

Journal of Peace Studies - Volume 8, Issue 2, March-April 2001

National Security: Theoretical Perspectives

Amarendra Mishra*

**Dr. Amarendra Mishra teaches Political Science in N.K. Mahavidyalaya, South Balanda, Angul, Orissa.*

The Concept of Security

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

The policies that the States follow to promote their security rest on a series of judgements and choices. In the first place, the State should find out the vital interests and prepare to preserve it.[2] In the second place security-judgements should be taken with proper consideration of the changing conditions of the State, its relationship with other States and their intentions and capabilities. In the third place, the degree of threats for a State should be properly studied while making policies relating to security. Even while facing similar threats, States differ in their security-arrangements; some tend to spend relatively high while others relatively low proportion of their resources on security.[3] In the fourth place, methods for ensuring security differ from State to State. Dangers may be warded off or countered through conflicts or peaceful means. When some States prefer peaceful negotiations and co-operation, others resort to war, conflict alliance, and counter-alliance for preserving their security.[4]

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

In common parlance, concept of security is usually narrowly identified with military preponderance. Recently, the concept has undergone a qualitative change. Besides military security, now it includes political, economic, environmental and socio-psychological security. In the present context, it is not possible to maintain security solely through military preponderance. Robert McNamara highlights this aspect of security when he says: "It is not a military force though it may involve it. Security is not traditional military activity though it may encompass it".[7] Thus the objective of security now has been "all round development focussing national attention

on political and economic power". The latter, in particular, in the context of the developing countries, is an essential ingredient of security".[8] Today security concerns encompass not only the defence of the territory but also the problem of access to raw materials at reasonable prices and how to alter and satisfy the expectations of social and economic stability. [9] In the post Second World War, particularly in 1980s unstable economic conditions of a state posed a threat to the concept of domestic security. Higher the expectations of the people, more the threats to the domestic concept of security in the industrial world. Developments during the post war period have enlarged the problem of security within industrial societies to include not only the question of physical but also questions of individual well-being such as job security, maintenance of standard of living, health care and retirement pensions. Though these problems are not new to the government but they are now perceived as security problems by the large segments of Western population. [10]

Besides military and economic aspects of security, political dimensions also play a vital role in the policy of national security. Domestic and foreign policies of a nation are largely influenced by it. [11] Political instability, class and community conflicts, secessionist tendencies of states shatter the internal fabric of security. Thus security involves not only freedom from physical danger but also from psychological danger and is therefore a subjective concept.[12] Thus security encompasses political, economic and socio-psychological security of nations.

At another level, national security is conceived as an important ingredient of international security and policies of national security therefore, have started addressing to issues like global environment, global peace. For a better understanding of the concept of security, one should analyse the various approaches to 'security'.

Classical Approach to Security

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

Realism

Realism, which is the prime mover of the security paradigm, emerges out of the individual's fear psychosis that others are trying to destroy him for which he must take protective measures.[13] This approach is developed under the basic assumption that rivalry and strife among nations continue in some form or the other. As it emphasises on the struggle for power or the contest for powers, most of the nations revolve around this power paradigm for protecting their security. They adopt various means like balance of power, deterrence and alliances, for effective check of the contest for power. Hans J. Morgenthau, George F. Kennan, Reinhold Niebuhr, Stanley Hoffman Arnold Wolfers, E.H. Carr, Hedley Bull and Raymond Arun are the leading advocates of the realist school of thought.

The best exposition of realistic theory of international politics has been given by Hans J. Morgenthau. Security is the prime concern in his theory. He says, “international politics like all politics is a struggle for power. Whatever be the ultimate aim of international politics, power is always supreme.”[14] It is obvious that a nation can be secured if it enjoys power. Power occupies a cardinal position in the realist paradigm as it helps in preserving security. The struggle for power leads to the balance which nations try for their protection against others’ attack. [15] Kenneth Thompson and Hans J. Morgenthau laid stress on balance of power. They viewed balance of power as an effort by the nations to increase their strength at least to equal level with other nations if not superior to other nations’ strength to counteract the power of other nations.[16] Balance of power also helps to protect the vital interest of nations by adopting various methods like war and aggression.[17]

The idea of equilibrium is the basis of balance of power. But in reality nations prefer preponderance, not equilibrium of power. They prefer disequilibrium as it works out in their favour. Realists hold that it is in the interest of every nation to prevent other nations to be more powerful than itself as it may bring threats for its security and survival.[18] Morgenthau argues in favour of national interest at the cost of morality as it helps in ensuring security. On the other hand, Kennen supported the idea of moral relativism as against Morgenthau’s idea of transcendental relativism.[19]

Raymond Aron emphasises on maximum security of a nation as it helps in protecting a nation and simultaneously increases its prestige by helping less powerful nations as the leaders of the coalition. In other words “to want the maximum of security means to want the maximum of power which in turn means the greatest number of allies and the fewest possible enemies.”[20] A great power also does not ignore the significance of ideology. They help their allies on ideological grounds and pave the way for opposite ideological nations to make counter allies in the struggle for power. Aron maintains that most of the conflicts and rivalry continue, as most of the nations do not agree either to a common law or compromises.[21] However, Arib differs with Morgenthau and others in his nalysis and distinguishes between power as a means and power as an end.

Prominent realist Quincy Wright examines that since World War II, states had preserving their security than international law and organisation.[22] Studies of the course of public opinion also supported this conclusion. Since World War II, nationalism and state sovereignty and security overshadowed internationalism and world community. International problems were solved militarily rather than through peaceful means. According to Wright, realism, which defined national interest in terms of power, represented short-term national policies, which would be helpful for the fulfillment of immediate requirements of nations.[23] Balance of power as a method for ensuring security cannot prevent war prematurely as balance of military power always required occasional wars to make their operation effective.

Hedley Bull critically reviewed one of the strategic experts, Noel-Baker, for his theory of collective security. He, in fact, rejected it and gave his own theory in stead. Unlike other realists, he argued against excessive self-interest in approaches to security. He tried to introduce a link between common interest and national security.[24] He pointed out that “the military balance is itself most important source of security, and it is not necessarily made more important by being reduced to a lower level in terms of strategic or limited war forces.” [25] He argued that “there is no necessary presumption in favour of disarmament rather than rearmament in the design of a system of arms control.”[26] In the 1980s, he became concerned about the defence policies of super powers and stressed more on armaments than arms control to enhance their security. Nevertheless, he was very much sceptical about the response of the super powers to arms-control as they wanted to spread their ideological and military hegemony over the rest of the world.

Among other realist thinkers, Arnold Wolfers emphasised on the concept of national security and critically analysed the many-dimensional complexities of this concept. He characterised security as an ambiguous symbol –at one point he argues that it does not have any precise meaning.[27] Stanley Hoffman compared the present power struggle in politics for ensuring security with a game of ‘roulette in a cellar’, and noted that “as long as the competition goes on, the player cannot be asked to behave as if it were over.” He argued that it was absurd to want states to give up their separate interests merely because they had a common interest—divergently perceived—in survival or in a modicum of order. But it is not absurd for states to refrain from pursuing separate interests with means that are capable of throwing not only their immediate rivals but all by-standers and themselves to abyss.”[28]

Neo-Realism

Neo-realism is a synthesis between classical realism and elements of various critiques of realism. Modern neo-realists emphasise on international system and the structure than the nation-states in their analysis of power paradigm. The leading advocates of Neo-realism are Kenneth Waltz, Robert Gilpin, Barry Buzan and Bjorn Moller.

Kenneth Waltz’s structural realism reflected that in the structure of international system, states, though important, are not the only actors. It is obvious that national interest is the prime concern of the states in taking important decisions including decisions on national security. But this self-help attitude of the states shatters the fabric of the system.[29] Waltz argued that this anarchy was a lesser evil than the hierarchical structure, such as collective security, world government, which regulated balance of power but often favoured the powerful nations. He argued in favour of nuclear revolution and even he rejoiced at the prospects of nuclear proliferation as he felt “it restrains and imparts a sense of caution among those states that are in possession” and such kind of a nuclear deterrence, in the ultimate analysis helped in preserving security rather than endangering it. In his opinion there is an important correlation between degree of freedom and security. Higher the freedom, more the social threats to the individuals and thus individual security was threatened. In the same way, freedom of

the states leads to insecurity, as that will lead to a state of chaos where states will be groping for direction.

Neo-realists like Robert Gilpin would seek a terrain away from the realists' obsession with power. Even he substantially modifies the realists' overall conceptual position of the state. He would call the state a 'coalition of coalitions' rather than a unitary actor as was emphasised in earlier times and even go to the extent of banishing the concept of state from the realm of conceptual possibility.[30] He ridicules the realists' weakness for *status quo* and situates the problematic of security against such a backdrop where *status quoist* states bent on preserving the *status quo* would seek power for the sake of it in overtly military terms. Gilpin rather emphasizes on economic factors. He argues that calculation of cost and benefits very often determines the locus of decision-making of nations in preparation for war and peace.[31] The recognition of economy as the most important ingredient of power makes Gilpin's neo-realist study sounds very logical in the context of happenings all round the globe right now. His concern for security, therefore, has more to do with strengthening of economic factors and considerations of them than the preparedness of war strictly in military-power terms.

Barry Buzan analyses the concept of security holistically. According to Buzan, security is a complex combination of individual, national and international security, which he considers as three levels in his analysis of security paradigm. He discusses security in relation to specific threats. He emphasizes on social threats that are intertwined in human environment with unavoidable social, political and economic consequences. Freedom is the most important factor that regulates the social security of a man. To overcome the threats that spring up from freedom and to maintain adequate level of security against social threats, people seek the mechanism of the state. The paradox is that, the state, instead of ensuring individual security, becomes a source of social threat against the individual because of its so called 'defence dilemma'. The objective of the state is to guarantee security to its citizens for which it seeks to go nuclear in the modern age, which ultimately leads to their extinction. Thus states in stead of acting as a vehicle of individual security acts as a source of insecurity. In his opinion, national security depends upon the relationship between the nation and the state. The vulnerability of national security depends upon the components of the state, i.e. the institution of state and physical base of it. The different character of the components, which constitute the state, suggests that threats to the state can come in variety of ways. They can be military, political and ecological. In the same way they can be averted by a variety of means among which military power may not be considered as the most important one.[32] Thus he tries to modify the conceptual position of realists and their over-emphasis on power paradigm.

According to Buzan, the two major systems, which constitute the security environment of the state, are: international political system and international economic system, which he characterizes as 'anarchical'. He distinguishes between immature and mature anarchies. The former variety resembles the popular image of anarchy; the latter seems to be a utopian concept of anarchy where "the benefits of fragmentation can be enjoyed without the costs of continuous struggle and instability". Hence such mature anarchy will lead to a better existence of the state system by mutual respect and

understanding.[33] This condition of anarchy suggests that the security concerns of the sub-systems do not spread uniformly throughout the system and complex patterns of alignments seek to promise security at different levels. He calls these arrangements as ‘security complexes’. He defines a “security complex” as a group of states whose primary security concern link together with their national securities so closely that their individual security cannot be considered in isolation of the overall security arrangements.[34]

Bjorn Moller emphasises on a new type of defence structure- ‘Non Offensive Defence’ (NOD)- for ensuring security of nations, which is at stake. He argues in favour of it as it leads to arms control and disarmament, increased crisis stability and the elimination of incentives for preventive war and pre-emptive attack. He compared Non-Offensive Defence (NOD) with military strategy and elaborates its feature in the context of military, maritime forces and nuclear strategy. He analysed its implication in making alliances in general and NATO as a corollary of ‘common security’. [35]

Paradigm of Idealism and Security

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

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

In the modern age Immanuel Kant, Leo Tolstoy, M.K. Gandhi, Woodrow Wilson are considered as the chief exponents of idealism. Kant insisted on (perpetual) peace, which he considered as pre-requisite for human kind’s ultimate societal and moral progress. He condemned war, and held that individuals should work for peace so should states. Kant regarded an end to war as something, which was not only desirable but whose historical progress was making peace increasingly realisable. As civilization develops, said Kant, people realise increasingly that they must cooperate with one another, even if this means denial of their own passions and desires”.[36] Kant’s ideas of *perpetual peace* had a tremendous impact all over the world. It gave a powerful stimulus to much of the nineteenth century thinking on how to limit and ultimately eliminate war on both sides of the Atlantic.

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

values like inequality, cruelty, and brutality, and suppresses noble virtues by its coercive structure. [37]

Mahatma Gandhi was a true champion of non-violence and peace. Though he did not evolve any coherent theory of security, the twin principle of truth and non-violence (*satya* and *ahimsa*) formed the core of Gandhi's philosophy. Gandhi said that truth and non-violence could bring about a total transformation in the world. Like other idealists, he supported the eternal idea of peace and denounced violence and immorality, as they corrupt human relationship and souls of the people of the world. He wanted to preserve peace through mutual respect and mutual promotion of each other's interest. [38] He wanted to fight against the force of an invading army with the force of love but he wished for a moral victory not by reconciling with aggressor but by forcing him to surrender to his eternal principle of non-violence and peace. The idea of *Shanti Sena* (Peace Army) which was his brain-child was effective in containing the Chinese incursion into Tibet as well as in other conflicts. He also proposed the concept of 'civilian based defence' which has more relevance in the present world. This is considered by many including strategic thinkers as the panacea to save the world from nuclear catastrophe. Gandhi extended his idea of non-violence and peace to national and international defence and strived for preserving security through these weapons.

Woodrow Wilson, with his ideas of federalism, laid the foundation-stone of 'League of Nations'. He is the founding father of 'modern idealism', which he thought could be reflected in the world order and federalist traditions and advocated the abolition of states in favour of 'world government', peace societies, peace movements and other such organizations those are influenced by his ideas. He stressed on 'world government' and strived for replacing occidental with oriental cosmology.[39]

The Rationalist Perspective

Concept of security has been analyzed by many through 'rational' approaches, as they would provide scientific insight into the complex and wider issues involved in it.

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

Deterrence is one of the most important theoretical concept of security, in which one party tries to influence the behaviour of another in a desired direction. It rests directly upon threats, sanctions or deprivation.[40] Thus it deters the opposition from initiating armed actions and restraining escalation in case of war. The far-reaching consequences of deterrence are as follows:

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

- Its prime motive is to prevent opponents from attack. For this, it keeps a vigilant eye on the opponents' moves, political behaviours and above all military strategies.
- Deterrence emphasizes on the capability of the attacker. It should be convinced about the potentiality of the other side and his motive to use force in case of war.
- In this game of deterrence, each side tries to win against the other; convincing other that it has potentiality to win.[41]

The most important premises of deterrence, which restrained rational actors like super powers from nuclear attack during the Cold War years was the cost-benefit considerations, horrors and irreparable damage which it would cause to civilian population, the possibility of escalating nuclear war beyond bounds which was a irrational and unethical.[42]

Like deterrence, Disarmament and Arms Control are the two important theories of the concept of security. Though the term 'disarmament' and 'arms control' are used interchangeably but both are not synonymous. Disarmament is related to reduction in armaments whereas arms control refers to restraint. Elimination of war and maintenance of peace and security are the catchwords of the disarmament programmes. The nation of disarmament springs up from the threat perception, which arises out of a situation of armed hostility. Each nation perceives the other as a threat to the national security and such perception is akin to the estimated capability and estimated intent of the opposition. Higher the capability and higher the intent of the opposition, the more the threat perception to a nation, but with the absence of anyone, threat perception diminishes drastically. The problem is that to come out of this 'arms tension circle' threat perception should be reduced. It could only possible through the reduction of both military capability and estimated military intent.[43]

Scholars of the *Gradualist School* argue that elimination of weapons should be done in a careful and controlled manner, which would generate an atmosphere of trust between the countries involved. They stressed on the Graduated Reciprocation in Tension Reduction (GRIT) scheme. David Singer, E. Osgood and L. B. Sohn are the exponents of this school of thought. But the scholars of 'armament-first school' believe that "the way to disarm is to disarm". When the States are serious and the environment for multilateral treaty is ready, the process of disarmament should begin.[44]

The theory of arms control plays an important role in the concept of security. At the end of 1950s this theory assumed prominence as it provided the stimulus for the development of 'arms control'. Hedley Bull is one of the advocates of this school of thought. Strategic experts like T.C. Schelling and M.H. Halperin also emphasised on this theory. According to them, it reduces the scope of war and violence and recognises the common interest and helps in developing a friendly and healthy relationship between potential enemies.[45]

Concept of Security: The present phase

As discussed above, besides military security, there are other areas-economic, environmental, societal-in which security threats are perceived. In the present world, particularly after the end of the Cold War, these relatively newer sectors have assumed much significance.[46] Post-structuralists have also stressed on the expansion of this concept of security. It is argued by Ole Waever that the security is a discursive practice, so the concept of security cannot be confined to military domain. The most important point is not to establish an objective relationship between the concept and possible domains of security, but “to study whether and how this issue can be securitized”. He argues in favour of problematising the possible relationship between the state and the other, asking whether security politics has to be built on a conquest of the other. [47]

Economic Security

Economic security concerns “access to the resources, finance and market necessary to sustain acceptable levels of welfare and state power.[48] The Third World countries are more economically insecure than the developed nations. These countries are unable to meet the needs of the people as they have been exploited by the centre (centre-periphery model). Nations like Sudan, Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Liberia are still struggling to improve their economy. Nations like Brazil, Argentina, Tanzania are unable to resist the pressure of outside institutions in return for needed supplies of capital. The periphery occupies a weak position in global market whose prices, trade, finance and technical evolution are controlled by the centre. There is hardly any hope for periphery to overcome this problem because of declining commodity prices, divergence of interests among the developing nations, strategy by the centre to divide and rule, debt crisis of developing nations, lack of facilities to utilize cheap labour in a productive way.[49]

Some scholars argue that the plight of the Third World countries arose from their dependent economic position, which they had inherited from their colonial past. Others view that these countries are politically independent but penetrated by outside market and political interests and problems in leadership and society whose traditions, skills, resources and internal divisions often impeded the development of a modern political economy.[50]

Besides the economic insecurity of the third world, economic crisis have been faced by developing nations. Of course with the introduction of liberalization in world economy and followed by disintegration of Soviet Union, rise of Japan, Germany as economic powers for global leadership and burden sharing have tremendous impact on economic security.[51]

Now the most pertinent question comes to the mind of a researcher – why do economic regionalism is strong when there is a globalising tendencies. The answer is that the economic regionalism is a response to globalization. It helps the nation in their day to day operation. The logic of economic regionalism can be considered as a response to manage the threats emanating from globalization. In the words of Buzan et.al.,

“Unlike the situation in 1930s, most contemporary regional blocs have fairly liberal internal trading structures and in many ways are open to world markets. Their purpose is to reduce the pressures of an open global economy without sacrificing all economics of scale and to try to reduce the over-stretched management demands of an open global economy by moving many of those demands to a more intimate regional scale”. [52] Another important part of economic regionalism is the desire to preserve societal security. In this line one can see the Islamic economics as a separate type which has regionalizing tendencies. Some realists have also viewed regionalization as an effort to be in the super powers race, but it has lost its relevance after the disintegration of USSR which led to the demise of second Cold War.

As discussed, the concept of economic security is related to military, political, environmental and societal security and it is too difficult to separate it. This over spill quality means that has been talked about economic security is also related to the survival in other sectors, not the economic one. [53] But liberals have attempted to separate the economic sector from politics and other sectors which is helpful to understand the concept of security from the perspective of wider security agenda. But still there are problems as we mentioned in this economic security. It can only be solved through concerted efforts of countries on the basis of multilateral constructive and mutual co-operation.

Environmental Security

Environmental security which is called the ‘ultimate security issue’ has broadened the security agenda further. Though security experts like Walt rejects the expansion of this concept to include *inter alia* AIDS, the drug problem and ecological hazards, because they think that this could destroy the coherence of the security paradigm. [54] But the demands of the people of the developed and developing nations to save the world from environmental degradation, resource depletion and environmental change which causes social turmoil either within a country or with neighbouring countries draw the attention of security experts to give importance to ‘environmental security’ in the new framework for security analysis. [55] A wide range of problems and issues are included within the environmental security agenda: disruption of eco-systems which include climate change, bio diversity, deforestation, desertification and other forms of erosion, depletion of the ozone layer and various kinds of pollution. Energy problems include depletion of natural resources such as fossils, fuels and forests. To this can be added various forms of pollution including management disasters (related in particular to nuclear energy, oil transportation and chemical industries); and scarcities and uneven distribution.

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

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

Societal Security

Societal security is the most prominent issue in the present world. It is “about the threats and vulnerabilities that affect patterns of communal identity and culture”. [56] A wide range of problems and issues are included within it. But the most common issues that have been considered as threats to societal security are outlined here.

The first problem is the issue of migration, which dilutes and changes the identity of one community with the influx of other people (e.g. Chinese migration into Tibet, Russian migration into Estonia). The second problem is the issue of horizontal competition, which changes the ways of a community because of cultural and linguistic influence from neighbouring culture. The third issue, which is a threat to societal security, is the issue of vertical competition where people lose their identity and identify with wider or narrower identities because there is either an integrating project (e.g. Yugoslavia, the EU) or a secessionist ”regionalist” project (e. g., Quebec, Catalonia). The fourth issue relating to societal security could be de-population, whether by plague, war, famine, natural catastrophe or policies of extermination. [57]

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

“Much of societal security in the richest part of the world is related to this possibly over-arching conflict, that is, the opposition is more between universalizing and particularizing cultures than between different particularizing cultures. In less privileged parts of the world, the patterns are different, either because wider segments expect to gain from internalization (e.g. EU support in southern Europe) or because much of the elite takes part in nationalist operations (the former Yugoslav area).” [58]

Other Approaches

The security experts have also come up with concepts like ‘Humanitarian Security’ and ‘Security Communities’. Humanitarian Security concerns ‘inter-state relations,

contacts among the people of various states for good relations, mutual trust and understanding and rational solution to the problems of the world.

A security community is ‘one in which there is real re-assurance that the members of the community will not fight each other physically, but will settle their disputes in some other way.’ According to Karl Deutsch, the factors for successful security community are, first a high co-relation of certain shared values such as democracy, social market economies and respect for the rule of the law and second, a degree of mutual understanding, solidarity and responsiveness among the states that made up the political community. [59]

From the above analysis, one can conclude that the concept of security has broadened its purview and it is not confined to military security issues alone. True security requires government, NGOs and international organisations to come together to address such objectives as social economic justice, political freedom and the protection of the planetary eco-system. Then only the security of the state will be preserved in a more meaningful way.

References

1. Vernon Van Dyke, *International Politics*, (Bombay: Vakils, Feffer and Simons, 1969), p. 35.
2. Arnold Wolfers, *Discord and Collaboration*, (Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1962), pp.147-66.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid. This line of arguments are also expressed by Barry Buzan’s, *People, States and Fear*, (Great Britain: Wheatsheaf Books, 1989), and Gregory Flynn, *The Internal Fabric of Western Security*, (Allanheld: Osmun & Co, 1981).
5. See Buzan, *People, States and Fear*, op. cit.,
6. Olof Palme, *Common Security: A Programme for Disarmament, Report of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security*, (London: Pan Books, 1982), p. 56.
7. Robert S. McNamara, “The Limitations of Military Power”, *Survival*, Vol. VIII. No. 7, (July 1966), pp. 212 –213.
8. Ibid.
9. Gregory Flynn, *The Internal Fabric of Western Security America*, (Allanheld: Osmun and Co. 1981), p. 2.
10. Ibid., p. 5.
11. George E. Hudson, (ed.), *Soviet National Security Policy under Perestroika*, (Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1990) p. 11.
12. Donald M. Snow, *National Security: Emerging Problems of U.S. Defence Policy*, (New York: St. Martins, 1987), pp. 5-6.
13. John H. Herz, *Political Realism and Political Idealism*, (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1951), p. 18.

14. Hans J. Morgenthau, *Scientific Vs. Power Politics*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1946) p. 101.
15. John Spanier, *Games Nations Play*, (New Delhi: Macmillan, 1990), p. 11.
16. K. W. Thompson and Hans J. Morgenthau (eds.), *Principles and Problems of International Politics*, (New York: Praegar, 1968), p. 103.
17. Martin Wight, *Power Politics*, (London: Penguin, 1978), pp. 35-39. see also Quincy Wright, *A Study of War, Vol. II*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972), pp. 743-59.
18. Nicholas J. Spykman, *America's Strategy in World Politics*, (New York: Macmillan, 1942), pp. 21-22. Similar views are also expressed by Arthur Hassal, *The Balance of Power, 1751-89*, (New York: Macmillan, 1914) p. 361; Alfred Vogts, "The United States and the Balance of Power", *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 3. No. 4, (November 1941) p. 405. and Dyke, *International Politics*, op.cit., pp. 220-224.
19. See for example, Robert Good, "National Interest and Moral Theory: The Debate Among Contemporary Political Realists", in Roger Hilsman and Robert C. Good (eds.), *Foreign Policy in the Sixties: The Issues and the Instruments*, (Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1965), p. 204.
20. Raymond Aron, "The Quest for a Philosophy of Foreign Affairs", in Stanley Hoffman (ed.), *Contemporary Theory in International Relations*, (New Delhi, Prentice Hall, 1964), p. 80.
- 21 Raymond Aron, *The Philosopher in History, Vol. 1*, (London: Sage Publication, 1986), p. 402.
22. Quincy Wright, *On Predicting International Relation, The Year 2000*, Morgenthau Series in World Affairs, Monograph No. 1, (Colorado: University of Denver, 1969-70), p. 9.
23. Quincy Wright, "Realism and Idealism in International Politics", *World Politics*, (October 1954), pp. 126-127.
24. Hedley Bull, *The Control of the Arms Race*, (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1961). pp. 25-29.
25. Ibid., pp. 37-62.
26. Ibid., p. 55.
27. Arnold Wolfers, *Discord and Collaboration*, (Baltimore, John Hopkins University Press, 1962), ch 10. see also Buzan, *People, States and Fear*, op.cit. p. 4.
28. Stanley Hoffman, *The State of War: Essay on the Theory and Practice of International Politics*, (London: Pall Mall, 1965), p. 154.
29. Kenneth Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*, (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1979), pp. 93-97, 105.
30. Robert Gilpin, *War and Change in World Politics*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), pp. 18-19, 35, 177.

31. Gilpin, *op.cit.*, pp. 39-55, and 105-155. For comparable European views see e.g. Mary Kaldor, *The Disintegrating West*, (New York: Hill and Wang, 1978), pp. 14-28 and 173-208. See also Paul Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500 to 2000*, (London: Unwin Hyman, 1988), pp. 514-535.
32. Buzan, *People, States and Fear*, *op. cit.*, p. 20, pp. 24-92.
33. *Ibid.*, p. 96.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 106, 126.
35. Bjørn Møller, *Common Security and Non-Offensive Defence*, (Boulder: Lynn Rienner Publishers, 1992), pp. 1-9, 285.
36. Garrett L. McAinsh (ed.), *World Encyclopedia of Peace Vol.I*, (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1986), p. 517.
37. Brian E. Porter, *World Encyclopedia of Peace*, Vol. II, (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1986), p. 465.
38. Eddy Asirvatham, *Political Theory*, (New Delhi: S. Chand and Co., 1988), p. 764.
39. Møller, *Common Security and Non-Offensive Defence*, *op.cit.*, pp. 11.
40. Phil Williams, "Deterrence", in John Baylis, et.al., *Contemporary Strategy*, (London: Croom Helm, 1975), p. 69.
41. Barry Buzan (ed.), *The International Politics of Deterrence*, (London: Frances Pinter, 1987), pp. 17-19.
42. Møller, *Common Security of Non-Offensive Defence*, *op.cit.*, pp. 111-113.
43. J. David Singer, *Deterrence, Arms Control and Disarmament*, (Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1962), p. 172.
44. Ken Booth, "Disarmament and Arms Control", in John Baylis, et.al., *op. cit.*, p. 98.
45. T. C. Shelling and M. H. Halperin, *Strategy and Arms Control*, (New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1961), p. 2.
46. Barry Buzan, "Rethinking Security After the Cold War", *Nordic Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 32. No. 1, (1997), pp. 5-28.
47. Lene Hansen, "A Case for Seduction? Evaluating the post-structuralist conceptualization of security", *Nordic Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 32. No. 4, (1997), pp. 369-397.
48. Barry Buzan, "New Patterns of Global Security in the Twenty-First Century", *International Affairs*, (July 1991), p. 445.
49. John Ravenhill, "The North-South Balance of Power", *International Affairs*, Vol. 66. No.4, (1996), pp. 731-748.

- ^{50.} Galtung, John, "A Structural Theory of Imperialism", *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. No. 2, (1971), pp. 81-118.
51. Barry Buzan, Ole Wæver, Jaap de Wilde, *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*, (Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1998), p. 112.
52. *ibid.*, pp.113-114.
- ^{53.} *Ibid.*, p.116.
54. S. M. Walt, "The Renaissance of Security Studies", *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 35. No. 2, (1991), p. 213.
55. W. Harriet Critchley and Terry Terrif, "Environment and Security", in Richard Shultz, et.al., *Security Studies for the 1990s*, op.cit., pp. 327-352.
56. Barry Buzan, et.al., op.cit., p.121.
57. *Ibid.*.
58. *Ibid.* p. 138.
59. See K. Deutsch et. al., *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area*, (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1957).