# Security in international relations

J. Jackson-Preece

IR3**140**, 2790**140**

**2011**

Undergraduate study in
**Economics, Management,
Finance and the Social Sciences**

THE LONDON SCHOOL
OF ECONOMICS AND
POLITICAL SCIENCE ■

# Contents

## Notes

# Introduction

**140 Security in international relations** is a '300' course offered on the Economics, Management, Finance and the Social Sciences (EMFSS) suite of programmes. It is a subject which provides insights and understanding of order and stability both within and between states. Many students when they approach this course think that security is only concerned with states and their armed forces. A common misunderstanding is to equate security with defence. But the security agenda is much broader than this and now includes questions of force and military preparedness problems and policies to do with human and minority rights, migration, poverty, the environment and other societal issues. Following on from this wider agenda, security in international relations is increasingly concerned not only with the safety of states but also of the peoples within them. What students take away from this course is an understanding of security as a core value of human life and an awareness that security policies will vary depending upon how one answers the key questions: security in (or of) what; security from what; and security by what means.

It is a particularly relevant course for those of you who want to go on to careers in law or public administration, politics, international and non-governmental organisations, or journalism as the way it looks at security addresses issues of immediate concern to those engaged in a range of advocacy, policy and media roles. A very similar course is offered at the LSE as a third-year course. My own research addresses problems and practices of ethnic diversity in a world of nation states including self-determination, boundaries, human and minority rights, ethnic cleansing, genocide, and humanitarian intervention. Questions of security and insecurity are integral to all of these issues, which yet again underscores the broad significance of security in international relations. I hope that you enjoy studying this course.

If taken as part of a BSc degree, you must have passed **11 Introduction to international relations** before this course may be attempted.

## Aims

This course aims to:

- introduce you to the central concepts in security studies
- develop your comparative skills of analysis of differing security policies in practice
- promote critical engagement with the security policy literature and enable you to display this engagement by developing your ability to present, substantiate and defend complex arguments.

## Learning outcomes

By the end of this course, and having completed the Essential reading and activities, you should be able to demonstrate:

- a critical understanding of the issues involved in security policy decision making
- an understanding of the contexts, pressures and constraints with which security policymakers have to deal

- an ability to engage in comparitive analysis of security policy without losing a sense of historical context.

## How to use this subject guide

The aim of this subject guide is to help you to interpret the syllabus. It outlines what you are expected to know for each area of the syllabus and suggests relevant readings to help you to understand the material. As with many of the courses available on the International Programmes there are only four set textbooks which you must read for this course; much of the information you need to learn and understand is contained in examples and activities within the subject guide itself.

I would recommend that you work through the guide in chapter order, reading the essential texts when asked to do so in the syllabus and then when you have understood the material complete the relevant activity. You may also wish to supplement your studies by some of the Further reading, in which case you should refer to the additional readings listed for each chapter.

Having said this, it is important that you appreciate that different topics are not self-contained. There is a degree of overlap between them and you are guided in this respect by the cross-referencing between different chapters. In terms of studying this subject, the chapters of this guide are designed as self-contained units of study, but for examination purposes you need to have an understanding of the subject as a whole.

At the end of each chapter you will find a reminder of your learning outcomes, which is a list of the main points that you should understand once you have covered the material in the guide and the associated readings.

## Structure of the guide

**Chapter 1** identifies security as a core value of human life. To be secure is to be undisturbed by danger or fear. The desire for security is a defensive and self-protecting response to the fact or threat of harm from other human beings. If there were no threatening people, the need to guarantee security would disappear. The four key assumptions underlying the idea of security − security in (or of) what, from what, for what, and by what means – are each discussed and analysed. Normative and instrumental methodological approaches to security are compared and contrasted.

**Chapters 2 and 3** examine security from the perspective of the state. As these chapters will reveal, the state was, in its origins, a security arrangement and it remains so today. A well-governed nation state is a formidable security organisation. It is for this reason that the nation state ultimately replaced clans, tribal societies, fiefdoms, free cities, medieval guilds, duchies, dynastic states and even empires, among others, to become the basic form of modern political organisation. The term 'national security' has thus come to refer to all those public policies through which the nation state ensures its survival as a separate and sovereign community and, in so doing, the safety and prosperity of its citizens. The reciprocal security obligation between the nation state and its citizens is the normative basis upon which the nation state's claim to be a protector of the people is justified and this will be discussed in some detail. For the national security paradigm to hold true, however, the coercive power of the state should be used as a last resort and as rarely as possible. But that is not always the case. Even in liberal democracies, what Barry Buzan terms a 'defence dilemma' may arise as the examples of nuclear deterrence

and counter-terror measures make clear. The experience of totalitarian and weak, failed or quasi-states will also be recalled to demonstrate the limitations of the national security paradigm.

**Chapters 4 and 5** examine security from the perspective of international society. The international security paradigm aspires towards a general condition of peace, order and lawfulness within the society of states. The history of international society will thus be presented as an ongoing struggle with the problem of disorder and its concomitant insecurity. In practice, primary responsibility for providing international security has come to rest on those states we refer to as great powers. Their role will be assessed in terms of the balance of power and the concert of great powers. A recurring problem of international security is that of ensuring that all of the great powers remain good international citizens who act to support and not to subvert international law and the balance of power. On those occasions when a great power begins to act as an international bully or outlaw, international security is put at risk and the potential for catastrophic war increases. These dilemmas will be interrogated as fundamental limitations of the international security paradigm in the context of military intervention, nuclear non-proliferation and climate change.

**Chapters 6 and 7** examine security from the perspective of the individual. The search for a global human community, which would transcend international frontiers and trump the rights and interests of particular communities be these states or indeed the society of states, has a noble pedigree in international relations. This history will be summarised with a view to analysing its basic normative content. We see evidence of the human security paradigm at work post-1945 in the universal protection of human rights, humanitarian law, the idea of crimes against humanity, and in the doctrine of responsibility to protect (R2P). The significance of each of these key developments will be assessed. Finally, we will consider the unavoidable limitations of the human security paradigm which are a direct consequence of the fact that international relations up to and including the present time remain, for better or for worse, organised on the basis of state sovereignty and plural values.

Each of the three main security paradigms surveyed up to this point in the syllabus – national security, international security and human security – prioritises different security objectives. Ultimately, these paradigms represent what Isaiah Berlin has called a 'collision of values' to which there can be no permanent resolution; these paradigms may be equally compelling but nevertheless remain mutually incommensurate. At a certain point, the requirements of one paradigm will conflict with the requirements of another and we will be forced to choose between them. Should the national security of the state come first? Or are there instances where a general condition of peace and stability within the society of states may reasonably necessitate an infringement of the national security of one of its members? And what if human suffering of a serious kind persists irrespective of a general condition of peace and stability within the states system and national security among its members? In such circumstances, should human security trump these other considerations? Chapter 8 will explore these contradictions and dilemmas in the context of recent debate on the problem of intervention with reference to five cases: Iraq (1991); Bosnia (1995); Kosovo (1999); Afghanistan (2001); and Darfur (2008).

# Essential reading

You should purchase:

Bain, W. (ed.) *The empire of security and the safety of the people*. (London: Routledge, 2006) first edition [ISBN 9780415380195].

Buzan, B. *People, states and fear: an agenda for international security studies in the post cold war era*. (London: Pearson, 2004) second edition [ISBN 9781555872823].

Hough, P. *Understanding global security*. (London: Routledge, 2004) first edition [ISBN 9780415296663].

Economides, Spyros and Mats Berdal (eds) *United Nations interventionism, 1991–2004*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007) first edition [ISBN 9780521547673]. This text is essential only for Chapter 8.

Each chapter of the subject guide commences by identifying the appropriate chapters from these textbooks. In instances where these textbooks are inadequate or simply do not cover a particular topic, additional or supplementary readings will be listed as activities in the chapters. Finally, it should be noted that this subject builds on previous knowledge and understanding you will have gained in studying for the prerequisite units if you are studying this course as part of a BSc degree.

Detailed reading references in this subject guide refer to the editions of the set textbooks listed above. New editions of one or more of these textbooks may have been published by the time you study this course. You can use a more recent edition of any of the books; use the detailed chapter and section headings and the index to identify relevant readings. Also check the virtual learning environment (VLE) regularly for updated guidance on readings.

# Further reading

Please note that as long as you read the Essential reading you are then free to read around the subject area in any text, paper or online resource. You will need to support your learning by reading as widely as possible and by thinking about how these principles apply in the real world. To help you read extensively, you have free access to the VLE and University of London Online Library (see below).

Other useful texts for this course include:

## Books

Bain, W. *Between anarchy and society: trusteeship and the obligations of power*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003) first edition [ISBN 0199260265].

Bull, H. *The anarchical society*. (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003) third edition [ISBN 0231127634].

Buzan, B. *The United States and the great powers*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004) first edition [ISBN 0745633757].

Hoffman, S. *The ethics and politics of humanitarian intervention*. (New York: University of Notre Dame Press, 1997) first edition [ISBN 0268009368].

Jackson, R. *The global covenant*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005) new edition [ISBN 0199262012].

Jackson-Preece, J. *Minority rights*. (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2005) first edition [ISBN 0745623956].

Mayall, J. (ed.) *The new interventionism*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003) first edition [ISBN 0521551978].

Schelling, T. *The strategy of conflict*. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2006) reprint edition [ISBN 0674840313].

Vincent, R. *Human rights and international relations*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987) first edition [ISBN 0521327989].

Walzer, M. *Just and unjust wars*. (New York: Basic Books, 2000) fourth edition [ISBN 0465037070].

Wheeler, N. *Saving strangers: humanitarian intervention in international society*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002) new edition [ISBN 0199253102].

## Articles

Ayoob, M. 'The security problematique of the Third World', *World Politics* 43(2) 1991 pp.257−83.

Baldwin, D. 'The concept of security', *Review of International Studies* 23(1) 1997 pp.5−26.

Booth, K. 'Security and emancipation', *Review of International Studies* 17(4) 1991 pp.313−26.

Buzan, B. 'Peace, power and security: contending concepts', *Journal of Peace Research* 21(2) 1984 pp.109−25.

Dunne T. and N. Wheeler '"We the peoples": contending discourses of security in human rights theory and practice', *International Relations* 18(1) 2004 pp.9−23.

Hendrickson, D. 'The curious case of American hegemony: imperial aspirations and national decline', *World Policy Journal*, Summer 2004, pp.1−22.

Herz, J. 'The security dilemma in international relations: background and present problems', *International Relations* 17(4) 2003 pp.411−16.

Kaldor, M. 'American power: from "compellance" to cosmopolitanism', *International Affairs* 79(1) 2003 pp.1–22.

Kennan, G. 'Morality and foreign policy', *Foreign Affairs* 64(2) 1985 pp.205−218.

Mandelbaum, M. 'A perfect failure: NATO's war against Yugoslavia', *Foreign Affairs* 78(5) 1999 pp.2−8.

Rothschild, E. 'What is security?' *Dædalus* 124(3) 1995 pp.53−98.

Newman, E. 'Humanitarian intervention, legality and legitimacy', *International Journal of Human Rights* 6(4) (2002) pp.102−120.

Rudolph, C. 'Globalization and security', *Security Studies* 13(1) 2002 pp.1−32.

Simpson, J. 'The nuclear non-proliferation regime: back to the future?' UNIDIR Disarmament Forum 1 2004 pp.1−12.

Sørensen, G. 'Individual security and national security', *Security Dialogue* 27(4) 1996 pp.371−86.

Williams, M. 'Identity and the politics of security', *European Journal of International Relations* 4(2) 1998 pp.204−25.

United Kingdom, Terrorist Act, 2006, www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2006/20060011.htm

United States Congress *Uniting and strengthening America by providing appropriate tools required to intercept and obstruct Terrorism Act* (US Patriot Act), 2001, http://fl1.findlaw.com/news.findlaw.com/cnn/docs/terrorism/hr3162.pdf

## Works cited

*Assessing the new normal: liberty and security for the post-September 11 United States* (Washington, D.C.: Lawyers Committee for Human Rights, 2003). www.humanrightsfirst.org/pubs/descriptions/Assessing/AssessingtheNewNormal.pdf

Bull, H. *The anarchical society*. (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003) third edition [ISBN 0231127634].

Bailyn, J. *The ideological origins of the American Revolution*. (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press, 1992) first edition [ISBN 0674443020].

Bain, W. *Between anarchy and society: trusteeship and the obligations of power*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003) first edition [ISBN 0199260265].

Berki, R. *Security and society*. (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1986) first edition [ISBN 031270920X].

Berlin, I. *The crooked timber of humanity*. (London: John Murray, 1990) first edition [ISBN 071954789X].

Bull, H. 'Society and anarchy in international relations', in M. Wight and H. Butterfield (eds) *Diplomatic investigations*. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968) first edition [ISBN 0674210018] pp.35−50.

Bull, H. (2003) *The anarchical society*. New York: Columbia University Press, third edition [ISBN 0231127634].

Commission on Global Governance *Our global neighbourhood: the report of the Commission on Global Governance*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995) first edition [ISBN 0198279981].

Donnelly, J. *Universal human rights in theory and practice*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, first edition [ISBN 0801423163].

Gong, G. *The standard of 'civilization' in international society*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984) first edition [ISBN 0198219482].

Hendrickson, D. 'The curious case of American hegemony: imperial aspirations and national decline', *World Policy Journal* 22(2) (2004) pp.1−22.

Hobbes, T. *Leviathan*. Edited by M. Oakeshott. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, (1946).

Jackson, R. *Quasi-states: sovereignty, international relations and the third world*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993) reprint edition [ISBN 0521447836].

Jackson, R. *The global covenant*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005) new edition [ISBN 0199262012].

Mayall, J. (ed.) *The new interventionism*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003) first edition [ISBN 0521551978].

Mayall, J. *Nationalism and international society*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990) first edition [ISBN 0521389615].

Mayer, A. *Islam and human rights*. (New York: Westview Press, 1995) fourth edition [ISBN 0813343356].

Musgrave, T. *Self determination and national minorities*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002) first edition [ISBN 0198298986].

Parsons, A. *From cold war to hot peace*. (London: Penguin Books, 1995) first edition [ISBN 0718138287].

Pollis, A. and P. Schwab 'Human rights: a western construct with limited applicability', in A. Pollis and P. Schwab (eds) *Human rights: cultural and ideological perspectives*. (New York: Praeger, 1979) first edition.

Rohde, D. *Endgame: the betrayal and fall of Srebrenica*. (New York: Westview Press, 1998) first edition [ISBN 0813335337].

Roberts, A. 'NATO's "humanitarian war" over Kosovo', *Survival* 41(3) 1999 pp.102–123.

Schelling, T. *The strategy of conflict*. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2006) reprint edition [ISBN 0674840313].

Shrivastava, B.K. and M. Agarwal 'Politics of intervention and the Bosnia-Herzegovina conflict', *International Studies* 40(1) 2003 pp.69−84.

Simpson, J. 'The nuclear non-proliferation regime: back to the future?', *UNIDIR Disarmament Forum* 1 (2004) pp.1−12.

Southern, R. *The making of the Middle Ages*. (London: Hutchinson 1993) [ISBN 0300002300].

*Sanctioned bias: racial profiling since 9/11* (New York: American Civil Liberties Union, 2004).

*The Concise Oxford Dictionary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005) eleventh edition [ISBN 9780198610472].

Vincent, J. 'Grotius, human rights and intervention', in H. Bull, B. Kingsbury and A. Roberts (eds) *Hugo Grotius and international relations*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002) reprint edition [ISBN 0198277717] pp.241−256.

Wight, M. *Power politics*. (London: International Publishing, 1974) [ISBN 0826461743].

Wight, M. and H. Butterfield (eds) *Diplomatic investigations*. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968) first edition [ISBN 0674210018].

## Additional resources

**Periodicals**

The following are a list of recommended periodicals that are relevant to this course:

*Adelphi Papers*

*American Political Science Review*

*Daedalus, Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*

*European Journal of International Relations*

*Global Society*

*Human Rights Quarterly*

*International Affairs*

*International Security*

*Journal of Peace Research*

*Millennium*

*Nations and Nationalism*

*Peace and Conflict Studies*

*Political Studies*

*Prospect Magazine*

*Review of International Studies*

*Security Dialogue*

*Survival: The IISS Quarterly*

*The Economist Magazine*

*World Politics*

## Online study resources

In addition to the subject guide and the Essential reading, it is crucial that you take advantage of the study resources that are available online for this course, including the VLE and the Online Library.

You can access the VLE, the Online Library and your University of London email account via the Student Portal at: http://my.londoninternational.ac.uk

You should have received your login details for the Student Portal with your official offer, which was emailed to the address that you gave on your application form. You have probably already logged in to the Student Portal in order to register! As soon as you registered, you will automatically have been granted access to the VLE, Online Library and your fully functional University of London email account.

If you forget your login details at any point, please email uolia.support@london.ac.uk quoting your student number.

### The VLE

The VLE, which complements this subject guide, has been designed to enhance your learning experience, providing additional support and a sense of community. It forms an important part of your study experience with the University of London and you should access it regularly.

The VLE provides a range of resources for EMFSS courses:

- Self-testing activities: Doing these allows you to test your own understanding of subject material.

- Electronic study materials: The printed materials that you receive from the University of London are available to download, including updated reading lists and references.

- Past examination papers and *Examiners' commentaries*: These provide advice on how each examination question might best be answered.

- A student discussion forum: This is an open space for you to discuss interests and experiences, seek support from your peers, work collaboratively to solve problems and discuss subject material.

- Videos: There are recorded academic introductions to the subject, interviews and debates and, for some courses, audio-visual tutorials and conclusions.

- Recorded lectures: For some courses, where appropriate, the sessions from previous years' Study Weekends have been recorded and made available.

- Study skills: Expert advice on preparing for examinations and developing your digital literacy skills.

- Feedback forms.

Some of these resources are available for certain courses only, but we are expanding our provision all the time and you should check the VLE regularly for updates.

## Making use of the Online Library

The Online Library contains a huge array of journal articles and other resources to help you read widely and extensively.

To access the majority of resources via the Online Library you will either need to use your University of London Student Portal login details, or you will be required to register and use an Athens login: http://tinyurl.com/ollathens

The easiest way to locate relevant content and journal articles in the Online Library is to use the **Summon** search engine.

If you are having trouble finding an article listed in a reading list, try removing any punctuation from the title, such as single quotation marks, question marks and colons.

For further advice, please see the online help pages: www.external.shl.lon. ac.uk/summon/about.php

# Useful websites

The following are a list of websites which may be useful in essay preparation.

Unless otherwise stated, all websites in this subject guide were accessed in April 2011. We cannot guarantee, however, that they will stay current and you may need to perform an internet search to find the relevant pages.

## International organisations

**United Nations**

www.un.org is the main homepage

www.un.org/Docs/sc/ is the site of the Security Council

### North Atlantic Treaty Organisation

www.nato.int is the main homepage

www.kforonline.com is the site of the NATO operation in Kosovo

www.nato.int/issues/afghanistan/index.html is the site of the NATO operation in Afghanistan

www.nato.int/issues/sfor/index.html is the site of the NATO mission in Bosnia

### Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe

www.osce.org is the main site of the OSCE

www.osce.org/kosovo is the site of the OSCE Mission to Kosovo

www.oscebih.org is the site of the OSCE Mission to Bosnia

### Organisation of American States

www.oas.org

### Organisation of African Unity

www.oau.org

## Non-governmental organisations

### End Genocide

www.endgenocide.org

### Human Rights Watch

www.hrw.org

### International Committee of the Red Cross/Crescent

www.icrc.org

### Independent International Commission on Kosovo

www.kosovocommision.org

### International Crisis Group

www.crisisgroup.org/home/index.cfm

### Minority Rights Group

www.minorityrights.org

### Prevent Genocide

www.preventgenocide.org

## Research centres, projects and online documentation

### Carnegie Council for Ethics and International Affairs

www.cceia.org/

### Center for Defence and International Security Studies

www.cdiss.org/

### Center for Peace and Human Security

www.peacecenter.sciences-po.fr/

### Center for Military and Strategic Studies

www.cmss.ucalgary.ca/index.html

### Human Security Center

www.humansecuritycentre.org/

### International Institute for Strategic Studies

www.iiss.org/

### International Relations and Security Network

www.isn.ethz.ch/net/prin/hsc.cfm

**Institute for War and Peace Reporting**

www.iwpr.net/

**Institute on Global Cooperation and Conflict**

http://igcc.ucsd.edu/

**Terrorism Research Center**

www.terrorism.com/

**Trudeau Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies**

www.trudeaucentre.ca/

**Web Genocide Documentation Centre**

www.ess.uwe.ac.uk/genocide.htm

**Yale University Avalon Project**

(for international treaties from the sixteenth century to the present)

www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon

#### Wikipedia

Wikipedia can be useful as a freely accessible online encyclopedia. But you must always remember that the quality of entries varies enormously. Accordingly, you should not rely on Wikipedia as a sole source of information. Instead, Wikipedia must always be used in conjunction with other, more reliable sources (e.g., academic books and journal articles such as those listed in the subject guide). This cautionary note also applies more generally to other information available on the web.

## Examination structure

The examination paper for this course is three hours in duration and you are expected to answer four questions, from a choice of twelve. The Examiner attempts to ensure that all of the topics covered in the syllabus and subject guide are examined. Some questions could cover more than one topic from the syllabus since the different topics are not self-contained. A Sample examination paper appears as an appendix to this guide, along with a sample *Examiners' commentary*. The *Examiners' commentaries* contain valuable information about how to approach the examination and so you are strongly advised to read them carefully. Past examination papers and the associated reports are valuable resources when preparing for the examination. You should ensure that all four questions are answered, allowing an approximately equal amount of time for each question, and attempting all parts or aspects of a question.

## Examination advice

**Important**: the information and advice given here are based on the examination structure used at the time this guide was written. Please note that subject guides may be used for several years. Because of this we strongly advise you to always check both the current *Regulations* for relevant information about the examination, and the VLE where you should be advised of any forthcoming changes. You should also carefully check the rubric/instructions on the paper you actually sit and follow those instructions.

#### Answer the question asked

Your answer needs to address the question asked and not another that you have seen on a past exam paper or that you would prefer to answer. To

avoid this mistake, it is useful to clearly identify the precise question you are answering from the outset. Similarly, you should also define the key terms relating to that question. It is helpful to the examiner if, in the first paragraph, you briefly indicate what your answer to the question will be, the main points you will put forward in support of this position and the order in which these will be discussed (this is often called 'signposting'; for more on this tactic see also the answer structure below).

### Develop your own ideas

Remember, you are asked to put forward your own ideas in answering the examination questions, so do not confuse analysis with description (i.e., the aim is not merely to identify what happened but to explain how it came about, why these particular events, decisions, policies, people were important, etc.). Similarly, you should not simply repeat what you have read in the course. The examiner wants to know what you think and why and so the aim is not to provide a summary of what various authors on the reading list have argued but to discuss your own perspective in relation to the issues surveyed. Finally, be sure to fully explain your ideas rather than simply identify them in passing. To avoid this pitfall, always ask yourself 'why do I think this point is important' and then make sure to say precisely that in your answer.

### Support ideas with examples

Wherever possible, provide concrete examples and illustrations so that your answer is based upon solid, empirical evidence. This evidence can be provided by, among others: defining key terms and concepts; citing a particular event, decision, policy, etc., to back up a generalisation; providing dates whenever possible.

### Structure

To the examiner, the structure and coherence of your argument are just as important as your knowledge and understanding of the syllabus. To help organise your thoughts quickly, it is always sensible to start with an essay plan before you begin the actual writing. That way you will know in advance what you are going to say and in what order, which will make the writing easier. Your answers should always include an introduction which identifies the question, defines key terms or concepts, and provides 'signposts' so that the examiner can follow your argument in the main body; a main body which develops your answer by discussing the key points on which it is based and supporting these with examples; and a conclusion which recaps your answer and offers final reflections (why the question is important, further implications of your answer, etc.)

Remember, it is important to check the VLE for:

- up-to-date information on examination and assessment arrangements for this course
- where available, past examination papers and *Examiners' commentaries* for the course which give advice on how each question might best be answered.

## Syllabus

This course will interrogate the key concepts and dilemmas involved in security policy by a careful examination of the leading security paradigms – national security, international security and human security. In each case, we examine the historical circumstances out of which the paradigm originates, the political problems it seeks to address, the constraints it imposes upon policy makers, and its significance within contemporary international society.

The principal themes to be addressed are:

- What does it mean to be 'secure' and why does it matter?

- Does security for some automatically imply insecurity for others?

- How have changes in domestic and international society influenced the ways in which we respond to security dilemmas?

## List of abbreviations used in this subject guide

NATO North Atlantic Treaty Organisation

OAU Organisation of African Unity

UK United Kingdom

UN United Nations

US United States Of America

# Chapter 1: The idea of security

## Aims of the chapter

The aim of this chapter is to introduce the idea of security as a core value of human life and the key assumptions which underlie it:

- security in (or of) what
- security from what
- security for what
- security by what means.

## Learning outcomes

By the end of this chapter, and having completed the Essential readings and activities, you should be able to:

- explain where the desire for security comes from, and how this desire is reflected in everyday life
- describe the kind of human activities we associate with security
- discuss and compare the main international relations approaches to the problem of insecurity
- discuss the relationship between personal security and state security
- describe and evaluate security policies in response to the threat of international terrorism.

## Essential reading

Bain, W. *The empire of security and the safety of the people*. Introduction and Chapter 1.

Buzan, B. *People, states and fear*. Introduction.

Hough, P. *Understanding global security*. Chapter 1.

'Morality and foreign policy', George F. Kennan *Foreign Affairs* Vol. 64 (2) (1985), pp.205–18 (article consists of 14 pages)

## Further reading

Baldwin, D. 'The concept of security', *Review of International Studies* 23(1) 1997 pp.5−26.

Berki, R. *Security and society* (1986) Chapters 1 and 2.

Buzan, B. 'Peace, power and security: contending concepts', Journal of Peace Research 21(2) 1984 pp.109−25.

Jackson, R. The global covenant. (2000) Chapter 8.

Huysmans, J. 'Security! What do you mean? From concept to thick signifier', European Journal of International Relations, 4(2) 1998 pp.226−55.

Rothschild, E. 'What is security?', Dædalus pp.124(3) 1995 pp.53−98.

## Additional resources

International Relations and Security Network www.isn.ethz.ch/ Center for Security Studies, ETH, Zürich, Switzerland.

# The value of security

Security is a core value of human life. To be secure is to be untroubled by danger or fear.[1] As Thomas Hobbes reminds us, without security 'there is no place for industry… no arts, no letters, no society; and which is worst of all, continual fear, and danger of violent death; and the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short'.[2]

Citizens of developed Western states routinely take their security for granted until it is challenged by some extraordinary event like the September 11 attack on the World Trade Center or the July 7 bombings on the London Underground. Sadly, many people around the world do not live in such peaceful or prosperous circumstances. For them, insecurity is a fact of everyday life just as it was for Hobbes during the English Civil War of the seventeenth century. Such profoundly insecure conditions are particularly evident in circumstances of war where the fundamental preoccupation of everyday life becomes safety and survival.

Recall for a moment television images you have seen about life in states which have experienced violent conflict. Do you remember the image of a bombed street market in Sarajevo during the Yugoslav wars of secession? The daily routine of buying and selling is disrupted by shelling. Men, women and children run for shelter. Those who do not make it to safety lie injured or dying in the streets. Scenes like these have, at various times, also occurred in Baghdad, Beirut, Gaza, Mogadishu, Grozny, Belfast and many other cities around the world. Insecurity is associated with war and the threat of war; security is associated with peace and stability. Because security is a necessary precursor for human life it is a fundamental good in itself, both a personal good and a political good. Hobbes and others like him who have experienced first hand the tragedy of war remind those of us in more privileged circumstances, lest we forget, that security is the most basic of all human values. It is the foundation upon which we build our individual and collective lives.

**Activity**

Can you think of a moment when you felt threatened or insecure? What were the circumstances? What were you afraid of? How did you respond to these feelings of insecurity?

For example, I was afraid to walk to my car at the railway station. It was dark and raining and no other people were in sight. I was afraid of being mugged or worse. So I waited by the train platform until a group of people came along and walked into the car park with them on the assumption that there was 'safety in numbers'.

The desire for security is a defensive and self-protecting response to the fact or threat of harm from other human beings. If there were no threatening people the need to guarantee security would disappear. Natural disasters like the hurricane and consequent flooding in New Orleans in 2005 would still occur and would require emergency planning and responses. But there would be no problem of looting, shooting, rape, murder or other forms of predatory and violent behaviour with which to contend. Disruption and loss of life would probably still occur but it would not be a result of violence or attack from other human beings. Unfortunately, human history to date powerfully supports the proposition that there will always be some people who will pose a threat to others. Consequently, the problem of security remains.

[1] The Concise Oxford Dictionary *(Oxford: Clarendon Press, eighth edition 1990), p.1093.*

[2] *Thomas Hobbes,* Leviathan*. Edited by Michael Oakeshott (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1946), esp. Chapter. 13.*

---

**Activity**

Read Buzan, introduction, Hough, Chapter 1, and Bain, Introduction, then answer the following questions.

1. How is the desire for security reflected in social life?

2. What sort of human activities are associated with security?

3. How does international relations approach the problem of insecurity?

## Key assumptions of security

There are four key assumptions underlying the idea of security: security in (or of) what, from what, for what, and by what means?[3]

### Security in (or of) what?

This assumption recognises the vulnerability of humans who live in social circumstances. An isolated individual is inviolable from attack by other people: Robinson Crusoe knew no fear of this kind until Man Friday arrived on the island. The idea of security is directed at the problem of harmful acts by other people, either fellow citizens or foreigners and not the forces of nature. The crux of security for our purposes is captured by Hedley Bull: 'Security in international politics means no more than safety: either objective safety, meaning safety which actually exists, or subjective safety, meaning safety which is felt or experienced.'[4] Safety is a condition of human relations. Safety is order and predictability in our relations with other people.

### Security from what?

In Hobbes' 'state of nature' every human being is a potential threat because the struggle for survival in a world of limited resources is 'war of all against all'. One human being may be stronger, another more cunning, but each in his or her own way is capable of inflicting harm upon another. Accordingly, there can never be complete trust and mutual security between human beings. The human condition is precarious even in the most hospitable of circumstances because we are all unavoidably exposed – at least to some degree – to others who are at best careless and unreliable and at worst mean and malevolent. It is precisely because human nature is flawed that perfect security cannot exist in any human society. Some measure of insecurity, however large or small, is always present or possible. People who live in stable and generally peaceful and prosperous societies nevertheless install burglar alarms to protect their homes. And they may also avoid certain areas at certain times of the day where they calculate that a reasonable risk of being mugged, raped or even murdered exists. For example, even though I live in a prosperous English market town with a low crime rate, I avoid going into the railway station car park late at night. On such occasions, if at all possible, I try to take a taxi rather than drive myself. Behaviour like this discloses prudence rather than paranoia. And it is a further reminder that each and every one of us is, to some extent at least, insecure.

### Security by means of what?

Our safety is protected by creating barriers, bulwarks, ramparts, police forces, armed forces, etc., to keep us out of harm's reach. The opposite of safety is vulnerability – being exposed to danger, in peril, at risk, etc. Safety requires only that everybody respect everybody else's freedom and leave them alone. Security is achieved wherever and whenever men and

*[3] Robert Jackson,* The Global covenant: human conduct in a world of states *(Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp.190–92.*

*[4] Hedley Bull,* The anarchical society *(second edition) (London: Macmillan, 1995), p.18.*

women do not threaten or harm one another. Unfortunately, not everyone is prepared to forgo their own desires or ambitions if these infringe the well being of others. We put locks on our doors and alarms on our houses to keep out those who would otherwise take our possessions or in other ways rob us of that which we hold dear (be this life, liberty, property or whatever). Insecurity arises when some people will not restrain themselves and cannot be restrained by others.

Security can be achieved in two ways: through deterrence on the part of the would-be protector or diffidence on the part of would-be attacker.[5] Some theorists, like Thomas Schelling, prioritise the credibility of deterrence as the key component of security policy.[6] Other theorists, like Thomas Hobbes, prioritise diffidence, which is a mental condition that disables people who otherwise would be a threat.[7] Deterrence and diffidence are not unrelated ideas − far from it, diffidence is the desired consequence of deterrence. Providing security is thus all about instilling fear in the mind of a would-be attacker with a view to preventing an attack.

[5] *Global covenant,* *p.192.*

[6] *See T. Schelling,* The Strategy of conflict *(Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1980).*

[7] *Thomas Hobbes* Leviathan *p.81.*

## Security for what?

The answer to this question should now be clear: so that people can enjoy the advantages of living in society with others while limiting the risks. Isolated individuals like Robinson Crusoe are in a perfectly secure condition with respect to attack from other human beings because there is nobody around to attack them. But few of us would find the life of a sole shipwreck survivor appealing. All alone, there can be no interaction, no communication and no cooperation. This is a life devoid of human kindness, compassion, companionship, love or family. And I think most people would agree, the loss of human society is too high a price to pay for complete freedom from harm by other people.

As a result, security is a core value of human relations. The necessity of security arises from the fact that people do want to live together and are thus vulnerable to each other. Security makes possible what otherwise probably could not be achieved: a flourishing society that is relatively safe from would-be attackers. Of course, within society, one can never be completely safe. That is precisely why we need security policies. Such policies usually involve creating and maintaining police and military forces that are prepared and equipped to carry out that essential job for the public good.

## Normative vs instrumental approaches to security

There are two very different approaches to security evident within international relations: one normative and the other instrumental.

A normative view of security is one predicated upon values, ideas and identities. The clear implication of this subject guide is that security should be regarded as fundamentally normative because without it human life is reduced to a basic struggle for survival. This normative view is also evident in the Buzan, Bain, Economides and Berdal and, to a lesser extent, Hough essential texts. When we approach security in this way, our analysis tends towards hard choices between competing values (e.g., as between security of the state and security of the person). These choices are concerned not only with the ends or goals of security policy but also with the means used to pursue them. Thus, security policy itself comes to be regarded as a series of moral dilemmas to which there can be no easy solutions.

But much of the wider literature on security (e.g., many of the leading journals cited at the end of the introduction to this subject guide) takes a rather different view, one constituted by instrumentalism or the belief

that policies should be judged only by their outcomes. Neo-realism is a case in point. Neo-realism is a material approach informed by power capabilities and quantifiable risks (see the reference to Schelling above for an example). Moral dilemmas are not only absent from such analyses but tend to be regarded as deeply inappropriate because of their ability to distract us from the rational pursuit of our interests.

You should be aware that the ongoing debate between normative and instrumental approaches to security is part of a much larger methodological controversy within international relations, and indeed the social sciences more generally. Each approach has its advantages as well as its disadvantages. It is up to you to decide which view you find most convincing and on what basis.

---

**Activity**

Read the following article by George F. Kennan. Then consider whether and to what extent security policy should have a normative dimension. Write your points down under two separate headings: Advantages of a normative approach and Disadvantages of a normative approach. Now re-read your list and ask yourself which view you find most convincing and on what basis.

'Morality and foreign policy', George F. Kennan *Foreign Affairs* Vol. 64, No. 2 (Winter, 1985), pp.205–28 (article consists of 14 pages)

Published by: Council on Foreign Relations
www.jstor.org/stable/20042569

---

# Security of the state and security of the person

The study of international relations is fundamentally concerned with relations between states. The state was, in its origins, a security arrangement and it remains so today. A huge amount of state resources is directed towards maintaining effective police and armed forces, implementing anti-terrorist measures, ensuring civil and emergency defences, using intelligence to detect and counter external attack and internal subversion, using diplomacy to strengthen alliances and isolate threats and using economic power to encourage cooperation and isolate or weaken political rivals.

Hobbes' solution to the problem of personal security is the creation of a political order or sovereign which he terms 'leviathan' to protect the people. 'Leviathan' can only come about if individual men and women are prepared to exchange their personal freedom to individually protect themselves for protection by the sovereign. The state for Hobbes is essentially a collective security arrangement. But as he famously indicates, that statist solution to the problem of personal insecurity simultaneously gives rise to a new threat of insecurity between states:

> kings, and persons of sovereign authority, because of their
> independency, are in continual jealousies, and in the state and
> posture of gladiators; having their weapons pointing, and their
> eyes fixed on one another… and continual spies upon their
> neighbors; which is a posture of war.[8]

*[8] Hobbes,* Leviathan, *Chapter. 13, p.83.*

So, paradoxically, at the very moment that 'leviathan' resolves the problem of personal security within the state, it creates a new problem of insecurity between states. That security dilemma between states is a defining feature of international relations up to and including the present time. It is the consequence of the existence of a plurality of independent sovereign states, which Hedley Bull describes as an 'anarchical society'.

There is, however, an important distinction between security of the state and security of the person. Personal security is an essential precondition for human flourishing. It frees people to pursue their own interests, goals, ambitions etc. without the fear of harm by others provided they, in turn, do not violate the harm principle by causing deliberate injury to others. Personal security is our individual protection from harm by other people. In a nutshell, personal security means peace of mind.

It is of course impossible to remove all possibility harm by others. My house in England has a burglar alarm. Even the most sophisticated burglar alarm may be overcome by those determined to do so. But if a burglar alarm is installed many burglars will be deterred, others will be thwarted, and those that do manage to get through will be pursued by the local police force, and hopefully apprehended, charged and convicted. For this reason, I sleep soundly in my house at night even though I know my burglar alarm is not foolproof.

Security of the state refers to a state's ability to protect itself from external dangers and menaces: for example, intervention, blockade, invasion, destruction, occupation, or some other harmful interference by a hostile foreign power or terrorist group. The methods of state security are analogous to the burglar alarm on my house. The goal of state security is to deter, prevent or defeat attacks against the state and its population.

The ideas of state and people are closely related. Indeed, a classic definition of sovereignty (which is the key attribute of a state) is effective control over territory and population. Nevertheless, it is crucial not to collapse the distinction between state security and personal security as some liberal political theorists try to do. In liberal political theory, the state not only belongs to the people but is in fact a creation of the people; it is the people's government, the people's law, the people's army, the people's police, the people's courts and ultimately the people's prisons and even the people's gallows. Therefore, in theory at least, the state cannot pose a threat to its own citizens whose personal interests are synonymous with state interests. For that theory to hold true, however, the coercive power of the state should be used as a last resort and as rarely as possible. In other words, the state is legitimate only in so far as its coercive power 'affects most people marginally, negligibly, and indirectly, while its full might is meted out to a relatively small (and in principle) indefinite group of 'law-breakers'.[9]

In practice, however, security of the state does not always translate into security of the people in the way that liberal theory would like it to do. There are many states which are unable to provide personal security for their populations because they do not exercise effective control over all the territory within their jurisdiction – we often refer to these as 'weak' or 'failed states'. There are also states which directly and purposefully threaten their own peoples in order to maintain control or fulfil ideological or economic goals – we often refer to these as 'totalitarian' or 'police states'. If we collapse the distinction between security of the state and security of the people we will not be able to adequately analyse circumstances like these.

[9] *R.N. Berki* Security and society. *(London: J.M. Dent and Sons, 1986), p.53.*

### Activity

Consider a state of your own choosing, then answer the following questions.

1. Is the government answerable to the people (i.e., through free and fair elections)?

2. Does the government exercise effective control over all the territory of the state?

3. Are the human rights of the entire population of the state generally respected?

4. Based on your answers to questions 1–3, does this state protect the security of the people?

# Three paradigms of security

There are three main paradigms of security within international relations: national security, international security and human security. The first two approaches give moral primacy to the state as a necessary precondition for human flourishing. In contrast with these two state-centred approaches, a third perspective on security gives moral primacy to human beings and the community of humankind over and above the interests of states or the international society to which they belong. These three security paradigms may be briefly summarised as follows.

## National security

The proponents of national security, who we often refer to as realists, generally assume that we live in a world where states are both the main sources of security and the main security threats. You will recall from **11 Introduction to international relations** that realism envisions a world of mutual fear, suspicion and conflict in which states must constantly struggle for survival. The problem of national security arises out of this anarchical world view, that is, a world of independent and armed states which are capable of inflicting harm upon one another. National security policies are directed at creating and maintaining armed forces for national defence and deterrence. They also involve measures designed to deal with internal threats to security such as criminals, rebels, terrorists, etc. The national security paradigm is well equipped to address circumstances like those of the Cold War where two rival states are actively opposing one another. But it is less well placed to interrogate problems of 'weak', 'failed', or 'totalitarian' states because of a tendency to collapse the distinction between state security and personal security. Thus, for example, realists like Schelling produced convincing accounts of the arms race between the USA and the USSR during the Cold War but were largely silent on the security dilemmas confronting civil rights proponents in 'Jim Crow' states of the American South or political dissidents in communist states of Central and Eastern Europe.

### Activity

Compare and contrast the security objectives of Canada: www.pco-bcp.gc.ca/default.as p?Language=E&Page=publications&Sub=natsecurnat&Doc=natsecurnat_e.htm and the United States: www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.html.

1. What are the similarities?

2. What are the differences?

3. Can you think of any reasons which might explain these differences?

## International security

The proponents of international security, who we often refer to as pluralists or rationalists, see a world characterised by a mixture of conflict and cooperation. From this perspective, relations between states constitute an 'anarchical society'. Thus although it is true that there is no single source of authority or government, international relations nevertheless are reasonably orderly and purposeful, and subject to mutual regulation and constraint stemming from a shared interest in survival and coexistence.

Following on from this, pluralists differ from realists in their assumption that states are not the only actors responsible for providing security. Instead, pluralists believe the responsibility for providing security also extends to international society.

This way of conceptualising security became prominent during the twentieth century as the idea of a global and increasingly institutionalised international society gained ground. One of its earliest embodiments is in article 11 of the Covenant of the League of Nations which was intended to preserve the territorial settlement created at Paris in 1919 following the end of the First World War.

> Any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of
> the Members of the League or not, is hereby declared a matter
> of concern to the whole League, and the League shall take any
> action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the
> peace of nations.

A similar endorsement of international security was embodied as Article 1 of the United Nations Charter in 1945:

> To maintain international peace and security, and to that end:
> to take effective collective measures for the prevention and
> removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts
> of aggression or other breaches of the peace…

The international security paradigm operates somewhat differently than either the national or human security paradigms. Whereas both national and human security imagine insecurity as an external threat, there is no similar external dynamic within international security. Since international society is global, unless or until we encounter extraterrestrial beings capable of threatening human life, insecurity in this context must necessarily come from within and not from without; it is an internal dynamic arising out of the condition of anarchy. Usually insecurity is consequent on the action of other members of international society (i.e., states) but it can also be created by non-state actors like terrorist groups. It is this non-state dynamic which gives the so called American-led 'War against terror' which followed the September 11 attacks its global extent.

International security is thus an internal problem for international society as a whole. In this context, the use of armed force is directed at what may in essence be thought as the problem of internal subversion by those who would threaten the plural and cooperative character of international society. Secession, irredentism, aggressive war, conquest, illegal occupation, mass expulsion, genocide and other actions which violate international law all threaten to disrupt the general condition of peace, order and lawfulness within international society. International law and enforcement directed at such transgressions are akin to domestic law enforcement within state – that is, they are intended to preserve a general condition of peace and stability within society (in this case international society) so that the members of that society (principally states) can go about their daily lives.

In practice, however, such enforcement is often highly controversial precisely because it would potentially sacrifice the national security of one state member of international society for the good of the whole society. The 2003 invasion of Iraq by US-led forces is a case in point. The military attack and consequent occupation of the independent and sovereign state of Iraq was not authorised by the United Nations Security Council and, for that and other reasons, many experts in international law consider these acts to be illegal. In contrast, the so-called Gulf War of 1990−91 is

usually cited as one of the few examples of legitimate international law enforcement both because it was done with prior UN Security Council authorisation and because it received almost universal support by the members of international society.

## Human security

The proponents of human security, who we often refer to as solidarists or revolutionists, consider personal security to be a fundamental problem of international relations and not merely a matter for the domestic politics of the state concerned. Human security is often presented as a new perspective on security questions. To describe human security in this way is somewhat deceptive because there are historical precedents for assigning moral primacy to individuals. Immanuel Kant, for example, believed in universal duty towards other human beings without exception of place or jurisdiction. Kant describes a 'universal right of mankind' by which he means the legitimate claim of all men and women to recognition and protection by public authorities as individual human beings. Similarly, human rights law, the doctrine of crimes against humanity, the rights of non-combatants under international humanitarian law (the laws of war) and the prohibition of genocide, to name only a few issues, existed in order to protect personal security over and above the security of states long before the term 'human security' was coined.

The core idea embodied by human security is essentially that the security of the person, the security of the state and the security of the society of states are fundamentally interconnected – you cannot have one without the others. If any one man or woman or child in the world is unsafe, then nobody else can be safe either. To tolerate personal insecurity in one state risks spreading insecurity to other states, and by extension, international society itself. For example, human or minority rights violations in one state may spark refugee flows that cross frontiers, which in turn create a problem of asylum seekers in other states and a consequent matter of concern for international agencies like the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. A similar chain effect might be seen with regard to terrorism, or civil war, or other threats which threaten to overrun international frontiers.

The criticism that human security proponents direct at contemporary security arrangements exactly follows on from this principle of human interconnectedness which continues to exist regardless of juridical boundaries. Torture, terrorism, ethnic cleansing, genocide and other gross human rights violations within states cannot be tolerated if the safety of all human beings is to be achieved. Something must be done to stop them, and states should not hide behind the international legal principles of equal sovereignty and non-intervention to evade this fundamental humanitarian obligation. The human security paradigm is becoming increasingly influential in international relations. Nevertheless, for the time being at least, with a few notable exceptions like Canada, it remains disproportionately a subject of non-governmental organisations rather than the foreign policies of states. And it is still far from universally accepted.

**Activity**

Read Bain Chapter 1. Then consider each of the three security paradigms we have just summarised and answer the following questions.

1.  Which of these three do you find most appealing and on what basis?

2.  Are they equally important in international relations?

3.  Or do you think one security paradigm dominates and, if so, why?

The subsequent chapters will more fully interrogate the core content and practical implications of these three security paradigms for our understanding of international relations.

# A reminder of your learning outcomes

Having completed this chapter, and the Essential readings and activities, you should be able to:

*   explain where the desire for security comes from, and how this desire is reflected in everyday life

*   describe the kind of human activities we associate with security

*   discuss and compare the main international relations approaches to the problem of insecurity

*   discuss the relationship between personal security and state security

*   describe and evaluate security policies in response to the threat of international terrorism.

# Sample examination questions

1.  'Security in international politics means no more than safety.' Discuss.

2.  What is deterrence and how has it featured in security policy?

3.  Does security of the state always translate into security of the people?

# Chapter 2: The state as a security arrangement

## Aims of the chapter

The aim of this chapter is to examine the origins of the state as a security arrangement. In so doing we will discuss:

- the security of the prince in dynastic states
- the rise of popular sovereignty and the security of the people
- nation states and national security.

## Learning outcomes

By the end of this chapter, and having completed the Essential readings and activities, you should be able to:

- describe and examine why the state is viewed as a formidable security organisation
- describe and analyse the relationship between popular sovereignty and the security of the people
- explain what conditions must be satisfied for the ideal of national security to be achieved.

## Essential reading

Bain *The empire of security and the safety of the people*. Chapters 5 and 9.
Buzan *People, states and fear*. Chapters 1 and 2.

## Further reading

Cohen, Y., B.R. Brown and A.F.K. Organski 'The paradoxical nature of state-making: the violent creation of order', *American Political Science Review* 75(4) 1981.

Jackson-Preece, J. *National minorities and the European nation states system*. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985) first edition [ISBN 0198294379] Chapter 2.

Jackson-Preece, J. *Minority rights*, (2005) Chapters 2 and 5.

Krause, K. 'Insecurity and state formation in the global military order: the Middle Eastern case', *European Journal of International Relations* 2(3) 1996 pp.319–54.

Mayall, J. (ed.) *Nationalism and international society*. (2003) pp.5–69 and pp.111–25.

Neocleous, M. 'From social to national security', *Security Dialogue* 37(3) 2006.

Walker, R.J.B. 'Security, sovereignty and the challenge of world politics', *Alternatives* 15(1) 1990: pp.3–27.

Williams, Michael C. 'Identity and the politics of security', *European Journal of International Relations* 42 1998 pp.204–25.

## Works cited

Southern, R. *The making of the Middle Ages*. (2003).
Bailyn, J. *The ideological origins of the American Revolution*. (1992).

# Origins of the state as a security arrangement

The modern state was, in its origins, an important security arrangement and despite the many other roles we now attribute to states (for instance, providers of welfare, justice, prosperity and so forth) security remains a primary consideration. The medieval Europe out of which the first states emerged was characterised by profound insecurity. The so-called pax romana of the Roman Empire (the long era of peace in Europe that characterised the first and second centuries AD) was long gone and in its wake existed a series of competing authorities, secular as well as ecclesiastical. Europe in the Middle Ages was thus more or less in a condition of deep disunity and political chaos. A variety of strong and weak rulers jostled for control over territory and population. Political jurisdictions were fluid and as a result usually too ineffectual to create much stability. As R.G. Southern notes:

> Areas of authority shaded into each other and overlaid each
> other with little relation either to geography or history. No
> political boundaries survived in their entirety the death of a
> ruler; they were all subject to the chances of domestic change,
> marriage, dowry, partition, death and forfeiture.[1]

Even the law itself was uncertain. Instead of a unified legal order there existed a jumble of competing and frequently contradictory laws and customs – some of it based on the remnants of Roman law, some on ecclesiastical law, some on ancient barbaric codes. Justice was largely a do-it-yourself affair and therefore frequently arbitrary. For example, the 'blood feud' whereby the family of a murdered person could exact revenge on the family of the murderer persisted in penal law (albeit with increasing restrictions) until it was finally extinguished by royal prerogative in the twelfth century. Violence was commonplace and, as Thomas Hobbes so eloquently put it, the life of man 'solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short'. The state emerged as a way of imposing order and control on this hitherto chaotic social condition.

[1] R.G. Southern, The making of the Middle Ages. (London: Pimlico 1993), p.18.

# Security of the prince

In its earliest form, the state was a dynastic possession – quite literally the personal property of the prince. By claiming sovereignty or final and absolute authority in the political community, the princes of early modern Europe were able to impose a single, unified political will – namely their own. The idea of sovereignty thus gave legal authority and moral purpose to the state-building endeavours of these dynastic princes: rex est imperator in regno suo – 'the king is emperor in his own realm' became the motto of the age. At the beginning and throughout their history, the great dynastic families of Europe – Tudor, Valois, Bourbon, Hapsburg, Wittlesbach, Hohenzollern, Savoy, Romanov, and so forth. – were motivated by territory, wealth, prestige and power. Their political purpose was to consolidate and wherever possible extend their dynastic possessions. This objective they accomplished through war, conquest, purchase, inheritance, marriage, diplomacy, duplicity, and the legal and illegal confiscation of feudal vassals' property.

In this world view, security of the state was synonymous with security of the prince. The state was the personal property of the prince, and the prince would use violence to defend and indeed extend that property. Accordingly, dynastic princes were prepared to act ruthlessly against those who challenged their new-found sovereign authority.

The so-called 'Catholic monarchs' Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain (1479–1516) expelled 170,000 Jews who refused their order to be baptised. Henry VIII of England (1491–1547) imprisoned and executed those who would not sign his Act of Supremacy establishing the English monarch as head of the Church of England, including even his 'good friend' Thomas More. Louis XIV of France (1638–1715) repeatedly resorted to internal violence (repressive taxation, pillage, military subjugation, etc.) against those provinces that opposed his centralising policies. Thus security for the prince did not always translate into security for the people over whom he ruled and might in fact cause them profound insecurity.

## Security of the people

For the security of the people to take precedence over security of the prince, a new understanding of political authority was required. The principle of popular sovereignty began to emerge in England in the late seventeenth century but was not fully formulated until the second half of the eighteenth century. At about this time, the medieval theory of authority and its concomitant political identities of sovereign and subject were increasingly questioned by political theorists and reformers. Initially, this challenge came from English parliamentarians and political philosophers in the context of the Civil War of the 1640s. This new way of conceptualising political authority led to the conclusion that such power could not safely be entrusted to just one man, or even to a few men, because the temptation to abuse it would be too great. Instead, it was argued that sovereignty should properly be vested in parliament which was 'neither one nor few'.

It was this view of political authority which triumphed in England in what has become known as the Glorious Revolution of 1688–89. At that time, the English Parliament deposed the reigning Stuart monarch (James II) and replaced him with the Dutch Prince William of Orange and his wife Mary Stuart (daughter of James I), who jointly acceded to the English throne as William III and Mary II. The only justification which could convincingly be made for such a radical act was that ultimate sovereignty resided in the people not the prince and thus Parliament as representative of the people could transfer it from one prince to another when circumstances required. A century later, the American and French revolutionaries explained themselves in precisely these terms. As James Madison wrote in 1792:

> In Europe, charters of liberty have been granted by power.
> America has set the example and France has followed it, of
> charters of power granted by liberty.[2]

It is at this point in the history of political ideas that the concept of the nation achieves political salience. Who are the people in whom sovereignty ultimately resides? The people are the nation and the state exists as an expression of the national will. 'The principle of all sovereignty rests essentially in the nation. No body and no individual may exercise authority which does not emanate from the nation expressly' (Article 3, 1789 Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen).

[2] *J. Bailyn,* The ideological origins of the American Revolution. *(Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press, 1992), p.55*

---

**Activity**

Read either the 1789 French Declaration on the Rights of Man and the Citizen, www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/rightsof.htm, or the 1776 American Declaration of Independence, www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/declare.htm, and then answer the following questions.

1. On what basis do these revolutionary declarations criticise the security of the prince?

2. How do they characterise the security of the people?

3. Is this characterisation still valid today?

The security implications of this new formulation of authority are immense. Henceforth, the state would belong to the people and not to the prince. Consequently, the people were no longer the object of security policy but instead its central subject. Nowhere is this transformation more apparent than in the idea of a popular right of rebellion against tyrannical government.

> For a nation thus abused to arise unanimously and to resist their prince, even to the dethroning of him, is not criminal but a reasonable way of vindicating their liberties and just rights.[3]

*[3] Jonathan Mayhew, 1750, as quoted in Bailyn, p.93.*

It was just such a right which the American and French revolutionaries claimed as justification for their actions.

**Activity**

Read Bain Chapters 5 and 9, then answer the following questions.

1. What view of security is reflected in the doctrine of self-determination?

2. Have demands for self-determination supported or subverted the national security of existing states?

3. What kind of national security policies have been directed at problems of ethnic and cultural diversity within states?

4. Is the personal security of the majority compatible with the personal security of the minority? Why or why not?

# Nation states and national security

As a result, from the time of the American and French revolutions onwards, the dominant security paradigm has viewed the state, now styled the nation state, to reflect its popular basis, as the fundamental source of social belonging and ergo also personal well-being. The nation state in the Western liberal tradition is understood as an extension of the will of the individual citizens who comprise it and thus becomes the supreme moral association within society. Its raison d'être is to preserve and promote just relations among the citizenry, thereby ensuring that they remain free and equal.

A well-governed nation state is a formidable security organisation. It is for this reason that the nation state ultimately replaced clans, tribal societies, fiefdoms, free cities, medieval guilds, duchies, dynastic states and even empires, among others, to become the basic form of modern political organisation. The nation state performs this central task by acting as an effective and impartial arbiter within society.

In all of this, it is crucial to remember that according to liberal political theory the state not only belongs to the nation but is in fact a creation of the nation. In other words, the state is not meant to be a remote entity separate from and imposing itself upon the nation. Far from it, it is through the nation state that citizens guarantee their own security, individual as well as collective. Personal security thus becomes dependent upon and even analogous to national security. In contrast, insecurity is understood as an external threat located outside the state/citizen relationship: therefore in theory (if not in fact) the state cannot pose a threat to its own citizens whose personal interests are synonymous with

state interests. This ideal is captured by the Latin expression: ubi bene, ibi patria: 'where it is well with me, there is my country'.

For the national security paradigm to hold true, the coercive power of the state should be used as a last resort and as rarely as possible. In other words, the state is legitimate only in so far as its coercive power 'affects most people marginally, negligibly, and indirectly, while its full might is meted out to a relatively small (and in principle) indefinite group of 'law-breakers'.[4] That is the ideal, and in many states it closely corresponds to historical reality. We might even go so far as to say that the history of such countries in the period since 1945 bears out the liberal idea that a secure state is the ultimate foundation for the 'good life'. Citizens of such states – examples include the member states of the European Union, the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and Japan, among others – enjoy the highest standards of living in the history of humankind. These are of course highly internationalised nation states, whose populations benefit greatly from common security arrangements (NATO, etc.) as well as economic unions (like the European Union and the North American Free Trade Association) and internationally institutionalised free trade (GATT, WTO), etc. This enviable condition owes much to the state's ability to create and maintain a secure society in which individual freedom is protected.

*[4] Berkhi, p.53*

### Activity

Read Buzan Chapters 1 and 2 and then answer the following questions.

1. What does the state exist to do?

2. What is the state's relationship to the society which it contains?

3. How does the maximal state differ from the minimal state?

4. Is either kind of state more conducive to personal security and, if so, on what basis?

## A reminder of your learning outcomes

Having completed this chapter, and the Essential readings and activities, you should be able to:

- describe and examine why the state is viewed as a formidable security organisation

- describe and analyse the relationship between popular sovereignty and the security of the people

- explain what conditions must be satisfied for the ideal of national security to be achieved.

## Sample examination questions

1. Should citizens have a right of rebellion against governments who do not protect their personal security?

2. Under what circumstances does popular identity become a focus of security policies?

3. Do you agree with the suggestion that it is in practice impossible to distinguish between 'national security' and the security interests of political leaders?

## Notes

# Chapter 3: National security: current issues and contemporary application

## Aims of the chapter

The aim of this chapter is to examine the paradigm of national security and current issues associated with its application. In so doing we will discuss:

- the reciprocal security obligation between the nation state and its citizens
- the kinds of policies associated with national security
- national security and deterrence
- national security and anti-terrorist measures
- national security in totalitarian states
- national security in weak, failed or quasi-states.

## Learning outcomes

By the end of this chapter, and having completed the Essential readings and activities, you should be able to:

- describe the relationship between popular identity and national security
- identify what conditions must be satisfied for the ideal of national security to be achieved
- give examples of states that do not satisfy the ideal of national security and describe how they fall short of this ideal.

## Essential reading

Hough *Understanding global security*. Chapters 2 and 3.

Buzan *People, states and fear*. Chapters 3 and 6.

## Further reading

Ayoob, M. 'The security problematique of the Third World', *World Politics* 43(2) 1991.

Ayoob, M. 'Subaltern realism: international relations theory meets the Third World', in Stephanie Neuman (ed.) *International Relations Theory and the Third World*. (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2005) first edition [ISBN 0312177062] pp.31–54.

California Senate Office of Research, *The Patriot Act, Other Post 9/11 Enforcement Powers and the Impact on California's Muslim Communities* 2004, www.sen.ca.gov/publications/subject/IMMIG.txt

Enriquez, Juan 'Too many flags?' *Foreign Policy* 116 1999 pp.30–49.

*European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia: the impact of 7 July bomb attacks on Muslim communities in the EU*. (2005). http://eumc.europa.eu/eumc/material/pub/London/London-Bomb-attacks-EN.pdf

Human Rights Watch *In the name of counter-terrorism: human rights abuses worldwide*. http://hrw.org/un/chr59/counter-terrorism-bck.pdf (2003).

Sørensen, G. 'War and state-making: why doesn't it work in the Third World?' *Security Dialogue* 32 (3) 2001 pp.341–54.

## Works cited

*Assessing the new normal: liberty and security for the post-September 11 United States* (2003). www.humanrightsfirst.org/pubs/descriptions/AssessingAssessing theNewNormal.pdf

*Sanctioned bias: racial profiling since 9/11* (New York: American Civil Liberties Union, 2004).

United States Congress *Uniting and strengthening America by providing appropriate tools required to intercept and obstruct Terrorism Act* (US Patriot Act), 2001, http://fl1.findlaw.com/news.findlaw.com/cnn/docs/terrorism/hr3162.pdf

# National security as a reciprocal arrangement

The nation state defines the standard of acceptable conduct within which citizens can pursue their own ends free from outside interference. This is often presented as a reciprocal arrangement. To understand national security in this way draws our attention to the fact that the nation state, and specifically its agents and representatives, is given a monopoly on the use of force only insofar as it is necessary to protect against harmful intervention and punish those who violate the common legal framework. In other words, the underlying rationale here is one of force used only for the public good and not for personal power or aggrandizement. Public officials are therefore responsible for providing both national security and personal security and they can be held to account for neglecting or failing to fulfil their security mandate. At the same time, citizens can be condemned for ignoring or violating any reasonable security demands placed upon them.

That reciprocal security obligation between the nation state and its citizens is the normative basis upon which the nation state's claim to be a protector of the people is often justified. From this perspective, the nation state is the provider of peace, order and – by implication – good governance. The term 'national security' has thus come to refer to all those public policies through which the nation state ensures its survival as a separate and sovereign community and, in so doing, the safety and prosperity of its citizens.

# National security policies

Policies taken to ensure national security may be of an economic, political or military nature. And they may be either internally or externally directed. National security measures thus include, among others: maintaining effective armed forces; implementing anti-terrorist measures; ensuring civil and emergency defences; using intelligence to detect and counter external attack and internal subversion; using diplomacy to strengthen alliances and isolate threats; and using economic power to encourage cooperation and isolate or weaken political rivals. For example, the 2002 National Security Strategy of the United States of America singles out 'defending our [American] Nation against its enemies' as the 'the first and fundamental commitment of the [US] Federal Government'. To do that, the US government says it will 'make use of every tool in our arsenal − military power, better homeland defences, law enforcement, intelligence, and vigorous efforts to cut off terrorist financing.'[1] In a similar vein, the United Kingdom's Home Office acknowledges that it is 'responsible for keeping the UK safe from any threat to our national security. We work with the police and security agencies to ensure we do all we can to prevent any harm coming to our country or our people.'[2] National security statements like these may be found in the public documentation of most Western states.

[1] *www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nssintro.html*

[2] *www.homeoffice.gov.uk/security/*

**Activity**

Read Buzan Chapters 3 and 6 and Hough Chapters 2 and 3, then answer the following questions.

1. Explain the distinction between domestic security and external security.

2. Why is this distinction crucial to an understanding of national security?

3. How does non-state violence differ from state violence?

4. What type of violence constitutes the gravest threat to national security today?

5. Does the same answer hold true for developed states and developing states? Why or why not?

# National security and deterrence

As we noted in Chapter 1, deterrence is one of the key means of achieving security. Policies of deterrence are commonly employed by states as part of their national security strategies. A deterrent is a threat of retaliation such that would-be aggressors are dissuaded from attacking in order to avoid subsequent damage to themselves. Economic sanctions, conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction or any combination of these may be used as deterrents. Such an approach to security is epitomised in Cold War policies like 'mutually assured destruction' whereby both the US and the USSR knew that a nuclear attack by one side would result in immediate retaliation and annihilation by the other.

However, deterrence theory also has its weaknesses. Deterrence assumes that would-be attackers are keen to avoid harm to themselves. But this rationale may not always apply. Some governments (e.g., of totalitarian states) may be less concerned than others (e.g., liberal democracies) with keeping their military personnel and civilian populations safe. Similarly, perceptions of threat may vary according to other influences unrelated to the deterrent (e.g., diplomatic misunderstandings and/or opposing political ideologies). Finally, policies of deterrence may lead to an arms race between rival states, which in turn may increase rather than decrease the risk of actual war. In this way, policies of deterrence may produce what Barry Buzan calls a 'defence dilemma' (see Chapter 6 of People, states and fear) wherein military power subverts rather than supports national security.

**Activity**

Read the 1967 'Mutual deterrence' speech by then American Secretary of Defence Robert McNamara at www.atomicarchive.com/Docs/Deterrence/Deterrence.shtml and then abswer the following questions.

1. How does McNamara characterise the threat posed by the Soviet Union to the United States at that time?

2. Why does McNamara believe 'mutual deterrence' is an appropriate response to that threat? Do you find his reasons convincing. Why or why not?

# National security and the war on terror

In extreme circumstances (war or threat of war), even liberal democracies may restrict the civil liberties of resident aliens and sometimes also their own national citizens. We see evidence of such policies in the American response to the threat of international terrorism after 9/11. A 2003 report by the Washington-based Lawyers Committee for Human Rights documents post-September 11 restrictions in several key policy areas,

including government openness, personal privacy, immigration and security-related detention.[3] Most notorious of these are perhaps the set of extra-legal institutions established by executive order to bypass the federal judiciary in cases relating to the 'war on terror'. In such circumstances, the nation state may single out certain individuals for security-related reasons. For example, the American Civil Liberties Union claims that security screening of immigrants and refugees since 9/11 has disproportionately targeted males who fit a specific 'racial or ethnic profile' (i.e. of Arab origin).[4]

**Activity**

Read the US Patriot Act, 2001, http://fl1.findlaw.com/news.findlaw.com/cnn/docs/terrorism/hr3162.pdf and the California Senate Office report on its impact on California's Muslims, 2004, www.sen.ca.gov/sor/reports/REPORTS_BY_SUBJ/PUBLIC_SAFETY_JUDICIARY/PATRIOTACT.PDF.

Then reflect on the following: Are anti-terrorist measures which disproportionately affect particular groups in society justifiable? Why or why not?

In other words, even where its function more or less corresponds with the liberal ideal, national security comes at a price. Citizens must pay for their security. They do that in their taxes, in their obligation to obey the law, in the requirement to perform military duty in times of war or threat of war, and in accepting certain incursions into their usual civil liberties when circumstances require it.

The price of security is not without its controversies. In a liberal democracy there will always be those who claim the price is too high because the perceived gain in national security does not justify the necessary infringement of individual freedom needed to sustain it. We see exactly this sort of argument at work in public criticism directed at post-9/11 anti-terrorist measures in the United States, the United Kingdom and elsewhere. For example, the United Kingdom's 2006 Terrorism Act allows groups or organisations to be banned for glorifying terrorism or distributing publications that advocate it.[5] Human rights campaigners argued the law was drawn far too widely and as a result it faced stiff opposition in the British House of Lords. Members of the House of Lords were worried that such restrictions constituted an unjustifiable infringement on the freedom of speech and rejected the proposal five times before finally voting it through in March 2006. Liberal Democrat and Conservative Members of Parliament also voted against the 2006 Terrorism Bill, arguing that existing legislation already covered the glorification offence.

## National security in authoritarian states

Outside Western liberal democracies, the potential incompatibility of national security and personal security is arguably even greater. In authoritarian or police states like the German Democratic Republic (communist 'East Germany') or the People's Republic of China (PRC) or the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (communist North Korea), security for the rulers may translate into profound insecurity for the ruled. Communist rule in the German Democratic Republic was only sustained by the very real possibility of military intervention by the Red Army. The threat of such intervention effectively prevented any democratic opposition from arising. And it was only after the Brezhnev Doctrine

[3] Assessing the new normal: liberty and security for the post-September 11 *United States (Washington, D.C.: Lawyers Committee for Human Rights, 2003). www.humanrightsfirst.org/pubs/descriptions/AssessingAssessing theNewNormal.pdf*

[4] *Sanctioned bias: racial profiling since 9/11 (New York: American Civil Liberties Union, 2004). www.aclu.org/Files/OpenFile.cfm?id=15101*

[5] *http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/4905304.stm*

(which made it an obligation of communist countries to intervene in support of communist rule elsewhere) was publicly repudiated by the Soviet Union in 1989 in favour of the so-called 'Sinatra Doctrine' (they do it their way) that communist rule in Eastern Europe came to an end.

---

**Activity**

Read the 1968 speech by then Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1968brezhnev.html and then answer the following questions.

1. Is Brezhnev responding to a threat of state violence or non-state violence?

2. Is Soviet policy as described by Brezhnev representative of a maximal state or a minimal state?

3. On what basis did Brezhnev justify Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia?

4. Do you think this intervention was conducive to the national security of Czechoslovakia? Why or why not?

---

The People's Republic of China (PRC) is another authoritarian state in which the Chinese Communist Party continues to rule by maintaining a tight grip on society. Chinese Communist Party members hold almost all top government, police and military positions. Continued rule of the Chinese Communist Party and its hierarchy relies on the control of public officials, the media and the security apparatus, and the continued improvement in the living standards of most of the country's citizens. In theory, the constitution guarantees an independent judiciary; but , in practice, the ruling Chinese Communist Party frequently intervenes in the judicial process, and even direct verdicts in many high-profile political cases. The net result of all this is that the Chinese people lack the freedom to express political opposition and the right to change their political leaders or form of government. Nowhere is this fact more powerfully revealed than in the brutal suppression of the Tiananmen Square demonstrations of 1989.

In a similar vein, the communist government of North Korea has long used rationing as a means to control its population. By banning people from buying and selling grain, it has forced them to rely on the state for their most basic needs. This policy has proven very effective at ensuring the political survival of Kim Jong-il and the Korean Worker's Party. But the price for their security has been a widespread famine and consequent suffering for the people of North Korea.

# Security in weak, failed or quasi-states

Alternatively, in what are variously referred to as weak or failed or quasi-states, there is in effect no civil rule and instead circumstances closely approximate what Thomas Hobbes referred to as the 'state of nature' which is a 'war of all against all' in an unending struggle for survival. States are generally deemed 'successful' when they are able to maintain effective control over territory and population through a monopoly on the legitimate use of force – indeed, this was the classic, nineteenth-century definition of sovereignty. Conversely, when states cannot satisfy these basic criteria, their statehood becomes suspect. States may fail when rival actors such as warlords or popular militias usurp some of their governmental powers, in particular the monopoly of force. States are also said to fail in those circumstances where they are rendered ineffective because of high crime rates, extreme corruption, a powerful 'black (unregulated) market', judicial ineffectiveness, military interference in politics, or in cultural

situations where traditional leaders have more authority than the state in a certain area of competency or regional jurisdiction.

Domestic circumstances in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Somalia, Sierra Leone and the Sudan have in recent years all been characterised by conditions of armed conflict, famine, disease and refugees. Consequently, these are widely acknowledged to be 'failed states.'

---

**Activity**

Read the following article on the 2006 Failed States Index: www.globalpolicy.org/nations/sovereign/failed/2006/0502failedindex.htm and then answer the following questions.

1. What criterion was used by the Failed States Index to rank the relative success and failure of states?

2. What paradigm of security is reflected in this criterion?

3. Why was Sudan identified as the 'most failed' state?

---

Significantly, these four are far from being isolated cases: according to the 2005 Failed States Index compiled by Foreign Policy and the Fund for Peace, 'about 2 billion people live in insecure states, with varying degrees of vulnerability to widespread civil conflict.'[6] In other words, for somewhere in the region of 2 billion men, women and children worldwide, national security has failed to guarantee personal security. This statistic is a very damning indictment of the national security paradigm. And it calls into question the very basis upon which security is understood in the liberal tradition – the nation state is a tremendous boon to personal security in some places, but in very many others it is tremendous liability.

[6] *www.foreignpolicy.com/story/cms.php?story_id=3098*

# A reminder of your learning outcomes

Having completed this chapter, and the Essential readings and activities, you should be able to:

- describe the relationship between popular identity and national security
- identify what conditions must be satisfied for the ideal of national security to be achieved
- give examples of states who do not satisfy the ideal of national security and describe how they fall short of this ideal.

# Sample examination questions

1. Are the security requirements of maximal states fundamentally different from those of minimal states?

2. Does the current security focus on international terrorism reinforce or weaken personal security?