

ГЛАВА 2

ТЕОРЕТИЧЕСКИЕ ВОПРОСЫ МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫХ ОТНОШЕНИЙ

NEW FIVE DIMENSIONS OF GLOBAL SECURITY (AMERICAN EXPERTS VIEW)

N. Zharylgasova, F.T. Kukeyeva

Al-Farabi Kazakh national university, Almaty, Kazakhstan

E-mail: fturar@mail.ru

Abstract. Authors analyses the new dimensions to global security. Analyses are based on the American experts' research works. *According to the American experts, in a globalized world, security can no longer be regarded as a zero sum game, with the state participation. Global security and the security of any country or culture cannot be achieved without good governance at all levels, ensuring security through justice for all people, nations and cultures*

The realist thinking traditionally is a basis for analyzing International Relations (IR). In the field of Security Studies, the realist security paradigm – the old state-centered and militaristic view of security – was the main approach for many years. According to the realist approach, states are the primary source of both security and insecurity.

As the Cold War came to an end, the interstate conflicts gave way to a number of other security issues, which led to number of other issues also recognized as security concerns, including illegal immigration, environmental degradation, organized criminality, and terrorism. As a result, a greater departure from the traditional approach to security was thought to be required.

According to the proponents of the realistic approach, states will inevitably suffer from insecurity as long as there is no overarching authority structure in the international system. In the absence of a higher political authority that can guarantee security, states, which are assumed to be rational entities, will make similar strategic calculations. Each will seek to acquire military power in order to prevent an attack. Since no supranational authority exists, states have only themselves to rely on for security, making the international security system a self-help system characterized by the security dilemma.

The security dilemma is analyzed by liberal or idealistic principles, who contend that the negative implications of international anarchy can be modified through the creation of rules and norms that govern state behavior, such as that informing the practice of collective security, for example. Yet, despite the tremendous contribution of the United Nations (UN) to global security and stability, the concept of collective security does not depart significantly from the traditional security paradigm's military-and state-centrism.

The different approaches led to debates between experts seeking to broaden the scope of Security Studies and those who sought to preserve a narrower focus. Scholars who want to widen the agenda argued that issues traditionally associated with domestic policy, such as health, the environment, immigration, and rights, ought to be viewed as global security issues. Given this altered focus, the means of achieving security necessarily extended beyond the use of force and prevention. An increasing number of IR scholars, including some neo-realists, called for a widening of the security agenda. For example, the Copenhagen School sought to set out a framework for security capable of incorporating a wider security agenda [1]. It aimed to establish a more radical view of Security Studies by including both military and nonmilitary

issues and the securitization of those threats (i.e., a way of distinguishing security from merely political issues).

Their so-called sectoral approach classified security into five principal substrates: military, political, economic, environmental, and societal security.

Efforts to increase the scope of security have been accompanied by attempts to challenge the military- and state-centrism of the traditional security paradigm on a more fundamental level through the concept of human security. The concept of human security refocuses security on the individual rather than the state. By focusing on the individual, the numerous ways that human welfare is affected by different phenomena, such as environmental degradation, poor governance, and organized crime, could more adequately be captured. Many of the issues rendered more visible by a widening of the security agenda and the concept of human security were transboundary in nature in that they transgress the boundaries of individual states and thus affect a number of states at once.

This means that effectively addressing such security challenges requires cooperation between states. In many respects, in response to the realization that states needed to cooperate in order to respond to many of the multifarious security challenges identified during the post-Cold War era, a cooperative-security concept was elaborated in the late 1990s. According to this concept, national security was no longer just a national concern; rather, it was also transnational in that no state can claim or achieve security through its own efforts alone. In elaborate form, cooperative security combined many dimensions of all of the above efforts to reconceptualize security, but it went beyond each individual contribution [2]. It went further than the concept of collective security in that it emphasized achieving security with other states, as well as against them when necessary. In some versions, it called for cooperation between states not only in efforts to respond to transnational security challenges, but also to promote human security within a zone of cooperative security, as well as beyond it.

Security through cooperation is vital in a world in which threats to security are often transnational. Transnational security threats are non-military in nature and transcend a number of state borders, threatening the political, social, or economic integrity of a state. The primary agents driving many transnational threats are often non-state actors, such as criminal and terrorist networks, and traffickers of various kinds. This creates considerable problems for states and state-based arrangements that have been established

to deal with more traditional, military-security challenges. It also encapsulates the sense in which national borders demarcating separations between national economies and ethical norms are less important than they once were. The focus on individual or human security, for example, implies that universal human-rights norms override the principle of noninterference that had previously been crucial to state sovereignty.

It is needed to devise ways of addressing the root causes of the multitude of security challenges facing the world. Both the Western and the Eastern experts contribute to this aim by setting out a new security principle, based on the doubt of the primacy of the state and the military in both academic and practical approaches to security. The scholars search for more adequate approaches to security. Some have emphasized the possibility of overcoming the negative implications of international anarchy through collective security, thus not fully abandoning the traditional focus on the state and the military. Others have distanced themselves from the traditional security paradigm by widening the scope of security to include sectors other than the military. In addition, the emergence of a human-security paradigm has called into question the regular focus on the state as the object that is to be secured to an even greater extent, arguing that the individual, and not the state, should be the primary focus of security. Others still have combined dimensions of all of the above.

Today, it is reasonable to say that security involves more than the accumulation of military power. Most policy makers and academics would not argue with the claim that security may be enhanced through, for example, increased police cooperation, institution-building within new states, and the democratic reform of armed forces. Moreover, many would go a step further and claim that human security should be at the center of our attention and of policy agendas [3].

The analysis of the American authors' works showed that the popular approach to security today is THE MULTI-SUM SECURITY PRINCIPLE. This principle aims not only to promote cooperative interaction between states, but also peaceful coexistence between cultural groups and civilizations. It combines a proposed new classification of global security that comprises five dimensions of security – human, environmental, national, transnational, and transcultural security – and the idea that justice is a prerequisite for security. Specifically, the multi-sum security principle states that: “In a globalized world, security can no longer be thought of as a zero-sum game involving states alone. Global security, instead, has five dimen-

sions that include human, environmental, national, transnational, and transcultural security, and, therefore, global security and the security of any state or culture cannot be achieved without good governance at all levels that guarantees security through justice for all individuals, states, and cultures.” [4]

Well known American scholars (Herz J., Fell M, Al-Rodham R.F. propose a to classify global security into five substrates: human, environmental, national, transnational, and transcultural security [5]. The most well known work is *Global enter other countries illegally. The smuggling and trafficking Security Paradigm: “The Multi-Sum Security Principle»* by Dr. Nayef Al-Rodhan. The author advocated a “Multi-Sum Security Principle” that promotes win-win cooperative security interactions between states and cultures based on [global justice](#). This principle insists that the promotion of global justice should be central to [global politics](#), not for [altruistic](#) reasons, but in order to achieve sustainable interests of states and cultures. [6].

While analytically separate, there is, of course, similarity between them. All these authors motivates this classification by the human condition, the biosphere, good governance at the state level, the need for cooperation between states, and the cost of suspicion, frustration, and anger as a result of exclusionary collective identities [7].

The proposed new classification of global security needs the new approaches, which includes five dimensions: human, environmental, national, transnational, and transcultural security

The first one is **human security**, which was defined by UNO as an absence of hunger and illness, respect for human rights and dignity, as well as the absence of violence armed conflict, which huge suffering on civilian population. The UNO Charter and the Universal Declaration of human Rights are the main documents on human security. The Red Cross and the international organizations programs on development assistance have made a significant contribution to the promotion of human security.

Experts also articulate the threats to human security as human mobility, global health risks, instability of finance market, labor market instability, poverty.

Environmental security. Environmental issue is an integral part of international relations in the age of global interdependence and has impact both on the life of the individual and relations among states. Environmental degradation could have contributed to the worst forms of social instability and ethnic conflict. Analyses within IR have investigated the relation-

ships between environmental change and violence and come to the conclusion that international conflict is unlikely as a result of environmental change. They have also used environmental agreements and negotiating processes as an analytical focus for research into the dynamics of international regimes. The impacts of environmental damage can pose a threat to either global security or to regional security. That is why environmental security has national, regional and global levels

National level: includes interconnection among the natural resource base of the state, the social fabric of the state, and the economic development of the state – all factors which provide state’s stability.

Regional level: is determined by unequal distribution (or access to) resources and population size and growth. Unequal access to resources may lead to conflict, including violent conflict.

Global level: today it is impossible for one country to response to global environmental threats and challenges. It lead to the IR enviromentalization. Hence regional and global organizations (UNO, OSCE, SCO, NATO) deal with en-I issues.

Threats to environmental security may lead to the increased severity of natural disasters inflict severe economic harm, destabilize societies, and even contribute to interstate conflicts [8]. At the most fundamental level, environmental damage and degradation affects human security.

Deforestation and threat to biodiversity. Forests cover 40 percent of the world’s territorial surface and constitute for 80 percent of the world biodiversity. Loss and fragmentation of forests may also be facilitating the spread of disease. Deforestation is also resulting in a loss of biodiversity, which refers to the huge diversity of plant and animal species that make up the planet’s local, regional, and global systems [9].

Water scarcity. River Water is one of the possible reasons for rising conflicts between regional states. Water is a renewable source. About 50% of all rivers are transboundary. Water also could be a basis for cooperation on regional level and shift the accent from hydro conflict to hydro cooperation.

World community faces the global challenges: depletion and pollution of fresh water supplies, depletion of fisheries, degradation and disappearance of biodiversity, degradation and loss of agriculture lands, food and health safety, stratospheric ozone depletion, and global warming.

Of these major environmental changes facing humankind, the first five are now, or will likely be,

growing threats to environmental security in the near term; the latter two will increasingly affect human security in the coming 50 years.

National security States have traditionally constituted the primary referent object of security. According to realistic theory the state is the highest political authority and subject of IR. It means that the state has the monopoly to use the force.

Military security traditionally is an important dimension of national security. Military security tends to largely concern a ruling elite's maintenance of the civil peace, territorial integrity, government ruling mechanism, the challenges to national security are militant separatists, revolutionaries, terrorists.

Economic security is another aspect of national security. It is related to the ensuring the well-being of the population. Today the idea of economic security is increasingly politicized and controversial.

Societal security is closely related to and inter-related with political security. It concerned with the protection of the state population. It includes a number of issues, such as migration, the disparity between rich and poor, social movements, demography, health insurance.

Transnational security includes terrorism, organized crime, human and drug trafficking, cyber-crime, weapon trafficking, migration and environmental degradation. Transnational means "extending or going beyond national borders". Actors driving many threats are non-state, such as criminal and terrorist network. According to well known expert P. J. Smith "the growth of transnational organized crime has become identified as prime security concern in the Post-Cold War period [10].

The growth of organized crime is a transnational threat is a challenge for the modern world community. Criminal organizations have been able to make significant inroads into society and institutional structures.

International terrorism can impact states in a number of ways, either through casualties, or by targeting infrastructure which is critical to daily activity as informational systems and communications [10].

International migration is challenge for the world security. As a result of immigration and asylum seekers the governments react to immigration in a alarming manner. Migration has social, economic and cultural aspects. Labor migration is the most important issue in the interconnected world. This problem exists for both source countries as they lose their skilled

workers and those that the labor as these potential responses are generated received.

Human trafficking. Many people in a many reasons are making a great risks to enter other countries illegally. The smuggling and trafficking of human beings has become a worldwide industry, with the turnover of billions of dollars a year [11].

Health. The epidemic and pandemic of infectious diseases are viewed by states as a threat to national and transnational security. Over the last thirty years has witnessed the emergence of new infectious diseases, such as AIDS.

Environmental degradation is one of the main transnational security challenge. Poor governance and weak institutions are often the central problem of environmental security. As Frank Mcnail notes environmental damage can lead to the increased severity of natural disasters, wreak severe economic harm, cause societal instability, and even contribute to conflicts within nation, as well as across borders [8, p.12].

Transcultural security. The first four substrates are, as indicated, represented in one form or another in the above-mentioned approaches to security. They all could be analyzed by the sectoral and cooperative approaches. But transcultural security is one facet of global security that has not yet received sufficient attention.

American experts believe that Security Studies should be concerned not only with threats posed to individuals, the environment, and states, but also with cultural and civilizational interactions. Unfortunately, cultural and civilizational dimension have been sorely lacking in security thinking, with the exception of the Copenhagen School's concept of societal security, which suggests that there exist within states collective identities that are not necessarily coterminous with the state that may become securitized (i.e., elevated to a security concern) [12]. The identification of the security of groups and cultures within states is particularly important within the context of transnational realities, including migration and irregular immigration and xenophobic and exclusionary tendencies in host societies with regard to culture, political beliefs, and religion. A better understanding of different cultures and greater tolerance and respect for diversity could help to prevent or at least mitigate some of the most pressing security concerns of our day [12, p. 45].

Transcultural security could be analyzed at the level of the international political community, alliance-building and the coexistence of civilizations.

Nevertheless, the end that scholars have in mind is not simply coexistence between cultural groups and civilizational forms. This is particularly the case in an age of intensified transcultural interaction. When acting together, individual cultures and civilizations can have a greater impact on global security than any individual culture or civilization could when acting independently. Thus, a plurality of cultures can have a net effect on global security that is greater than would be the case if representatives of individual cultures acted individually [13]. Transcultural interaction and security is a vital component of enhancing security globally, with the eventual goal of achieving transcultural synergy.

Threats to transcultural security. S Huntington analyzed the notion of culture as a source of insecurity in his "Clash of civilizations". Conflicts that are generated as a result of culture are unfolding were societies are undergoing rapid and sometimes intense change [13, p.80].

Conclusion. In the new conditions of globalization and interdependence led the experts to the new classification of security dimensions. Well known scholars classify global security through five dimensions- human, environmental, national, transnational and transcultural- to provide a framework that is capable of identifying the diverse array of phenomena that impact individual, state, and cultural security. All these dimensions are interrelated.

References

1. Buzan B., Weaver O., Wild J. Security: A new framework for analyses. – London; Lynne Rienner, 1998
2. Hough P. Understanding Global security.-London: Routledge, 2004
3. Human security network // www.Humansecuritynetwork.org
4. Nayef R.F. Al-Radham Proposal for multi-sum security principle. – London, 2007
5. Herz J. Idealist internationalism and the security dilemma // World politics .-vol.2, issue 2, January 1999; Fell M. Is human security our main concern in the 21 century? // Journal of security sector menegment. – vol.4, no.3; Nayef R.F. Al-Radham Proposal for multi-sum security principle. – London, 2007
6. The Five Dimensions of Global Security: Proposal for a Multi-sum Security Principlemp. – (Berlin: LIT Verlag. – 2007.
7. Fell M. Is human security our main concern in the 21 century? // Journal of security sector menegment. – vol.4, no.3
8. McNail F. Making sense of environmental security // The North-South agenda papers, No 39, Univ. of Miami, 2000
9. J Golstain international Relations // New-York: Longman, 1999
10. P. J. Smith Transnational security threats and state survival: a role for the military?
11. Vayrynen R. illegal immigration, human trafficking and organized crime. – United Nations University // 2003
12. Center for strategic and international studies // Transnational threats update. – vol.4, No7, July 2006
13. Lieber R. Globalization, culture and identities in crisis // International Journal of politics, culture and society. – volo.16, No2, 2002.

Н. Жарылгасова, Ф.Т. Кукеева
Жаһандық қауіпсіздіктің жаңа өлшемдері
(Америкалық авторлардың көзқарастары)

Авторлар жаһандық қауіпсіздік мәселесіне байланысты жаңа өлшемдер мен шешу жолдарын талдайды. Авторлар қорытындылары америкалық ғалымдардың зерттеулеріне негізделген. Батыс зерттеушілерінің пікіріне сүйене отырып, жаһандық қауіпсіздік нөлге тең болатын ойыны мемлекетпен қарастыра алмайды. Жаһандық қауіпсіздік және әр мемлекеттің қауіпсіздігі, мәдениеті эффективті басқарушылықсыз бола алмайды.

Н. Жарылгасова, Ф.Т. Кукеева
Новые измерения глобальной безопасности
(Взгляд американских авторов)

Авторы анализируют новые измерения и новые подходы к глобальной безопасности. Выводы авторов основываются на исследованиях американских ученых. По мнению западных экспертов, в глобализованном мире, безопасность больше не может рассматриваться как игра с нулевой суммой с участием государства. Глобальная безопасность и безопасность любого государства или культура не может быть достигнута без эффективного управления на всех уровнях, что гарантирует безопасность посредством правосудия для всех людей, государств и культур.