

Security Paradigm Between Classic and Modern

Constantin Bușe, Constantin Hlihor

The security concept is a relatively new issue in all political and academics discussions, although the efforts of the individuals, human communities and states to assure their peaceful existence, prosperity and to protect the achievements and the way of life go way back in time and the only difference was in the forms and the methods that have been used throughout one century or another.

Long time the security has been identified with military power. Gaining or losing of military potential was essential for every state in order to play an important role in the power equation which was realized in international relations and also was essential for stability of the security. That situation has created a very distinctive security architecture which was materialized on Europe continent as “power equilibrium” formula. Historians in international relations has domain have noticed that the “power equilibrium” formula assured security as long as all the states respected some moral principals and legal engagements. That formula almost diminished the believe in the use of brutal force and have led to moderacy and stability After the Westfalien Peace Treaty to the very ending of the Cold War, peace and war as well as security and insecurity have changed there places so many times with so many dramatic consequences for so many people and nations.

There are just a few aspects in historical evolution of international society, which point out the fact that security has suffered essential transformation. To understand all those transformations we have to know the way of people’s influence over security in evolution of the international relations. A very profound analysis of the security concepts evolution is

more then necessary in order to understand all the changes that every state has made in its security strategies in the past decade. Barry Buzan was right when he said that if we want to understand correctly all the problems with national security, first we have to understand the very concept of security. It’s necessary to highlight the fact that the definitions and concepts for security were presented differently by all philosophical schools and that’s the reason we have so many different security definitions without having possibility of creating one unifying concept. Until mid 80’s there were two major tendencies in security domain which had dominated all discussions.

- **“Security as a consequence of power”** that tendency is followed by “Realistic School of International Relations” developed by E.R.Carr and H. Morgenthau and analyzes the concept of power. Security is a consequence of one player’s dominant position that has suffusion power to impose him on the international relations scene.
- **“Security as a consequence of peace”** that tendency is followed by “Idealistic School” which has been created in the early years of 20-th century based on “The League of The Nations”. “A lasting peace would give security to everyone”- claim idealists, but so far they can not impose there point of view because of the mistakes made by “The League of The Nations” in the past.

One of the most important researches in security domain have been made by John Herts, who in the early 50’s has created and has introduced in science discussions the concept of “security dilemma”, as well as Arnold Wolfers who has insisted on elaborating a

multidimensional concept. Robert Jervis has introduced a new interesting idea of different security regimes and has underlined the necessity of systematical analysis. His way of analyzing has its origin in the International Organizations Theory promoted by Stephen D. Krasner, Robert Keohane and Joseph S. Nye. Robert Keohane claims against theory of the classic realism which describes international relations as a battle for power, which is based on three statements: "All the states are coherent units and has a very important role on the political scene", "The power is a efficient instrument and it's used often in policy", "There is a hierarchy of the problems in world policies dominated by the requirements for military security.

He states that, under the globalization conditions and the increase of the interdependencies caused by the appearance of non-state actors, there is no clear hierarchy of solutions so force become inefficient.

In the '80s both the realistic school of thinking and the liberal one reconsidered the conceptualization and analysis of security phenomenon. Thus, Kenneth Waltz, developing the neo-realism theories in international relations asserted that security depends on the state behavior within an anarchic system. "In anarchy, underlined K. Waltz, the security is the supreme goal. The purpose of a system which encourages the quest of the states is the security"¹. His studies are centered in the proximity of the International Security magazine. The Idealist School simultaneously offers a new concept and solution to the security relations inter-dependency: "the common security", term which was emphasized for the first time by the Palme Commission in 1982 and made operational as an idea of non-provocative defense.

In 1988, M. Allagappa used his study "Comprehensive Security: Interpretation in Asian Countries"² to call the scientific community to a "comprehensive" and "total" approach of the national security concept, according to the threats total and multi-dimensionality. In the same year (1988), Barry Buzan introduced the concept of "security complex"³ when he realized an analysis on security dimensions in South East Asia and developed it in his 1991 study: "People, States

and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era". He also underlines the necessity of establishing some analysis levels: "Because the reality of interdependent security is inevitable, the only hope to define some maneuverable studying subjects, which neither be lost, nor vanish in front of the vital signification of the whole, is to find an hierarchy of analytic levels in the international system. Each of these levels must identify long lasting, significant and essentially independent features of the security problem"⁴. The concept of "security complex" is built on regional level on the dynamic of friendship pattern ("from a simple friendship to requesting protection and help"⁵) and enemy pattern ("relations established on suspicion and fear"⁶). Barry Buzan succeeds in enriching the concept of security in international relations domain and to go further to a holistic perspective of neo-realism, eliminating the criticism of ethnocentrism⁷.

These two evolutions circumscribe the main conceptual dualities of security around which the notion is dimensioned in the '80s:

- ✓ security – anarchy; security is either the result of the maintaining of the power balance (the bi or penta-polar model), or of the developing of a hegemonic international system (uni-polar model).
- ✓ security – community; community of interests creates joint security structures, on the base of proximity laws.

The contradiction security – defense can be added.

From the structural point of view there are two approaches of the security concept dimensions:

- ✓ from Kenneth Waltz's structural theory are kept the levels at which these act: individual level, state level and international level⁸.
- ✓ from the theories of interdependencies are kept the domains at which the concept of security acts: military, political, economical, social and environmental.

The beginning of the '90s coincides with the development of several thinking schools in the field of security concept, rising from international relations, political doctrines or organizational and cultural domains. It is noticeable that methodological and conceptual

mechanisms from various domains are used, going to a pluri-paradigms knowledge of security.

From these schools three are the most important: realism (neorealism, classic realism), liberalism (neoliberalism) and constructivism. Each school develops different approaches, but maintaining the basic ideas of each of them as they were established by the classics. Thus the realism gets a series of variants which enrich its literature; Robert Jervis operates with the distinction between offensive realism and defensive realism, Alistair Jonson creates a context with three analysis categories (power balance, maximization of power, threat balance, identity), Dale Copeland introduces the theory of dynamic differentials, Jacek Kruger – the theory of power transition, Charles Glaser and Benjamin Miller elaborate the theories of the cooperation between the great powers, Randall Schweller – the theory of the interest balance, John Mearsheimer – the theory of the great powers policies, all these theories respecting the desideratum of realism, as it was established by Morgenthau and E.H.Carr.

In its neo-classic form, the realism gets enriched with Stephan Walt's theory of threats balance, Fareed Zakaria's realism of centric state, Thomas Christiansen's theory of domestic mobilization, offensive – defensive theories elaborated by Stephen Van Evera, Thomas Christiansen, Jack Snyder, Charles Glaser and Chaim Kaufmann, Eric Labs' theory of targets and William Wohlforth's hegemonic theory of foreign policy.

The distinction between neo-realism and neo-classic realism can be better understood if these two are considered as continuous and not divided. The theories of neo-realism try to explain the international results, for example the probability of war between the great powers, the durability of alliances or the probability of international cooperation. The neo-classic realism, through its theories, tries to explain the foreign behavior of the states as a whole, for example the economic foreign policy, the military doctrine, the diplomacy. In the same context of ideas specific to neo-realism, there is the school from Copenhagen, developed around Barry Buzan, Jaap de Wilde and Ole Weaver, school that promotes concepts as:

“security as silence”, “subsuming security”, securization – non-securization, and from the structuring models perspective it keeps the same general categories of security (military, environmental, economic and political) or adds new models, as the one of Ole Waever – the security model of a “hourglass”⁹.

From the beginning of the '90s in the international relations literature, where the main paradigm was the realism, a new paradigm emerged – the one of constructivism. The realists who tackled structural or systemic theories, inspired from the Kenneth Waltz's theory of international policies, were the main target of the constructivist school which accused them of failing to analyze the decisive factor which is the share inter-subjective of ideas, which generates the behavior by setting up the identities and interests of the actors. The result of this school's effort is to diversify and enrich the specific literature with many models such as norms, culture, identity, trust, persuasion, learning, demonstrative effects, trans national conceptual flows, socialization and many other processes of ideas that influences the dramatic end of the great powers rivalry¹⁰.

The main theorist of constructivism is Alexander Wendt who, in his 1999 “Social Theory and International Politics” study, synthesizes the whole criticism of realism. According to Wendt, even if a system is conflictual or pacifist, this is a function and is not due to anarchy and power, but to shared culture, created through discursive social practices. Each actor's opinion about himself (his interests and identity) is a product of the diplomatic gestures of the others; states can redefine the structure through a process and reconfigure interests and identities through a new gesture.

The postulates of constructivism are:

1. The global politics are the result of intersubjective sharing of ideas, norms and values, at the level of the actors. The constructivists are centered on the intersubjective dimensions of the knowledge, because they want to emphasize the social aspect of human existence – the role of ideas being shared in the theory of the behavior compulsion and directing.

2. The theoretic structure has not only a steadily effect, but also a constitutive one on the actors.
3. Between the theoretic structures and the actors (agents) there is a double direction: of determination and of constitution. The structures constitute the actors, in terms of their interests and identities, and the structures themselves are produced, reproduced or altered by the actors' discursive practices¹¹.

At the border between the constructivism and institutionalism is the study co-coordinated by Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett¹², edited in 1998 at Cambridge University Press, which, inspired either from security concept of the English school, or from constructivist theoretic models, offers a heuristic model which assumes three developing stages: "nascent", "ascendant", "mature". The utility of this model is to ensure a common set of questions for the cases treated in this study. In the last chapter the authors emphasize how trust develops as a main idea in the creation of "the security community".

From the political doctrines field, in the line of international relations, liberalist and neo-liberalist analysis models are borrowed. The adjustment of the models is made by Mike Mochizuki and Michael O'Hanlon¹³ who, through their analysis on the core principles of security relations between USA and Japan, show that the guarantee of US – Japan alliance is not a common military threat, but common interests arouse from sharing democratic values.

Together with those three schools described previously others can be identified: the Feminist School¹⁴, the Poststructuralist Studies School¹⁵, Third World States Security School¹⁶, and Critical Studies School¹⁷.

The diversity of approaches on the security concept and the coagulation of some thinking schools in international relations field shows nothing else but the main directions of research which, combined, allow a complex operationalization of security.

The components of the concept of security, after the post Cold war period show a transfer of accent to the things concerning the new realities and threats to the security, very different from the epoch of political

ideological confrontation between the democratic eastern world and the communist eastern world. At the beginning of the nineteen's the identification of the five dimensions of the security, political, military, economical, social, (here we can include the human rights and the protection of the minorities) and of course ecological¹⁸. As seen by Barry Buzan leads to a postbelic vision based on the understanding of security both in its political and military variants. The idea of security for all in an Euro Atlantic cooperation area opposed to old time confrontation abandoned the old formula "game with no gain". In order to define a new domain in security that in which everybody is a winner and the benefits are divided according to the security.

The pentagonal formula of security as seen by Buzan, stressing a special meaning for obtaining the dimension of protection of human rights as part of the concept of security have been rapidly adopted by the main organization of Euro-Atlantic security: OSCE, NATO, UEO, and European Union after the establishment of Foreign Politics and Mutual Security in the Maastricht Treaty, in 1992. For example, chapter VIII-th, about THE HUMAN DIMENSION OF THE DECISIONS, adopted thru a document during the OSCE summit, in Budapest, TO A REAL PARTENERSHIP IN A NEW AGE, from December 1993, stated clearly; "the human Rights and fundamental liberties, the rightful state and democratic institutions represent the foundation of peace and stability, giving a crucial contribution in preventing the conflicts, in a system of security"¹⁹.

Starting from the idea of protecting this component of world security namely the respecting of human rights, a new idea come to life including the interpretation of the famous article 2 (7) from UNO Charta, that deals with the policy of non-intervening of the UNO in the internal affairs of the states with the exception of the cases when internal events contravene with the chapter VII-th of the chart the necessity of protecting peace and international security. From this moment in the council of security were inevitable the transformations in interpreting the role of the council as is stated in Charta; a precise policy

of intervention appeared in order to limit the massive violations of human rights anywhere in the world unconditioned to obtain the vote of the permanent members. So on the 5/th of April 1991 the resolution 688 appeared and connected the protection of the human rights in Iraq with the preservation of the peace and international security. Chapter VII UNO Charta. Based on this resolution a multinational coalition intervened in Iraq under UNO guidance in order to protect the Kurds from the brutal reprimation lead by the leaders from Baghdad.

From our point of view this would be the first major change of the paradigm security after the Cold War a change that goes from games with no gain's to providing security for the whole world but which seems to focus on the dimensions of the concept of security that were not take in account during the 90's at least from the point of view of the motivation for which the states could go to war with UNO blessing. It's about th4e consolidation of the idea that the military intervention is a solution to stop the genocide and the massive violation of the human rights in counties were along the whole period of the cold war the atrocities were seen as an internal affair by the chart.

The second change derives from our point of view from the new dimensions of the concept of collective defense applied at NATO and USA defense department. After "the beginning of the global war against terrorism" after 09/11 although terrorism is considered a danger to the security of the alliance the new NATO strategic concepts expressed at Rome in 1991 and reiterated at Washington in 1999, only after 09/11 coherent strategic doctrine against terrorism appeared first in the American administration and then in NATO without giving birth to controversies between the allied countries.

The main architect of the new doctrine is president Bush, the Formula proposed by him being defined by many specialists as that of preventive action (the military dimension being included), in front of nonconventional threats especially terrorism. Without being a doctrine for the first time in history this fact leads to a phenomena of reinterpretation of article 51 from the UNO Chart, concerning the right of self defense and launch once again the

dispute about the imminence of danger which must be eliminated by a preventive action: "the terrorists and the terrorist countries don't unveil this threats, through right modalies as formal declarations and to answer to such enemies only after they had stroke first is not self defense but pure suicide²⁰ (this is in fact the logic of the article 51 from UNO Chart).

This new idea of the American administration makes use of the strategic data gathered after the cold war and which hadn't existed in the relations of security between two superpowers after the world war two which were both hostile and wiling and capable of a dialogue. The paradingm of security has undertaken dramatic changes after 1991: "as we face the new realities the old security doctrines seem outdated. In the days of cold war we are able to face the menace with the strategies of deceptions and containment". But it is harder to do it with enemies who don't have a country to defeat. It is also very difficult to act when the dictators can get weapons of mass destruction and are ready to give them to the terrorists that want to produce huge losses to the USA²¹.

Although this Bush doctrine (which has a even more important element, that of making the countries that help and shelter terrorists, pay²²) was contested by some members of the alliance it imposed itself during NATO summit from Prague in the 2002. In a formula adapted, through creation of NATO Response Force (NRF) with a operational capability that has to be reached no later than October 2004 and with a full operational capability to be reached no lather than October 2006²³. On the 18 December 2001, the North Atlantic council at the level of ministers of defense asked the military authorities of NATO to prepare A MILITARY CONCEPT FOR DEFENSE AGAINST TERORISM which later would be approved by NAC. This concept was approved by NAC in the permanent session and then assumed by the heads of state and government during the Prague Summit on the 21.11.2002. the main idea of this NATO concept is: "the alliance had to be prepared for military operations against terrorist groups, when and where it is needed and as will be decided by NAC²⁴.

In what concerns the strategy of the European Union security that is linked to that of the NATO, the document called THE EUROPEAN STRATEGY OF SECURITY is very important. It was adopted in Bruxelles by the European Council, on the 12.12.2003. In it is specified that the union needs a strategic culture, which generates an early, rapid and necessary strong intervention”²⁵.

The modification of the international system of security by linking to the protection

of human rights to the concept of international security and the placement of this matter under the incidence of chapter VIII-th of the chart as well as the important part which Bush doctrine played in rethinking of the security strategies on global scale as an answer to the threat of international terrorism are from our point of view the new directions in the evolutions of the paradigm of security of present time.

NOTES:

¹ Apend., Barry Buzan, *People, States and Fear*, Chişinău, Cartier, Pu, page 24.

² See, R. Scalpino, *Asian Security Issues: Regional and Global*, Berkeley, Institute for East Asian Studies, 1988.

³ Barry Buzan, *op.cit.*, page 196.

⁴ *Idem.*, page 193.

⁵ *Idem.*, page 196.

⁶ *Ibidem.*

⁷ Joanne Wright, “Northern Isles Security Complex” in *Terrorism and Political Violence*, volume 5, no. 4, 1993, pages 266–286.

⁸ Kenneth Waltz, Man, *The State and War: A theoretical Analysis*, Romanian edition, Iasi, 2001.

⁹ Barry Buzan, *op.cit.*, pages 32-36.

¹⁰ Stephen Brooks, “Power, Globalizations and the End of the Cold War”, in *International Security*, no. 3, vol. 25, 2000/2001.

¹¹ Dale Copland, “The Constructivist Challenge to Structural Realism” in *International Security*, no. 2, vol. 25, 2000.

¹² Emanuel Adler, Michael Barnett (ed) *Security Committees*, Cambridge, University Press, 1988.

¹³ Mike M. Mochizuki, Michael O’Hanlon, “A Liberal Vision for the US-Japan Alliance”, in *Survival*, no. 2, vol. 40, 1998, page 127-129.

¹⁴ Martin Griffiths, *op.cit.*, page 349-364.

¹⁵ Lene Hansen, “A Case for Seduction? Evaluating the Poststructuralist Conceptualization of Security”, in *Cooperation and Conflict*, vol. 32, no. 4, 1997.

¹⁶ Brian L. Job (ed), *The Insecurity Dilemma> Natural Security of Third World States*, Columbia University Press, 1992.

¹⁷ Martin Griffiths, *op.cit.*, page 183–231.

¹⁸ Barry Buzan, “New patterns of global security in the twenty-first century”, in *International Affairs*, vol 67, No. 3 , July 1991, pp 431-451.

¹⁹ See CSCE Budapest Document 1994 “Towards a Genuine Partnership in a New Era” Budapest Decisions, Chapter VIII: the Human Dimension, second paragraph.

²⁰ News from the Washington File, Washington File, 17 March 2003, transcript : Bush Glives Saddam Hussein and Sons 48 to Leave Iraq (Refuzal to do so will result in military conflict” president says)(2170), THE WHITE HOUSE ,office of the press Secretary, March 17, 2003, REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT IN THE ADDRES TO THE NATION, The cross Hall.

²¹ News from the Washington File, Washington File, 26 August 2002, Transcript: Cheney Cites Threat from Iraq’s Saddam Hussein (Says Iraq has weapons of mass destruction and is preparing to use them)(4430), Office of the Vice President, August 26, 2002, REMARKS BY THE VICE, PRESIDENT TO THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS 103RD NATIONAL CONVENTION.

²² G. Bush the president of the USA, was very firm in his decision to express its determination to act against the supporters of international terrorism: (...) the doctrine which I sustained in front of American people, in front of the Congress, said that will not only seek and bring that terrorists, that kill in front of justice, and that we will bring also, in front of justice their hosts, that train, sustain, shelter and feed them. See For Immediate Release, Office of the Press Secretary, October 11 , 2001 President Holds rime Time News Conference, The East Room, 8:00 P.M.EDT.

²³ See. NATO Press Release (2002)127, 21 Nov. 2002 Prague Summit Declaration, Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Prague on 21 November 2002, para. 4.(a).

²⁴ NATO/IMS:NATO’s military concept for defense against terrorism, Updated: 15-Oct-2003 , NATO’s military concept for defense against terrorism.

²⁵ A SECURE EUROPE IN A BETTER WORLD, EUROPEAN SECURITY STRATEGY, Brussels, 12 December 2003.