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Introduction: Global Security Policy in the Twenty-First Century

Mary Kaldor and Iavor Rangelov*

We live in insecure times. We trust our institutions because we believe they keep us safe; yet the present moment is characterized by a pervasive worldwide sense of insecurity. In places like Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Somalia, and Mali, people live under the daily threat of being killed, expelled from their homes, or being robbed, raped, tortured or kidnapped. In places like Bangladesh, Oklahoma, Japan, and Australia, people are increasingly vulnerable to flooding, earthquakes, tsunamis, or fires. In much of the world, access to water, food, or shelter is scarce. And in the richer parts of the world, growing fears about welfare and pensions, or terrorism and criminality, are probably the basis of a growing mistrust of political institutions and the political class.

Security policy is supposed to address insecurity. During the Cold War, the institutions that were responsible for security policy were largely provided by nation-states and political blocs. Even though the United Nations (UN) had security functions, these were constrained by the continuing East–West conflict. Traditionally, security policies consist of military forces that are designed to repel an attack by a foreign state and police forces who are supposed to uphold the rule of law and deal with criminality. What Ulrich Beck (1992) calls the “master narrative” of the modern state was constructed around its role in protecting people against risk: the dangers posed by nature, personal risks of ill health and unemployment, as well as threats posed by foreign enemies. Indeed the idea of defense against a foreign enemy became

*We are grateful to five anonymous reviewers; the general editor of the series, David Held; the entire team at Wiley Blackwell that worked with us on the book; and the European Research Council. We are hugely indebted to Pippa Bore for her hard work and remarkable attention to detail in providing assistance.
a metaphoric umbrella term for security in general. Yet in a world where inter-state war is declining, the metaphor is much less reassuring than in the past. It is this mismatch between security policies as traditionally conceived and people’s everyday experience in which the pervasive sense of insecurity resides.

This book is about global security policy. By global, we do not mean universal; rather we refer to the changes in security policy “in these global times”. In part, global security policy is about the interconnectedness of contemporary sources of insecurity. Conflict, terrorism, criminality, climate change, or economic crisis can no longer be addressed only or even primarily at the level of the nation-state; hence the term global implies beyond the nation-state and often refers to a multiscalar system that is local, regional, and national, as well as global. But we mean more than that. Global security policy is not just about a change of level; it is about a change in kind. It is about how we understand and conceptualize security and how our understandings are implemented. It is about concepts and tools and not just actors. It entails a contradictory process of overlapping arenas that are public and private, and local and transnational, as well as national.

Much of the contemporary literature on security deals with the new range of world risks in place of the threat of attack by foreign military forces. Some of these risks, like cyber warfare or climate change, are clearly new; some, like terrorism or the spread of weapons of mass destruction or sectarian conflict, appear in a new guise. Some have new features that are the consequence of, for example, growing interconnectedness; new forms of communication that speed up mobilization and facilitate long-distance violence; or weak states that are the legacy of the collapse of dictatorships, the drying up of superpower aid to clients, and the pursuit of neoliberal economic strategies. Our point, however, is that many of these risks are risks that we used to think about in domestic terms – they only became visible as global risks after the end of the Cold War. During the Cold War, bipolar security was a mechanism for world order. Because an East–West conflict seemed like the worst possible eventuality, other sources of insecurity were accorded a low priority. Growing risk and complexity reflects not so much a change in how the world works, although it changes all the time, but rather the absence of a simple narrative to understand the world.

This book uses the term security to address primarily issues relating to violence. Nowadays, security discussions, including climate change, energy security, food security, and so on, tend to take a wider approach. This has the advantage of stressing the urgency of these issues. But it also allows for “securitization” – that is to say, co-option by those institutions traditionally responsible for security, such as the military and intelligence agencies (Buzan et al., 1998). It also carries the implication that if we solve these other problems, peace will follow. Of course, the sources of insecurity are much wider than this and, moreover, different sources of insecurity are interrelated; indeed, we touch upon this relationship in several of the chapters in this volume. There are, for example, complex linkages between high levels of military spending and global imbalances, strategies of structural adjustment and weak rule of law, sporadic violence, and poor economic performance. But a book that covered all sources of insecurity would be a book about global problems in general; thus we have chosen a perhaps arbitrary limitation on our subject matter although we do acknowledge that issues of war and crime need to be addressed on their own terms as well as in relation to wider global problems.
In identifying the sources of insecurity covered in this book, we have decided against any attempt to categorize or code different gradations of what are considered global risks; rather, we have adopted an empirical approach of identifying those sources of insecurity with which existing policy is actually concerned. We describe them as policy arenas rather than risks or sources of insecurity and they are addressed in Part II of the book.

Much has been written about conceptual and theoretical issues raised by global security (Booth, 2007; Buzan and Hansen, 2009) but much less about global security as policy. While there is growing literature on aspects of global security – terrorism, state-building, peace-keeping, and so on – we are not aware of any work that pulls all this together. Our interest is less in abstract theorizing about the possible directions and meanings of global security, although that is important, but more in the way that global security policy is actually practiced: how is it conceptualized and implemented, who is responsible, and what tools do they use? The book does not assume that a global security policy is being developed that offers a more effective answer to contemporary sources of insecurity. On the contrary, the global security landscape is characterized by multiple and often contradictory tendencies. The legacies of the Cold War period still shape the geo-political preoccupations of what could be described as the national players on the global stage; in fact, a very large proportion of world security expenditure is devoted to these preoccupations. The War on Terror launched in response to the events of 9/11 seems to have mutated into a global binary dynamic involving, on the one hand, long-distance air power, especially drones, carried out by new combinations of private security contractors, local non-state actors, and intelligence agencies, as well as traditional security actors and, on the other hand, networks of extremists and criminal groups tied together through an increasingly operational narrative of resistance. In international institutions like the UN, the European Union (EU), or the African Union, security policies are evolving largely around what Duffield (2001) describes as the “liberal peace”: the combination of formulations, strategies, tools, and preoccupations conjured up in terms like stabilization, crisis management, human security, post-conflict reconstruction, etc. Many of the chapters in this book primarily address the concerns of the liberal peace, although they are less about setting up norms and more about understanding actual practice, achievements and inadequacies. However, the authors do take into account alternative tendencies and consider how they shape the evolution of different aspects of global security policy.

Structure and Organization of the Book

The Handbook has four parts: key concepts; security risks, which we describe as policy arenas; policy tools or instruments; and global security actors. Collectively, they provide an original account of global security policy in the twenty-first century and a comprehensive introduction to the main subjects and ideas that animate scholarly and policy discussions in this field.

Part I comprises five contributions, which elaborate some of the key concepts that constitute global security policy as a distinctive field of practice and scholarship. In Chapter 1, Ken Booth argues that arriving at a consensual understanding of “global security” is critical for promoting the well-being of humanity and nature in general.
He elaborates the concept of global security in relation to existential and emancipatory global threats and places them in their contemporary historical context. The chapter examines the emergence of a new global “securityscape” at the current juncture, shaped by the tension between the urgency of developing what Booth calls “global domestic security politics” on one side and the continuing power of statist rationality on the other.

The next two chapters examine the contribution of Critical Security Studies, focusing on a series of unsettling questions that scholars in this field have raised about security policy. David Mutimer (Chapter 2) introduces three stands of critical security scholarship: Feminism; post-Marxist Critical Theory; and post-structuralism. He demonstrates how despite their differences, all these approaches share a commitment to interrogating troubling simplicities and certainties in the name of those who are marginalized, oppressed, or made insecure by security policy. The aspiration of the work surveyed in the chapter, Mutimer argues, is not to promote better security policy, even though it may help contribute to it; instead, critical security scholars seek freer people engaged in more productive politics. Natasha Marhia (Chapter 3) deepens the analysis of the relationship between gender and security. In particular, she examines with a critical eye the securitization of sexual and gender-based violence under the Women, Peace and Security Agenda of the UN and the mobilization of gender narratives in the War on Terror.

Next, Sabine Selchow (Chapter 4) highlights the growing significance of the logic of “risk” for security policy, especially in the West, and examines some if its far-reaching implications. She introduces two different approaches to risk in this context. The first approach reflects the increased reliance on the concept of risk in security practices, setting in motion important dynamics that have implications extending well beyond the security field itself. These developments require sustained public discussion because what is at stake here, Selchow argues, is nothing short of the future of affected societies. The second approach emerges from Ulrich Beck’s work on “global risk” and “risk society”, and here the main implication is the need to rethink modern (security) institutions.

The final contribution to this part of the book is Mary Kaldor’s discussion of human security (Chapter 5). The concept of human security came to the fore in the 1990s and since then it has attracted multiple critiques articulated from diverse positions and perspectives. Kaldor traces the evolution of the concept and takes issue with its radical critics, arguing that these critiques could be seen as representing the discursive achievement of the War on Terror. She suggests that the critical debates about what it is to be human, the meaning of security, and the use of the idea of biopower, add value and could help substantiate the concept of human security. The problem is their normative standpoint. By taking human security as their target, Kaldor argues, the radical critics have fallen into the trap set by the War on Terror and contributed to the narrowing of emancipatory space. The challenge is to reconstitute the idea of human security by harnessing some of the insights introduced by its critics.

Part II shifts the focus from concepts to risks that constitute key policy arenas in the evolving landscape of global security. Maria Rost Rublee (Chapter 6) discusses the related fields of nuclear disarmament and nonproliferation, starting with a critical examination of the meaning of these two terms. She considers traditional and more recent approaches in these arenas and addresses a series of questions about the
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Frontiers of research on disarmament and nonproliferation, as well as their potential contribution to broader debates over global security. Next, Ekaterina Stepanova (Chapter 7) draws attention to important trends, dynamics, and explanatory frameworks of terrorism and their implications for the pursuit of antiterrorism policies in the early twenty-first century. Her account highlights key insights from recent statistical data, in particular the significance of terrorist activity by insurgencies against foreign forces and their local allies in Iraq and Afghanistan/Pakistan as a share of terrorism in the 2000s. In thinking about long-term strategies to prevent terrorism, these insights call for developing solutions at the level of global governance to the underlying problem of internationalization of conflict in weak or dysfunctional states. Martin Shaw’s contribution to the volume (Chapter 8) evaluates the global policy challenges arising from genocidal violence. The chapter introduces the conceptual, theoretical and political background that shapes this policy arena and examines the character and extent of genocidal violence in a global era. Shaw takes a closer look at global policy-making aimed at preventing and punishing acts of genocide and offers reflections on the appropriate global institutions and policy frameworks for genocide prevention.

John Sullivan (Chapter 9) introduces an issue that is attracting growing attention from scholars and policymakers: transnational crime. He conveys the diversity of organized criminal groups that operate across borders in terms of their activities but also their relationship to global flows and state power. Sullivan considers how such groups increasingly operate as transnational networks and examines the role of actors such as transnational gangs, cartels, mafias, and pirates. The chapter reviews recent developments in key global regions and explores the potential of transnational networks to challenge states through criminal insurgencies. Next, Anouk Rigterink (Chapter 10) investigates the relationship between natural resources and insecurity. She argues that the evidence for the proposition that natural resources cause civil war is not as robust as popularly believed and points out that, from a policy perspective, it is equally important to understand the mechanisms that connect resources and violent conflict in order to develop effective policy interventions. In the final contribution to this part of the book, Mark Zeitoun (Chapter 11) explores the reasons why efforts to promote water security, whether by states or the international water policy community, often fall short of their goals. He proposes a new conceptual tool – the “web of water security” – as a partial remedy, combining consideration for the social and physical processes that either enable or prevent water security. Zeitoun argues that in the long term, sustainable water security depends on the balance between related security areas and equitable distribution of resources among the actors involved.

Part III comprises a set of chapters that focus on some of the “tools” available to policymakers: key instruments of global security policy. Sarah Sewall (Chapter 12) opens this part of the book with a discussion of civilian protection. She examines three approaches that have emerged in recent decades: international humanitarian law; the Protection of Civilians initiated by the United Nations in peacekeeping operations; and the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) norm, which at the sharp end may include humanitarian intervention. While each of these frameworks is a work in progress and may engender tensions, Sewall argues that they create new opportunities for protecting human rights. Henry Radice (Chapter 13) engages some of these issues from another perspective in his analysis of a related policy instrument: humanitarian
assistance. He points out that the definition of humanitarianism in conflict-affected environments has been broadened to encompass not only alleviation of insecurity but also provision of security though concepts such as humanitarian intervention and R2P, prompting concerns that it risks becoming a driver of insecurity in its own right. Radice also introduces the debate over humanitarian space, suggesting that what is often left out of these discussions is the sense that such spaces are sites of governance, which bear out the consequences of humanitarianism for the in/security of the intended beneficiaries of assistance. Renata Dwan (Chapter 14) traces the evolution of international peacekeeping since 1948 – from limited monitoring of ceasefires between states to a comprehensive exercise in enforcing and building peace within states. The chapter shows how the scope and effectiveness of peacekeeping reflects the consensus of the authorizing states and explores the extent to which changes in global governance may be even more important than operational challenges in shaping the future direction of international peacekeeping.

In a co-authored contribution, Vesna Bojicic-Dzelilovic, Denisa Kostovicova and David Rampton (Chapter 15) consider the meanings and implications of a range of international instruments employed in state-building, nation-building, and reconstruction efforts in the aftermath of conflict. The chapter highlights the tensions and contradictions inherent in externally driven, liberal peace-based interventions by focusing on accountability, legitimacy, ownership, and sovereignty, but also considers the turn to hybridity as an alternative framework and draws out some of the implications for policy-making. Next, Nicole Ball (Chapter 16) turns to security sector reform (SSR), introducing the concept with a discussion of its definition, evolution, and application. She explores four main challenges for effective implementation of the SSR agenda: the international political and security landscape; the extent to which reforming countries own SSR efforts; the ability of international actors to navigate the local politics; and the effectiveness of donor approaches to SSR. Álvaro de Soto (Chapter 17) discusses diplomacy and mediation, drawing attention to some of the new challenges and issues that have come to the fore since the end of the Cold War and highlighting the evolving roles of key players, old and new, active in this field. He argues that the War on Terror has narrowed mediation space while, paradoxically, the proliferation of conflict-resolution actors has ended up complicating the search for peace.

The last two chapters in this part of the book focus on the role of law and legal institutions in global security policy. Richard Falk (Chapter 18) interrogates the complicated relationship between international law and global security policy. He examines issues such as nuclear weapons, the threat and use of force, and climate change, arguing that in these domains international law has failed to protect the human interest in the face of structural constraints and pressures associated with world order, such as geopolitical control and the national interest of leading states. On this account, the link between global security policy and international law is complex and contradictory: part adherence, part interpretive manipulation, and part expedient violation. Iavor Rangelov and Ruti Teitel (Chapter 19) examine a range of novel legal instruments for addressing mass atrocity and human rights abuse, usually discussed under the rubric of transitional justice. The authors discuss the evolution of transitional justice in recent decades and introduce the “justice dilemma” – a set of perceived tensions and trade-offs between normative concerns and strategic
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considerations, which often underpins debates over justice and security – and the critiques it has elicited. The chapter identifies the state-centricity of transitional justice as the main challenge for scholars and policy makers and argues for engaging alternative normative frameworks, actors and geographies beyond the state in rethinking the relationship between justice and security.

Part IV of the book comprises nine chapters that explore the role of key actors in global security policy. Mary Martin (Chapter 20) traces the evolution of the EU as a security actor on the world stage, focusing on its contribution in terms of ideas, policies, and resources. The outcome of these efforts, Martin argues, is a distinctive but ambiguous concept of security, the effectiveness of which is yet to be proven in practice. Next, May-Britt Stumbaum and Sun Xuefeng (Chapter 21) examine China as a global security actor. The chapter discusses a range of traditional and non-traditional security challenges that China is facing and the capabilities that are used to meet them. It also introduces the debates over China’s role in global security that are currently taking place internationally and within China itself, conveying the perspective of outsiders but also those internal dynamics that are rarely visible in Western-dominated discussions. The contribution by Jivanta Schöttli and Markus Pauli (Chapter 22) emphasizes the growing demands on India to play a greater role in global security affairs. The authors locate India’s current aspirations in their historical context, which is inextricably tied to the idea and practice of non-alignment. They assess the relevance of India in the global security landscape by focusing on specific zones of (in)security and conclude by examining some of the constraints and challenges that are shaping India’s contribution to global security.

Turning to Russia, Andrey Makarychev (Chapter 23) shows how the Russian security agenda is formulated and how security messages are communicated to the outside world. In doing so, he employs the lens of “securitization” and interrogates security discourses, the interplay of academic concepts and political narratives, as well as their institutional effects. Next, Aslı Çalkıvik (Chapter 24) discusses the transformation of Turkey’s security policies in recent decades and their relationship to the broader agenda of global security. The chapter places these developments in the changing policy-making context of the post-Cold War era, emphasizing the ways in which Turkey sees itself as contributing to global security but also the emergence of security itself as a site of major contestation domestically. Adam Quinn (Chapter 25) examines the changing role of the United States in global security policy at a time when its power is seen as declining while, at the same time, many security threats arise from sources beyond the command and control of nation-states. Some of the key challenges facing the United States, such as rising powers, “rogue” states, jihadist terrorism, weapons proliferation, and economic instability, present serious questions about its ability to manage the new security landscape with existing capabilities and policy frameworks, without producing unintended consequences that may be aggravating these very problems or creating new ones.

The last three chapters of the volume shift the focus to non-state or private actors who have become more prominent in the formulation and implementation of global security policy in the early twenty-first century. Willemijn Verkoren and Mathijs van Leeuwen (Chapter 26) interrogate the role of civil society in fragile contexts. The chapter directs attention to the problem of distinguishing between state and society, and between “civil” and “uncivil” in such environments, and explores the tensions
between local and international legitimacy. These problems, the authors argue, complicate the work of those who seek to strengthen civil society as part of broader efforts towards building peace. David Cortright (Chapter 27) distills key lessons from some of the largest civil society mobilizations in recent decades, including the Vietnam antiwar movement, the nuclear disarmament campaign of the 1980s, and the opposition to the US-led invasion of Iraq. While many dismiss the effectiveness of peace movements, Cortright offers a nuanced assessment of their role in constructing norms and values, constraining decision-making options with tangible impact on policies, and influencing electoral, legislative, and policy outcomes. Finally, Shantanu Chakrabarti (Chapter 28) explores the proliferation of corporate actors in global security provision. The chapter relates the growth of the private security industry to broader changes in the nature of the state and governance in the context of globalization. Corporate actors are seen as key players in the global security marketplace but they also raise unsettling questions about legality and legitimacy that need to be tackled head-on.
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Part I  Key Concepts
“Global security” is a powerful idea, yet a settled understanding of the term remains elusive. This is not surprising because it couples together two concepts that are themselves individually contested. It will be argued that developing a common understanding of “global security” is a fundamental building-block in the construction of a better world – a world that works for all its human inhabitants and the natural world on which we depend.

What is a Global Security Issue? Existential and Emancipatory Threats

Every hour, for a growing proportion of people on earth, we are reminded of the shrinking of time and space and the reality of living in a truly global age. It is imperative therefore to situate the theory and practice of “security” in the context of the global, while incorporating the changing realities of the “global” in understandings and agendas of security. If a globalized we cannot define global security and develop a shared understanding of the term, how can we hope ever to achieve it? Concern with semantics is not always academic indulgence; here, this concern is fundamental in establishing what will later be called a global domestic security politics.

“Security”

Security is a fundamental human value. It is the condition of feeling or being safe from threats. Radical insecurity on the other hand is virtually synonymous with a person’s struggle for survival as a biological organism, whether the source of that insecurity is fear of hunger or the threat of imminent injury and death in a violent conflict. Security, therefore, is what Philippa Foot (2001) might have called a “fact of human existence”, namely a value that is rational for humans to pursue because we
cannot sustain social life in its absence, whether this involves attending to the needs of babies, developing communities, or exploring what it might mean to be “human”.

“Security” performs its central political role as a “speech act” (Buzan, Wæver, and de Wilde 1998, p. 26) and once an issue is labeled “security”, things happen. Significant features of world affairs over recent centuries can be explained by the power of the label “national security”. This chapter will explore the meaning and significance of the label “global security” to see whether it should or could have similar future leverage.

“Security” in the context of politics comprises three key elements: a referent (some person, group, or entity that is threatened); an actual or impending danger to that referent (a threat to which a probability of risk can be assigned); and the desire of the referent to be free from the dangers identified (resulting in strategies to mitigate or escape from them). How individuals and groups think about these elements in particular situations involves choices deriving from their most basic ideas about politics. One’s underlying political theory (even if not explicitly articulated) shapes security choices regarding the referent to privilege (particular collectivities or individuals?), the threats and risks to be prioritized (which danger is most pressing and/or most consequential?), and the strategies to be pursued (by confrontation or cooperation?).

Mainstream opinion in academic International Relations (IR) generally defends a narrow concept of security, focusing on the so-called nation-state as the privileged referent, war as the ultimate danger, and successful military strategy as the basic mode of survival. The concept has been broadened since the end of the Cold War to include other referents, dangers, and strategies. The way for this significant move in thinking about international relations was lit earlier by – among others – Johan Galtung (1971) with his idea of “structural violence” and Richard Falk (1975) with his framework of “world order” values. This rethinking of the security of real people in real places, as opposed exclusively to “national security”, helped encourage the reconceptualizing of security beyond (but also including) the Westphalian international framework.

These deeper conceptions of what is at stake when we talk about security have been built upon in contemporary IR theory, for example, Andrew Linklater’s (2011) theorizing of “harm”, and the “security-as-emancipation” theme in Critical Security Studies (Booth, 2007). As a result of the prizing open of the “iron cage” of statist security thought, paths have been opened to explore poverty, patriarchy, tyranny, environmental destruction, cultural imperialism, and so on as legitimate concerns for Security Studies in addition to interstate war and other aspects of the traditional agenda.

“Global”

The term “global” is hardly more settled than “security” itself. In academic and political discourse “global” is generally used lazily. It is assumed that we know what is “global” when we see it, or that we will accept its promiscuous usage in publications uncritically. The following discussion emphasizes analytical clarity and offers a particular conceptualization, while accepting that the term will remain somewhat contested, characteristic of art not science.