

DEBATE OF FUTURE IN INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

Z.Nilüfer KARACASULU (*)

ÖZET

In recent years there has been a debate about the future in international security. This article examines different approaches to international security, identifying this debate. Traditional realists' security concerns are mainly based on military issues. On the other hand, liberals believe that security should be defined more broadly as "world security", including all threats to human survival, both military and non-military. After examining both views, this article emphasizes that traditional security issues are more important though the framework of national security have broadened.

INTRODUCTION

After the Cold War, in the 1990s, a new approach to international security have challenged the traditional realist view. This causes us to rethink the security issues in the light of changed conditions in international relations. This essay analyzes the different approaches to international security and emphasizes the importance of traditional realist security concerns though the framework of international security have broadened.

The Framework of International Security

President George Bush after the Cold War told about a New World Order --in which major powers work together to ensure peace and to settle their disputes by peaceful means. Thus, the aim will be to deter aggression, to achieve stability, and to achieve peace. This involves the demise of authoritarian regimes, strengthening the world trading system, and providing structural improvements as of NATO, EC, CSCE to continue peace and stability. In short, with the end of the Cold War, for liberals it seemed feasible to establish peace and justice in international relations based on international laws and norms, administered by international institutions as the United Nations, resting on the commitment of the leading states for the maintenance of peaceful international relations. (Falk, 1993, 145)

Economic developments and advances in technology and communication increase interdependence today. Beyond the world interdependence, is the changed role of the nation-state in world affairs. Transnational non-governmental forces in the world affairs such as MNCs challenge the control of state over world affairs. Also, there is the growth of democracy. As a result of these developments, liberals believe that traditional security is disappearing.

(*) Arař. Gör., D.E.Ü. İřletme Fakóltesi, Uluslararası İliřkiler Bölümü.

Yet, despite the changing conditions, realists argue that this is illusional. People interpreted end of one conflict in the world as end to all conflicts. "The older order reflecting bloc politics and ideological contestation has come to an end. However, the transtion... generate new conflicts and new challanges." (Rupensighe, 1992) For realist, anarchic structure of the nation-state system is the starting point. Furthermore, realism is based on structural considerations and that assumes a constant struggle for power. The anarchial international system requires that states rely on themselves for protection. They have to be prepared for war for their security.

The Security Of Europe

During the Cold War, the security and stability in Europe has always been essential part of international security. The security and stability of Europe was provided by major powers. Each alliance was with one superpower. Thus, the United States provided security to Western Europe to preserve balance of powers. Each country enjoyed the benefits of this cooperation, because under the United States umbrella they did not fear from each other.

After the Cold War, there is a debate over the security of Europe. What made the difference was, after the dissolution of the Soviet Union, some observers suggested that the Unidet States should withdraw from Europe. However, third image pessimists like Mearshiemer "who view war as a result of the anarchic international system" continue to believe that the risk of war in Europe is increasing. Thus, U.S. forces should still remain in Europe. Second image pessimists like Synder "who focus on internal character of states" argue that new European order will substantially more dangereous than the Cold War order, because the Post-Communist regimes will not be able to develop democracy. Thus, the Western countries should assist and support the new democracies in the Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. On the other hand, optimists like Van Evera argue that the risk of war in Europe is low, but ethnic conflicts will increase in Eastern Europe. Western Europe is secure, danger is in the East. So the United States should try to help Europe to build democracy and to decrease hyper-nationalism and militarism. Finally, institutional optimists argue that increase in economic interdependence and integration, and international institutions will force more peaceful relations in Europe. Hence, there are different approaches, to U.S. commitment to the security of Europe.

More recently, there is a debate over the expansion of NATO as to include Central Europe. In January 1994, President Clinton proposed and NATO approved the Partnership for Peace. So far 26 countries have joined. It is argued that a partnership is necessary for an integrated Europe, and also for European security. Furthermore, it is assumed that this partnership will

provide the path to the NATO membership for the candidates who are able and willing to make necessary commitments. According to recent situation, new members will be accepted to the NATO, but the question of "when and how" still remains.

In addition, Warren Christopher, the U.S. Secretary of State, notes that the security of Europe is important for the security of the United States. The United States should act with cooperation not alone against the measure threats --such as proliferation, terrorism, crime and threats to the environment. The United States supports the Partnership for Peace for the European security. Hence, Warren Christopher argues that expanding the NATO membership will promote U.S. interests by reducing the chance of conflict in Europe's Eastern half. (Christopher, 1995, 6)

Three Factors

At the end of the Cold War, realists were concerned especially about three major factors. The first factor is the shift from bipolarity to multipolarity. According to the realists at the end of the Cold War, we are leaving behind bipolarity which is very safe and turn to multi-polarity which is dangerous. Kenneth Waltz and others argue that bipolar system is more stable than multipolar system. Waltz notes that multi-polarity will bring difficulties, but nuclear weapons will be helpful in providing deterrence. Thus, nuclear weapons are believed to be an important factor in security (Waltz, Mearsheimer) which reduces the risk of war by making the costs high. Mearsheimer notes that unpredictability of relationships in multipolar world is dangerous. In a multipolar world, states are afraid of two things: fear of abandonment and fear of entrapment. This is a two way dilemma.

A second factor that realists are concerned about is the offense-defense balance of the great powers. Great powers offensive forces are still dominant as seen in the United States-led coalition success in the Gulf War. But if small forces continue to proliferate, this situation might change. So realists are interested in limiting the transfer of advanced conventional weapons.

A third factor is the realists belief that the major powers must have the economic and military strength to restore peace. They are frightened by the declining economic power of the United States. They argue that the United States should be afraid of the increasing power of Japan and if the free trade is providing opportunity for Japan to grow economically more than the United States. Since they believe in the relationship between economics and security, realists feel this is a central security issue.

The Decline of Power Of the United States

With regard to the discussion about the decline of power of the United

States, there are different approaches among the realists. Kennedy illustrates the disagreements on the question. Some scholars like Huntington believe in deterrence and does not welcome the ideas that there is good to be seen in the decline of U.S. power. The U.S. hegemony is seen as good. Huntington states that who has power matters and the United States should try to preserve as much power as it can. The United States leadership provides security and stability. "If the United States is unable to maintain security in the world's trouble spots, no other single country or combination of countries is likely to provide a substitute." (Huntington, 1993, 82)

On the other hand, Layne asks does the United States want unipolar power is debateable. Being hegemon is not related to U.S. interests or what it gets. There is a collective goods problem. In the multipolar world relations will become more competitive and cooperation will become difficult. The longer the United States provides the leadership, it is better. Layne sees that multi-polarity is inevitable. The transition from unipolarity to multi-polarity will challenge the United States. The United States should try to safeguard its interests and adjust to inevitable emergence of new great powers. Nothing can prevent the emergence of challengers and 'the consequent end of the hegemon's predominance in international system." (Layne, 1993) The United States should rely on global and regional balances of power and follow a strategic independence policy.

Cooperation Under Anarchy

Although most of the realists argue on competitive interests, there is also a belief that cooperation is possible, because the security concerns are lower and common interests among the developed states are higher than it was during the Cold War. "Although each state will to have a significant bargaining resources and leverage over others in order to protect and further its interests, the stakes and the intensity of the competition will be much lower than the case when international politics was infused with deep concerns for survival and security." (Jervis, 1993)

In addition as noted by Jervis, there is a gap between people who perceive the world within **deterrence** and **spiral** model or **security dilemma**. **Deterrence** model assumes that any state can harm you, so you have to resist the other side and be tough. This will be successful in the long-run. In contrast, the **spiral model** assumes that the other side does not intend for aggression. If you are tough to the other side, this will be interpreted as you intend for aggression. Spiral model accepts cooperation and fear of conflicts, whereas deterrence says that the aggressors can be deterred in a conflictual world. The approach in the deterrence model is the military strength and have both offensive and defensive capabilities. If you believe in threats, you have to follow deterrence in foreign policy and

cooperation is not possible. If you believe in cooperation under anarchy, you can follow spiral policy. Hence, spiral and deterrence are two different models of national security discussed in realism.

A New Dimension

The new approaches challenge the realist approach that is given in the brief summary above based on geopolitics, real-politics. In this new approach international security is called world security. Human rights is at the centerpiece of this argument.

The scholars like Brown and Nelson argue that world politics is more than international politics that realist consider. Brown treats the nation-state system as subsystem of the world polity, which is in turn seen as subsystem of world society. World polity is not only a system of sovereign nation states, but more than politics among nation states it involves "corporations, ethno-cultural groups, ideological movements, churches, religious movements, labor organizations, professional associations and special interest groups." (Brown, 1992)

World polity is defined as "the global pattern of structures and processes for conducting and resolving conflicts and making and implementing rules." World society includes "the polity, the economy, the ecology and the variety of cultural connections between people." (Brown, 1992)

Brown feels that realism is not able to adapt to the growth of transnational economic ecological interdependence. Also, realism is not able to understand cultural and moral commitments. He places international relations in a wider global context of economic, ecology, culture and conflicting values. This is a new way of thinking about the global system and it is challenging realists.

Why the world is anarchic? How can we explain international cooperation in particular regions of the world? Is war a normal characteristic of world polity? How can we adapt human rights to the nation-system? These are some of the questions asked against realist assumptions.

Realists focus on nation states, so they consider the international security as a derivative of national security interests. New approach Dargues that threats are becoming increasingly transnational due to increasing economic interdependence, ecological conditions, the wide dispersal of nationality groups across state boundaries and so on. Thus, the world security policy to preserve peace and stability should not only focus on geopolitics and military balances of power, alliance relationship, but has to expand its focus to economical, political, cultural values and nongovernmental actors as well as nation-states. (Brown, 1994)

Finally, there is an idea that we have to set a system by non-state, collective mechanisms. Investing on states leads to increase in military and weapons based on national interests, and de-stablizes competition by threatening others. States create conflicts rather than recoinciling. International system defined by realists on the centrality of the nation-state is questioned. Security defined in military terms does not guarantee, peace, "peace, human rights and anti-nuclear activists, and environmental or defense-industry advocates all have domestic or global constituences that far out-weigh any calculus based on national well-being." The United States can no more be a hegemon. States are challanged especially by non-state actors and transnational processes.

Conclusion

In this essay, two separate views of security affairs are observed. According to a new liberal approach, the focus of security studies have broadened. The government policies should be aware of these new challanges to realist approach on security issues. Furthermore, government policies should be aware about their influence and should not ignore them. However, "the danger of war will be with us for some time, and states will continue to acquire military forces for a variety of purposes." (Walt, 1991) Despite the increasing awareness of the global interests, the nation-state will continue to have important role in security issues. Recent developments of ethnic and tribal conflicts does not indicate that a global security is possible. Thus, it is more important to focus on the traditional security issues though the framework of international security have broadened.

ÖZET

Bu makalede uluslararası güvenlik konusundaki farklı yaklaşımlar incelenmektedir. Soğuk Savaş sonrası uluslararası güvenlik konusunun kapsamı genişletilmiştir. Klasik realist düşünce dışında, liberal bir yaklaşım oluşmuştur. Yeni yaklaşım da, "uluslararası güvenlik" kavramı yerini "dünya güvenliği" kavramına bırakmıştır.

Liberaller, teknolojik ve ekonomik gelişim sonucu artan haberleşme ve uluslararası bağımlılık ile devletin uluslararası politikadaki rolünün değişmesine dikkati çekmektedirler. Ayrıca, demokrasinin yayılması da liberallere göre klasik uluslararası güvenlik kapsamının genişletilmesini gerektirmektedir. Uluslararası güvenlik, devletlerarası askeri ve jeopolitik denge ile birlikte ekonomik, politik, kültürel konularla da ilgilenmek zorundadır. Devletlerin üzerinde kolektif bir düzen oluşturulmalıdır. Realist yaklaşım ise bu düşünceleri reddetmektedir.

Bu makalede, uluslararası güvenlik kapsamı genişletilse de, realist yaklaşımın halen daha önemli bir rol oynamaya devam edeceği vurgulanmak isten-

miştir. Günümüzde, özellikle realistlerin Amerika-Avrupa arasındaki güvenlik ve işbirliği, NATO'nun genişlemesi ve Amerika'nın gücü hakkındaki tartışmaları tüm devletlerin güvenlik politikalarını oluştururken dikkate alması gereken konulardır.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brown, Seyom. 1994. World Interests and The Changing Dimensions of Security. Michael Klare and Daniel Thomas (Eds.), *World Security*, 10-26.
- 1992. *International Relations In a Changing Global System: Toward a World Polity*. Boulder, San Francisco and Oxford: Westview Press.
- Brezzezinski, Zbigniew. 1995. A Plan For Europe. *Foreign Affairs*, 74 (1), 26-43.
- Christopher, Warren. 1995. America's Leadership, America's Opportunity. *Foreign Policy*, 98, 6-27.
- Dole, Bob. 1995. Shaping America's Global Future. *Foreign Policy*, 98, 29-43.
- Evera, Stephan. 1990. Primed For Peace: Europe After the War. *International Security*, 15 (3), 10-57.
- Falk, Richard. 1993. In Search of A New World Model. *Current History*, 92 (573), 145-154.
- Holbrooke, Richard. 1995. America, A European Power. *Foreign Affairs*, 74 (2), 38-51.
- Huntington, Samuel P. 1993. International Primacy. *International Security*, 17 (4), 68-83.
- Jervis, Robert. 1993. International Primacy. *International Security*, 17 (4), 52-67.
- 1976. Deterrence, the Spriral Model and Intentions of Adversary.
- Kamp, Karl-Heinz. 1995. The Folly Rapid NATO Expansion. *Foreign Policy*, 98, 116-129.
- Nelson, Daniel. 1994. Great Powers and World Peace. In Michael and Daniel Thompson (Eds.), *World Security*, 27-42.
- Walt, Stephan M. 1991. The Renaissance of Security Studies. *International Studies Quarterly*, 35, 211-239.

