underdeveloped Third World countries, the developed world has not remained unaffected either.

Above all we now witness the environmental and ecological decay - a legacy of unchecked development and industrialization. It is as threatening as the nuclear arsenal. The Green-House Effect, global warming and
depletion of ozone layer threaten life more than a nuclear holocaust. It is slow death to every life-form on earth, slow but definite. What if we have reached the moon or explored possibility of life on Mars. We are taking our own planet 'Earth' towards an end. What if we can conform the theory of origin of universe according to the 'Big-bang' theory, we will ourselves write the theory to the end of life on earth, if not the universe as a whole. When can be life more insecure and security more in demand, than today?

We have reached a watershed, from where either we start afresh and reconsider our path viz-a-viz our military, political, economic, social or environmental options or we come to the end of human civilization.

Security: The Concept - Meaning and Definition

Thus it becomes essential to understand security, although it might be difficult to conceptualize it in definite terms. Individual is at the root of national, regional and international superstructure, and it is his security that should be emphasized for safeguarding global security. Security as a concept remains elusive and undefined in proper terms. Although security is a universal experience and constant preoccupation of mankind in its individual, social and corporate experience, the acute sense of insecurity in all spheres, however, reflects not only the
ineffectivity of the means adopted or the relative authority of the magnitude and sources of insecurity but also the elusiveness in the conceptualization of security problems. The individual faces threats from among his fellow beings, from nature, along with psychological and moral threats. Barry Buzan describes four basic categories of such threats as:¹

(a) physical threats - pain, injury, death;
(b) economic threats - seizure of property, denial of access to work and resources;
(c) threats to rights - imprisonment, denial of civil liberties;
(d) threat to status - demotion or public humiliation.

Such issues are often complicated and plagued by distinction between objective and subjective evaluation. Often contradictions give rise to great dilemmas - how to balance the freedom of action for the individual against the actual threats which such freedom poses for others. Individuals find their freedom maximized at the expense of their security. Kenneth Waltz puts it in this way, "States, like people, are insecure in proportion to the extent of

their freedom. If freedom is wanted, insecurity should be accepted."²

Although state is unacceptable to some, it is lesser of the two evils. It is around this that society develops its social and economic superstructure. State has to exist to avoid confusion that will result in its absence. The social welfare programme of the state, defence against external threats and like are tasks that can only be met through state structures. But if security of individual is indistinguishably connected with that of the state, so is his insecurity. State itself is a source of controversy and threat as stated in minimal and maximal conceptions of state. The minimalist view, based on John Locke's concept of social contract, is individual oriented. The state actions should be judged according to their impact on citizens and state is nothing more than a sum of its parts. On the contrary the maximalist view holds state as a collective entity which stands above the individual. It acquires its special and independent status, and has essential role in realizing the interests of the individual. In short, state is here to stay and the security of the individual has become inseparably intertwined with that of the state in spite of the threats that it pose for the individual.

2. Kenneth N.Waltz, Theory of International Politics (Massachusetts, 1979), p.112.
Security persuaded for the sake of the individual takes us into the realm of political science, sociology, psychology, economics and ecology. It becomes an interdisciplinary approach. Security is just not military security. It has much wider connotations in modern welfare state. Yet it is complicated by its subjective and objective evaluation and often becomes contradictory. State may act as a source of threat, directly or indirectly. These threats arise from domestic law-making and enforcement; from state action against individual, from competition for state control and from foreign policy and state's security policy. Individuals or the sub-groups too can become security threats as terrorists, revolutionaries and assassins. This is more explicable by way of terrorist and separatist militancy world over. Racial and ethnic violence is on the rise, and even the West is not spared from its threats. Hence, these are problems common to humanity.

Ideas and theories acknowledge no state boundaries. States are permeable to flow of thoughts which make the parameters of national and international security indistinguishable. Individuals may act as stimuli or constraints on national policy decision making, too. As a

leader of the state, individual can change or alter policies according to his own perceptions of security. The individual and the national security perception thus coexist in conflict and contradiction.

Directly connected with the essential problem of modern times, security building is more important than ever before. 'National Security' as a term has been used by politicians and military leaders to describe a theoretical phrase and policy objective. It has been defined by social scientists and historians to meet at least the basic criteria of a nation for security. Each state exists in its own web of threats and problems which define its insecurity and agenda for national security.

The problem often is how to approach the idea of national security. State is not a physical entity, it is abstract, with no clearly defined parameters. It generates physical expression through its law and governmental institutions. Its population and territory provide it with physical expression. It is difficult to subscribe a


subjective concept as security to another abstract thing as state. Sovereignty provides it with the dividing element which places the state separately above all social units. No general unity of meaning can be assigned to the concept of national security considering the special and peculiar circumstances each nation is placed in. Every nation varies in size, power, physical geography, relative location, resources, population and in its domestic political, social and economic structure. Thus the meaning of security will be as much diversified as the situations to which it is applied. Such a fragmented concept cannot be compared or pegged down to simple indicator like military capability.

Most definitions of national security have one common factor - power and national interests override any other factor and have predominance over economic and social issues. Everything points to the existence of two different approaches to the fundamental principles of security: one holds that security can be ensured through deterrence i.e., through use of military pressure and the other holds the premise that security can only be promoted by political methods, by developing wide ranging political relations, not underestimating the adequate defense potential. Another flaw that affects this approach is that it considers threats to security as something external. Whereas there exist factors - ethnic, communal and ideological - which undermine
national security from within. To be more precise these definitions are coined in terms of superpowers and the developed countries. Hence there is no place for the security policies of the Third World and developing countries. It is the developed nations that perceive threats to their security only from outside. Their affluent society and level of development have put them above internal security challenges. But the developing nations have to fight threats on two fronts domestically as well as internationally. They are more vulnerable as they are young on the international scene and have weak foundations. Above all, we have reached a self-destructive level of development. Such externalized and power-oriented definition of security fail to recognize the importance of economic and environmental factors.

It is necessary to re-define security from the point of view of small and developing nations. Talukder Manuruzzaman, explaining the concept as protection of core values, states, "By security we mean the protection and preservation of the minimum core values of any nation; political independence and territorial integrity". These nations face security threats peculiar to themselves, no

doubt indigenous, and can be tackled only by the nation concerned. Hence it would be wrong to prescribe a single model for all national and regional security concerns.

Power politics has always been the hallmark of national security. Most theorists of the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries offered no analysis of war causation. Both Hugo Grotius and Thomas Hobbes did not propose plans for perpetual peace and were thus minimalists. St.Pierre and J.J.Rousseau outlined proposals for new sets of international institutions to take care of problems of war, once and for all. Both of them were maximalists. State system, since then, has been a single paradigm in which the world is portrayed as an anarchy; with no overreaching authority to organize the fundamental activities of its essential constituents, the nation-state. What was regular in international life was war, conflict, balances, alliances, spheres of influence combined with some form of restraint.

The cause of war lie in the struggle for power and the eternal security dilemma which makes every state's efforts to provide security for itself the cause of another state's insecurity. Even the Second World War and the advent of nuclear weapons did little to alter the situation. The game of power politics still stayed on with us. The "state of war" which was common to all characters of international
politics was the logical fruit of world carved out into separate political communities, each contributing to and suffering from security dilemma. Amongst all the important classical thinkers only Kant articulated a cosmopolitan global order as an ultimate solution to the problem of war. To the theorists of global society, war is the result of fragmented political organization and not of human nature.

The protagonists of 'Global Society' state that world peace and security are inseparable from problems like human rights, ecological balance, income inequality, food distribution and malnutrition, over-population, energy crisis, resource exploitation, etc. Such images of the world model derive primarily from the evidence of growing 'interdependence'. The modern day version of the global society paradigm too has nation-states as its basic political unit. But there has to be a universal government, with a monopoly of force, which would act as the guardian of common interests on questions of war and peace.8

The relationship between the state and international system is so close and intimate that it would add more confusion if we speak of them as two different entities. The situation has completely changed after the Second World War. Nuclear parity, resulting in deterrence, has changed

8. This is further explained and explicitly developed in James Rosenau, The Study of Global Interdependence (London, 1980).
the security equations as it could no longer be ensured in terms of military force. It was necessary to prevent war by all means and mutual restrain was to be the component of all security oriented policies. Arms race in the late 1970s reached a stage where it became non-sensical. Even regional conflicts had international consequences, thus they were required to be settled peacefully. The process of decolonization gave birth to innumerable new states, big and small, and their own type of problems, which added new dimensions to international security.

The proposal to build a comprehensive system of international security is based on the presumption that problem of security is not as much a military-technological one, but a politico-economic problem. In the last four decades humanity's drift towards "unparalleled catastrophe" and self-destruction has been dangerously accelerated. All nations face universal threats posed by the nuclear and conventional arms race, which particularly underscores global interdependence. Our world is destined to have one common future for better or for worse.

International security is the result and sum of the security of each and every state. It cannot be reached without cooperation from all. Threats to the survival of mankind leads necessarily to the conclusion that alternative concepts of national and international security must be
developed and implemented. Then how to promote international security, especially on the global level, in order to preserve peace in the world establish international relations on a more stable basis in favour of all people and countries? Security is essentially a matter of perception. The security outlook of a nation is build up largely on how and where it perceives the threats to its security coming from; the other things that go into shaping a nation's security perspective are of course geo-strategic imperatives and geo-political environment in which it operates. 9

The age we live in, one is tempted to quote Charles Dickens, "It is the best of times and it is also the worst of times." This is the paradoxial situation. No four decades in any century have witnessed such acceleration of international events. It has changed the entire international scenario. Advances in science and technology, rapid development in means of transport and communication as well as increased international trade and direct investments have resulted in greatly enhanced international interdependence. G. Mally defined interdependence as a complex transnational phenomenon containing multi-dimensional and multi-sectoral patterns of interaction which

leads to increased mutual sensitivity.\textsuperscript{10} Richard Rosecrance and A. Steim have distinguished three distinct approaches to interdependence.\textsuperscript{11}

i) a relationship between interests that a change in the position of one country is reflected in the position of another;

ii) treats national economies as becoming more and more sensitive and vulnerable to each other;

iii) which assumes the kind of relationship that is costly to break.

The developing mismatch between man and nature threatens the well being and thus the security of all nations; but the answer is not for each nation to defend what it has. The sensible choice is to tackle the causes of problem with coordinated and cooperative efforts both by increasing the efficiency of economic activities and adjusting economic and social habits and consumption patterns to confirm with resource scarcity and ecological limitations. Resources scarcity and ecological stress are fundamentally non-military and thus have to be stressed accordingly.

\textsuperscript{------------------------}


Threats to Security

Till late the two colossal superpowers stood 'eyeball to eyeball'. In a long term perspective, however, it was also possible to see the East-West confrontation as a culmination of millennia of imperial confrontation and warfare. As the last shot of the horrible Second World War was fired, there has not been a World War since. Yet there was little cause for exuberance. The war moved down South and was substituted by many smaller, regional, local and internal wars. Most of these have been in the developing or Third World and tended to become bloodier and more destructive. Militarization of globe has taken great strides in recent years. Contrary to the 'stabilized' and mostly saturated North, instability and insecurity are practically everywhere, the basic condition of life in South. Due to over-sophistication and technical improvement, weapon systems have transcended national boundaries. War like old times, is no longer limited to state frontiers. The globe has shrunk and thus become more approachable. From the day the nuclear bomb was used for the first time there has been no looking back. Nuclear proliferation knew no limits since then, though at a heavy cost to development. We had reached a watershed long ago which brought us to the brink of extinction during the Cuban missile crisis (1962), had not better sense prevailed over the two superpowers. This
confers on our generation a heavy responsibility - the responsibility to take hold of our history and make sense of it.

Economically, politically, ideologically and demographically we have reached a stage where one reconsiders his options. Our military expenditures appear to have reached the maximum level or may be on verge of decline. Nations face severe competition for resources needed in their military, social and economic programme. Increasing costs and diminishing budgets are forcing hard choices. Politically and ideologically - at the moment the, shift is from bipolar towards a unipolar world. Communism has been rolling back over the years accompanied with the coming down of Berlin Wall in November 1989, the unification of Germany, the loosening of Soviet hold over other East European countries and break-up of the military, political and economic structures of the Warsaw Treaty Organization. The final disintegration of Soviet Union was confirmed with the creation of 'Confederation of Independent States' by its constituent units. The exit of Mikhail Gorbachev as the

12. It was the Minsk Agreement (8.12.1991) between leaders of Russian Federation, Ukraine, and Bylarussia which announced the abolition of the Soviet Union and formation of the confederation. The alma-Ata Declaration (21.12.91) finally confirmed the final formation of Confederation of Independent States (CIS) including all Soviet republics.
President of erstwhile Soviet Union might prove a setback to the process he initiated seven years ago at the 27th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party in February 1986.

The post World War period was predominated by the cold war and nuclear politics. The contemporary security debate was obviously highlighted by strategic and military oriented definition and accumulation of instruments of powers. All security discussions thus revolved around superpowers, perhaps, an appropriate response to needs and concerns of advanced industrialized countries. The centrality of an East-West framework and excessive emphasis on power had been the hallmark of all post-war security paradigms. What has, however, been a serious lacuna in conceptualization of contemporary security debate is an overwhelming systemic bias and an inadequate comprehension of 'component-whole relationship'. Conventionally it is assured that the security of the whole or system would evolve security of the components. Empirically, however, this is not always possible.

Those who define security in purely 'militaristic terms' while neglecting other aspects do not realize that climatic changes can have prolonged effect on present day balance of power among nations. The international conference on Disarmament and Development (September 1987) reiterated that 'the world can either continue to pursue the
arms race, or more cautiously and with desperate speed move towards a more stable and balanced social and economic development within a more sustainable international economic and political order, it cannot be both.‘

Environmental concerns emerged only in 1960s as a new dimension of security challenges to our physical survival. Much of this environmental threat is either caused, or accelerated, by man in the industrialized and developing countries. But it would be a mistake to presume that the North and the South have identical environmental problems. Many of the North’s problems are result of over-development and extravagant consumption. While in the South environmental degradation is frequently a symptom or an end product of poverty and not affluence. Environmental concerns to human security cannot be tackled only by a rationalistic approach. Despite the intrinsically domestic character of the problem and the policy choices to be made, environmental issues have become internationalized because of the irreversible nature of changes in the environment, and the need to adopt precautionary measures.

13. Some glaring instances are: acid rain generated by US power plants destroy forests and marine life in Canada; spillage of chemicals from Sandox plant in Basel (Switzerland) wiped aquatic life in the Rhine through Germany and Netherlands. Sulphur-dioxide from British power plants adversely affect forest cover and aquatic life in Scandivania.
Environmental degradation spell disaster for entire mankind – a threat second, if not equal, to the nuclear war. This was further emphasized at United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) concluded in June 1992 at Rio (Brazil). It universally recognized that environmental quality, as an essential life support system, is a common concern not more important than national interests but that it is important to national interests. One of the paradoxes of human civilization has been that the cycle of development has also put enormous strain on nature’s life support system. It endangered directly or indirectly the environmental balance by deforestation, acidification, soil-erosion, desertification, global warming and unrestricted exploitation of natural resources. Continued change in global environment would threaten global security as well as global economy and development. Release of excessive green-house gases into the atmosphere due to burning of fossil-fuel, and release of carbon-di-oxide has resulted in 'global warming'. The next forty years will witness, what took millions of years till now – the global temperature will go up by 3°C. It will result in melting of

14. International Conference on "Changing Atmosphere: Implications for Global Security" at Toronto, 27-30 June 1988, issued a statement that the ultimate consequences of climatic changes would be second only to a global nuclear war. This was cosponsored by the Canadian government and UN Agencies.
polar ice-caps and frightening increase in sea-levels over the world, affecting about 50 million people across. Ozone depletion will create health hazards due to ultra-violet radiations and lowering of oxygen content in the atmosphere. Yet another challenge comes from the disposal of radioactive waste and dumping environmentally unfriendly refuse. Destruction of our rain-forests will virtually turn our food bowls into dustbowl as about a billion water resources dry up. It will equally effect and change the precipitation patterns. David Wright rightly pointed out, environmental hazards "augur political, economic and social disruptions on enormous scale.... The accompanying strains and upheavals on international scene have serious foreign policy consequences for all countries".\(^{15}\)

Such environmental hazards are neither the work of any single nation, nor can it be faced by a nation alone. It is a threat to security of all nations and their survival. A co-ordinated and concerted effort has to be made by all towards meeting this threat. Threats from environment strike two fold - from degradation itself and conflict arising out of such degradation - compounding the already existing problems including that of security in developing countries. It is maintained that stopping external

---

15. David A. Wright, "Climate Chaos", *Foreign Policy* (Washington) no.74, Spring 1989, p.3.
aggression may be relatively simple as compared to checking the deterioration of life-support system of the environment.\textsuperscript{16} The concept of security needs reconceptualization in view of the environmental nightmares and the threatening prospects to survival of our civilization. Aptly, the World Commission on Environment noted that the notion of security must include "the growing impacts of environmental stress - locally, nationally and internationally. There is no military solution to environmental security".\textsuperscript{17}

In view of the challenges ahead, environment and development are those two rare subjects on which both industrialized and developing countries have consensus that global action and cooperation is required. The emerging conception that environment and development are very closely linked showed us that we are increasingly faced with issues that affect the world as a whole. 'Development' should not be 'destruction'; and 'environment' should not be 'stagnation'. The UNCED held at Rio-de Janerio in June 1992, emphasized the eradication of poverty as a pre-requisite for safeguarding environmental quality for future


\textsuperscript{17} World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED), \textit{Our Common Future} (New York, 1987), pp.6-7.
generations blurring the existing separation of economic and political issues in international relations.

In relations among states, the Rio-declaration recognizes that human beings are at the centre of human concern and they have every right to development. Environmental protection is an integral part and eradicating poverty an indispensable requirement of the concept of 'sustainable development' put forth by the Rio Summit. In the words of Brundtland commission, sustainable development must be such that it, "meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs." Sustainable Development is a long term concept. It is highly complex and is viable only in a global context of interdependence. It also links environmental, technological and social concerns into the economic decision-making process of the market. While explaining the inseparable relation between environment and development, Brundtland states, "the 'environment' is where we all live; and 'development' is what we do in attempting to improve our lot". While Stockhom Summit was concerned with specifying the causality and significance of the problem, Rio dealt with assessing options for action, particularly social environment.

The countries suffering from economic and infrastructural development, unstable political systems
which are for the most part post-colonial, and ethnic or other social cleavages, face a number of problems as security threats which undermine state autonomy and survival from within. It becomes complex due to interdependence of internal and external security levels. Security is hence thwarted as much by external forces as they are undermined by domestic constraints. But the linkage between various components of domestic stability is an important manifestation of security dynamics and there exist a strong link between various domestic and external contributors to security and insecurity. Due to the numerous problems that they face, it will be easy to highlight the insecurities that developing countries come across.¹⁸

National security for such nations should be understood as a multi dimensional and dynamic process. It is a complex and integrated phenomenon. National values are 'safeguarding the political and territorial survival of state, ensuring the organic survival of its population, establishing conditions for economic welfare and achieving and preserving inter-communal harmony'.¹⁹ Economic and

¹⁸. For the purpose of our study here, by 'developing countries' we refer to a nation: that had had a colonial past of some sort; that did not witness the first Industrial Revolution; and that which is not part of any military alliance.

social factors also form a part of the definition of security later on.

The initial threats such nation face to their security is of legitimacy. Even democratically elected government may sometimes find it hard to gain legitimacy. But once established, the nation reproduces itself automatically by transfer of culture to the young. State institutions can change without interrupting the continuity of the state which means that security of government can be differentiated from the security of state on the domestic level. This, however, cannot happen at the international level as state and government are inseparably bound together. Universalized nation-state system has emerged internationally. It is the larger nations who face problems in national consolidation, integration and nation building. Serious security problem arise out of intra-state considerations as linguistically, culturally and ethnically close communities are divided across national frontiers, often arbitrarily drawn by external powers without consideration for communities of border-lying areas. In such a situation, a nation is often threatened by ethnic violence and confronted with a demand from ethnic minorities for national self-determination.20 The tension generated by

20. Experience of Kurds (Iran-Iraq-Turkey) and the Western Somalis (Somalia-Ethiopia) are examples.
the nation-state dichotomy take varied and usually violent forms. 'Separatism' is one such force, driving internal wars such as those in India (Sikhs), Sri Lanka (Tamils), Ethiopia (Eritreans, Tigreans, Oromos and Somalis), and Sudan (Christians and animist southerners).

Nations can internally be insecure due to communal, fundamentalist or minority problems. This is true with reference to most developing and even some developed countries, where the problem is of division of political power between groups of varying ethnic and sectarian origins. Often there is lack of consensus over the organizing ideology of the state. National leaders may take a different view as regards the course of action to be persuaded. Structural-political threats arise when the organizing principles of two states contradict each other in a context where states cannot simply ignore each other's existence.21 Their historic, geographical and cultural ties do not allow them to ignore each other, as both are politically vulnerable. Similar religious and ethnic threats emerged sometime back among the bordering states, Armenia and Azerbaijan, of the erstwhile Soviet Union. A similar pattern can also be witnessed in Yugoslavia.

21. India and Pakistan are particular case of structural political threat. Pakistan, an Islamic unity is exclusively theological state while India is a secular federation. Pakistan fears absorption by an omnivorous India, while India is threatened by dismemberment into number of single religion state.
Britain and lately in racial violence of Los Angeles in April 1992. Gorbachev, while in Tokyo spoke with great concern of rising nationalisms the world over. "Rise of ethnic nationalism has become a major issue world over. Nationalism is emerging in Canada, let alone Yugoslavia. It exists in Britain. We have to take responsibilities for the consequences of neglecting the danger of nationalism." 22

More often than not, normally such issues have their origin in colonial past of such nations - a result of what its former rulers have done to their colonies, to keep them under control. Therefore, capabilities, motives, geopolitical position and the past and present policies of their states have an important bearing on the national security of the subject states. The greater susceptibility of weak nations is a consequence of their own weakness as a state, their relative low power capability and the rather loose connection of their security to the security and stability of internal political system. 23

Economic threats are more difficult to relate to security than other issues as they normally denotes risk, competition and uncertainty. Rather it is economic

--------------------

development or underdevelopment, that poses as insecurity. On certain occasions development may be uneven and intensify the urban-rural divide, that creates national discrepancies in income, which go hand in hand with gross disparities in land-ownership. At a more immediate level, investment in social and economic development raises local aspirations, which if unfulfilled leads to national upheaval something that Shah Reza Pehlavi faced in 1979 in Iran. Similarly, discontent may also result from the fact that a particular community benefits the most from state because they dominate the state apparatus.

The last two decades have seen unprecedented economic turmoil. There have been massive increase in oil prices, major recessions in developed industrialized economies, collapse of commodity prices and increase in debt burden. The decade from 1975-85 witnessed a 30 per cent increase in world-wide defence spending in real terms. Arms purchased by non-oil producing countries also contributed to an increase in international indebtedness. Resurgent arms race raise a number of questions:

(a) has military preparedness increased national and international security?

24. Similar discontent resulted in riots in Algeria in October 1988; price riots has affected stability in Argentina and Jordan.
have all post World War conflicts resulted from superior military preparedness and various other economic causes?

Whatever might have been the impact of militarization on economic development, the question remains whether economic development has been conducive to international security and whether internecine conflicts within the Third World have been caused by economic or by other factors? Another perplexing issue is whether the intra-Third World conflicts are the result of underdevelopment and exploitation, and whether the realization of collective economic security would pave way for world peace?

Scholars like R. Dahrendorf and L. Coser consider that economic development and industrialization of the Third World might intensify competition and conflict for scarce world resources, while others, rooted in the classical tradition of Hugo Grotius, Emmerich Vattel, Immanuel Kant, Adam Smith and John Stuart Mill, consider underdevelopment as the main cause of insecurity. Internal conflicts are seen only as an attempt to divert attention of the restive population from the real source of their misery. Today there are three major international economic issues: there is economic stagnation in many parts of the world that still encompasses more than half of mankind; chronic imbalances exist in the flow of international trade and foreign
exchange and there is need to ensure that continued economic
growth does not undermine physical environment by intense
utilization of existing resources and recycling of the
waste. Bipolar power rivalry continues to make Third World
no less an important source of raw material and a
potentially lucrative market, and a future contact point for
political support. The transnational corporations (TNC) an
outgrowth of the developed world, are transforming world
political economy through its increasing control over three
fundamental resources of human life, namely technology of
production, finance capital and marketing. Henry Kissinger
views TNCs as 'one of the most effective engines of
development'.

The formidable question is, 'development for whom'?
The role the TNCs play is itself an impediment to Third
World development. TNCs are said to control around 40 per
cent of the industrial production of developing countries
and between 50-95 per cent of their foreign trade, depending
upon their commodity. Thus the developing countries are not
entirely liberated from linkages between foreign trade and
financial capital.

25. Quoted in Joseph La Palombara and Stephan Blank,
Multinational Corporations and Developing Countries
Interdependence Among Nations

A world where an estimated 800 million people in the Third World live below a modest poverty line, suffer from malnutrition, famine and disease; where population, unemployment and illiteracy is the highest; where even safe and pure drinking water is not available to half of the population and where infant mortality rate is much higher than its developed counterpart, development must precede any other objective. It is underdevelopment which may result in instability of nation-state thus threatening a comprehensive plan for international security. All the issues stated above cannot be restrained within national boundaries. They tend to have world-wide effect, directly or indirectly, as they overlap and intertwine with each other.

As the events have unfolded in the second half of this century, nothing exists in total isolation. No man is an island, and economically, no country is either. All countries participate in world economy, producing goods for export which pay for the goods they import. For most the process creates wealth, employment and economic prosperity. There are three basic ideas underlying interdependence. 27

26. It is 13 in North America, 69 in Latin America, 122 in Africa and 126 in South Asia.

i) that interdependent nations are likely to take one another's interests into consideration, thereby diminishing the harmful consequences and hostile outcomes that result from conflicting interests;

ii) as economic and social structure of international system become more structured and intertwined, interests were increasingly affected when conflict emerged. When economic interdependence is strong, any conflict will result is serious consequences.

iii) increasingly interdependent relations are understood to enhance integration. It helps in recognizing consequences of its own policies on others and consequence of latter's on its own interests.

A state apart from being a sovereign entity is also a member of some treaty or organization. Which may, at times, get it involved into intra-national stability. Such involvement may not be of national interest but an international obligation. State's conflict may also arise from conflict of interests, since basic values are, sometimes, at stake. Cooperation does not necessarily mean absence of conflict. Keohane and Nye state:

We are are not suggesting that that international conflicts disappear when interdependence prevails. On the contrary, conflict will take new forms and may even increase... we must therefore be cautious about the prospect that rising interdependence is
creating a brand new world of cooperation to replace the bad old world of international conflicts.\textsuperscript{28}

Similarly, "there is no one to one relationship between the amount of interdependence and existence of cooperation among nations".\textsuperscript{29} Thus interdependence must be seen as factor influencing the intensity of cooperation as well as conflict.

What matters finally in the analysis is security, that is indivisible, universal and equal for all. The concept itself is multi-dimensional and interdependent. There can be no unilateral approach to it and hence should be seen in an inductive sequence i.e., security of the components leading to that of the whole. Robert Jervis argues, "attempt of one state to achieve security precipitate a feeling of insecurity in other states. All states tend to assume the worst of others and respond accordingly. Their collective action unilaterally generates a spiral of insecurity".\textsuperscript{30} The search for 'great power linkage' and the


\textsuperscript{29} Richard Rosecrance, "War, Trade and Interdependence", paper presented to International Conference on Interdependence and Conflict in International System, Groningen, November 1986.

'strategic consensus' by many developing countries creates problem of regional security. A clear distinction must however be made between 'state security' and 'regime security', because more often than not, external linkages are sought for the maintenance of regime security.

Some modern scholars divorce politics from economics and believe that burgeoning social and economic transactions are creating a 'world without borders'. The traditionalists still doubt the 'fading away of the nation-state' and the rise of nationalism illustrate that nation-state is not really giving way. In fact, neither of them have the framework for understanding the politics of 'global interdependence'. The era is marked with both continuity and change. The rising tide of interdependence has created a brave new world of cooperation to replace that of international conflict. In the wake of concepts like global interdependence, the traditional maxim - states will act in their own national interest in an attempt to maximise power - becomes more and ambiguous. Over the years, war has become too dangerous, and "the dangerousness of war has reduced the dangers of war".31 It shows states can and do cooperate on regional and global level.

It is the system of states that is, at present, the only political expression of the unity of mankind, and it is to cooperate among states, in the United Nations and elsewhere, that we have chiefly to look if we are to preserve such sense of common human interests as there may be, to extend it and to translate it into concrete action.\textsuperscript{32}

The proposal to build a comprehensive system of international security is based on the premise that the problem of security as such is not military-technological, but a political problem. It proposes to build a comprehensive system of security envisaging greater national and international security through disarmament. Security complexes offer an approach to security which requires attention to both the macro-level of greater power impact on the system and the micro-level of local state system. It emphasizes the mutuality of impact between them, with external influences tending to amplify local problems, and local problems shaping and constraining external entanglement and influences. Thus weakening of security in any state has negative consequences for the security of the international community as a whole. Common dangers can be encountered only mutually through universal international cooperation. This diffusion of power in contemporary system, accords equal importance to the actors at the bottom of the power hierarchy for proper functioning of the system

\textsuperscript{32} Hedley Bull, "The States Perspectyve Role in World Affairs", \textit{Daedalus} (Cambridge), vol.108, no.4, Fall 1979, p.120.
as a whole. There is a trend towards the 'decentralization of the international security system'.

The basic problem underlining almost all interests in international relations, is insecurity. The influence and status, power and peace have acquired spring up from this problem. What makes certain states, at certain times, to expand their influence abroad can be explained as: "anything which makes a person feel more important tends to increase his or her efforts to influence others". Although the individuals form the ultimate despository of insecurity, they do not provide for its most potent expression. That role is left on a variety of organizations, who aggregate individual insecurities up to a level at which sufficient resources become available for remedial action. State is the highest form of such manifestation having control over the individual. Insecurity underlines not only relations between states, but also relations between the governing powers in one country and a variety of sub-state organizations in another. It is towards the form of insecurity generated, at the state level and the


international system, that the concepts of power, peace and security are primarily aimed. The concept of security has traditionally been treated as a side effect, arising from the possession of either power or peace.

Free from the confines of 'national security', security as an important motive of behaviour offers a comprehensive prespective on international relations. It directs attention towards the need to find methods that can satisfy the legitimate concerns of state without at the same time amplifying the dynamics of security for them. Excessive attention paid to national security leads to the self-reinforcing dynamics of the struggle for power, while too much attention to international security leads to unrealistic idealism associated with peace view. A true security policy requires states to attend both to their own stability and vulnerability. The idea of security accepts the reality and durability of the anarchy, the importance of units within it and the role of power dynamics within its units. It also accepts the moral imperatives against war.

"A proper security based approach would require a conscious rejection of the current polarization between peace and power; and the assertion of security, as a fully articulated framework, in its own right".35 Thus security is a more

comprehensive concept than either power or peace for understanding the basic problem of international relations.

The universalization of the state system has extended the moderately mature norms of the older and stronger part of the system to cover the new members, but many of the new members are so weak as states that they cannot adequately fulfill their role in such a relatively advanced system. The weak states are specially vulnerable to political threats, as such threats are not aimed at the country as a whole, but at the main factional dispute within it.

Complete security cannot be obtained in an anarchic system. The multiplicity of states, the structure of the system and its interaction dynamics, complete the security dilemma by ensuring that any attempt to acquire complete security by any actor will stimulate reactions which raise the level of threat. In the present situation a holistic view of security is unavoidable. But it is plagued with a variety of problems. National security ranks among the highest in the national interest hierarchy. With its strong power orientations and militarist leaning, pursuance of national security can only generate more insecurity for others. Although a nation can reduce or contain its vulnerability by striking at its source, specially in economic sphere by self-reliance and development, it is easier said than done. Most of such challenges as poverty,
unemployment and generation of resources can only be met cooperatively on a global scale, particularly in small and developing states. "Development at an acceptable rate would be hard if not impossible to reconcile with a continuation of arms race" and "disarmament should be so designed that close connection between disarmament and development gets full recognition." 36 There is a close relationship between disarmament and development as progress in the former would greatly help in the realization of the latter. "Resources released as a result of disarmament measures should be devoted to social and economic development of all nations and continue to bridging of economic gap between developed and developing countries." 37 The logic of national security strategy by itself leads to a militarized and security obsessed society and not towards the ultimate common goal. It can be attained only through properly coordinated efforts to meet the economic and environmental challenges or else face a more problematique future.

With simultaneous interlinkage in their mutual relationship and impact, the understated developments constitute in their totality the dominant ethos of our age:


37. Final Document of the 10th Special Session of UN General Assembly; Resolution S-10/2 of June 30, 1978, para 35.
World Politics has faced decolonization and proliferation of states; world diplomacy has led to globalization and emergence of global powers; world economy witnessed the second Industrial Revolution and growth of TNCs; world culture is plagued by population explosion, mass societies and mass culture; and world strategy and security first led to arms race and later towards disarmament and peace proposals. We stand in testimony to global phenomenon of interdependence in state craft, nation building, diplomacy, in socio-economic process and in system of defence strategy. Never before a sweep of change and its impact, was so worldwide. A world overarmed and undernourished - is a paradox that sums up the essence of contemporary global context. We have an explosive power of about three tons of TNT for every human being today. To a situation like this Alva Myrdal had rightly remarked, "What makes war a folly is that all countries are now buying greater and greater insecurity at higher and higher costs."38 But Hedley Bull, while admitting that weapons contribute to international tensions attacked the notion that they cause war. He points out that force has an important role to play in preserving security in anarchical society of nation-states.39


The present international relations has put forth another interesting aspect for analysis - where will the disintegration and dismemberment of erstwhile states lead us to? Break of the former Soviet Union into fifteen independent states, division of Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia under domestic compulsions and fundamentalist and ethnic pressures has lead to a deluge of small states which have peculiar security problems. There seems to be no end to such a process. It will intensify the security dilemma and obstruct the ultimate task of achieving common security. Small states will mean more insecure frontiers, more ethnic-linguist disputes across borders and non-viability of small states as they lack self-sufficiency. Hence, dependency or interdependence may lead to conflict instead of harmony. Thus, it was rightly declared by Einstein-Russell manifesto (1955) which led to the establishment of the Pugwash Movement "Remember your humanity and forget the rest". Humanity rests above all other interests. Hence, international peace must rest on commitment to joint survival rather than a threat of mutual destruction.

With no world government possessing the power to curb the violence of its more aggressive members, the state system is pervaded with insecurity which produces power struggle and which logically culminates into war. Emphasis
on the military aspects of security policies have increased the pace of arms race, exacerbated international tensions and heightened the danger of nuclear and conventional war. As both disarmament and development have a symbiotic nexus, they facilitate economic growth. It not only generates peace and stability, but also paves way for maximum security for all. Thus the Olof Palme Commission advocated the doctrine of common security in place of deterrence theory and the Willy Brandt Commission insisted on prevention of nuclear war as the foremost objective of disarmament.

Threats to security are often ambiguous and thus need constant monitoring and assessment for building up general security framework. International relations throughout the post-war era have been featured by cyclical periods of thaw and freeze. With the conclusion of Intermediate Nuclear Force (INF) Treaty towards the end of 1980s we, for the first time, witnessed the destruction of fearsome nuclear arsenal. Whatever might be the compulsions, are we entering a period of lasting cooperation and understanding? Will the balance of terror, at last, give way to climate of trust and cooperation? Cold war has come to an end at the European continent and we witness resolution of problems in Iraq-

---

40. Less than one per cent of annual defence spending could help in achieving self-sufficiency in food in low income countries facing perennial food problems.
Iran, Afghanistan, Cambodia, Namibia, Nicaragua, West Sahara and South Africa, as well as in Ethiopia and Angola. Yet at the same time we wake up to aggressive behaviour of such nations as Iraq. So war cannot altogether be eliminated. It will exist as long as states are units of the international system, but certainly it can be minimized to the lowest level possible. An understanding should be sought on military doctrine which should be exclusively based on defensive strategies, i.e., military power should be sufficient for defensive needs only.

Common security is a serious effort to establish an altogether new world order. It is a concept of prevention of war as nuclear weapons have changed not only the scale of war but the very concept itself. It is built on a rationally oriented common interest in prevention of war. Its structural characteristic emphasize: common concern for insecurity; common aim for security and common procedural elements in seeking security. In an age of interdependence no nation can achieve security by itself. It can be only through a system of global, military, political, economic cultural and ecological security that it will be possible to attain the objective of national security. National and international security which are inextricably intertwined, cannot be ensured through arms. It can be achieved only by a rational and humanistic political and economical
organization of the world. Common security denies neither existence nor persistence of political, ideological, or 'system-determined' opposition of interests. It seeks to structure international environment in such a way that military engagement is excluded. Common security gives priority to political, economic and cultural factors over military, in order to assure common survival. It attempts at mutually assured security, mutual evolution instead of mutual obliteration, coexistence instead of co-annihilation.

In essence, security is accepted as a collective preoccupation of the international community, and not only of the blocs, big power or states with major military potential. Global interdependence also implies a collective responsibility for the fate of mankind, which has tremendous possibilities for development of modern technology and is used for benefit for all. As an alternative concept common security strives for rapid change and should be understood as an evolutionary process which avoids destabilization. It is built on cooperative and reciprocal multilateral negotiations, but by no means excludes unilateral measures of self-restraint. What is new in the concept of common security is the unequivocal emphasis on the fact that today one has to consider the potential enemy as a necessary partner in building and guaranteeing of global, continental and regional security. Although it is not easy to provide
for global security in circumstances of unequal relations, it implies that all efforts to prevent nuclear war are too important to be left to the superpowers. Broadly speaking all countries should participate in the efforts to enhance common security through elimination of threats whether they be military, economic, political, social, cultural or environmental.

It is question of our common existence, hence there is need for unanimous efforts by all states, either individually or through regional and international organizations, to strengthen common security. The international dynamics has reduced us to a 'global village'; there can be no East or West, North or South, big or small and developed or developing. Our common fate, in face of common security threats, leave us with little choice. What we have as 'humanity' is much more stronger and important than that which divides nations and societies with respect to ethnic origins, language, culture, history, customs, ideology, political institutions, economic systems and levels of development. Thus as Albert Einstein said, "We shall require a substantially new manner of thinking if mankind has to survive" or else 'we are drifting towards an unparalleled catastrophe'.
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