ABSTRACT
All over the world the concern for security is a basic pre-occupation of every individual, community and indeed, of every nation. This is because security affects not only the satisfaction of human aspiration, but also the fundamental issue of national interest. It is only under a secure atmosphere that individual within the state can engage in productive activities to meet their needs. Similarly, it is under a secure atmosphere that the state can mobilize its human and material resources for meaningful national development. Accordingly, any threat to the security of any nation is viewed with repugnancy. It is against the foregoing that this paper seeks to discuss the major theoretical issues on national and international security. Methodologically, this paper adopted qualitative method of data collection which involved the use of existing and available literature on national and international security.
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INTRODUCTION
There are growing needs to focus greater attention on theoretical issues in national and international security. This is probably premised on the dearth of theories that can explicate the subject matter of security. Besides, the development of conceptual frameworks to facilitate the understanding and explanation of political world events is urgently needed. What exist are large, grand theories which are not very tidy. Some have tried to synthesize the literature from a legal perspective. For example, Claude’s review of the classical approaches is helpful, and innovations like John Norton Moore’s incentive theory may be inspirational, but for the riot part, there is room for both new and old groundbreaking. It is customary to note that many of the theoretical approaches to be discussed are “borrowed” from diverse disciplines, such as sociology, psychology, and political science, and it is also essential to note that they are not borrowed without revision. Let’s begin by reviewing what is necessary to understand the

main contributing disciplines (as relevant fields of study), and then let’s review the contributions of other disciplines in the context of what might form the beginnings of a “jurisprudence” of national security law.

CONCEPTS OF SECURITY IN THE INTERNATIONAL ARENA

There is no universal definition of the concept of security. Edward Kolodziej has compared it to a Tower of Babel. Roland Paris views it as “in the eye of the beholder” but there is a consensus that it is important and multidimensional. It has been widely applied to justify suspending civil liberties, making war, and massively reallocating resources during the last fifty years.

Walter Lippmann views security as the capability of a country to protect its core values, both in terms that a state need not sacrifice core values in avoiding war and can maintain them by winning war. David Baldwin argues that pursuing security sometimes requires sacrificing other values, including marginal values and prime values. Richard Ullman has suggested that a decrease in vulnerability is security.

Arnold Wolfers argues that “security” is generally a normative term. It is applied by nations “in order to be either expedient a rational means toward an accepted end or moral, the best or least evil course of action”. In the same way that people are different in sensing and identifying danger and threats, Wolfers argues that different nations also have different expectations of security. Not only is there a difference between forbearance of threats, but different nations also face different levels of threat because of their unique geographical, economic, ecological, and political environment.

Barry Buzan views the study of international security as more than a study of threats, but also a study of which threats that can be tolerated and which require immediate action. He sees the concept of security as not either power or peace, but something in between. The concept of an international security actor has extended in all directions since the 1990s, from nations to groups, individuals, international systems, NGOs, and local governments.

CONVENTIONAL THEORETICAL APPROACHES TO NATIONAL SECURITY

Much of what questionably qualifies as theory is strategy or more precisely, grand strategy (which can be defined as the integration of military, political, and economic means to pursue states ultimate objectives in the international system - Hart; Kennedy). Grand strategy usually assumes war is too important a business to be left to soldiers; some countries can be manipulated more easily by a carrot than a stick; and that the best policies extend across many years or even multiple generations. Grand strategic thinking is not always theory, but assessment or re-assessment as in Biddies way of looking at the only two coherent choices in how to fight modern terrorist threats: rollback and containment.

For what does qualify as theory, we can follow Moore Turner’s synthesis and identify six (6) different approaches. It may be helpful to list them at first, and then explain them.

1. Balance of Power approach -
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2. Collective Security approach
3. World Federalist approach
4. Functionalist approach
5. Democratic Peace approach
6. Incentive approach

(1) The balance of power approach has been the most influential and popular approach in the field. The phrase goes back to 1740 when Frederick the Great first coined it in his book, Anti-Machiavelli, but the idea that a balance of power exists when there is “a parity or stability between competing forces” is as old as history. The theory posits, more or less, a “just equilibrium” doctrine or axiom which is intended to prevent any one nation from becoming sufficiently strong so as to enable it to enforce its will upon the rest. The world is seen as made up of rational state actors who do what comes naturally by uniting in alliances or coalitions with one another to counter a threat. Technically, “alliances” (like most international organizations) are formalized in treaty and endure over the long term; while “coalitions” are generally less formal, issue-specific, and in it for the short-term. In today’s world, there are seven great powers which control over half the world’s GDP and have military power projection capabilities, but there are only three great alliances that currently exist: (1) NATO, or the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; (2) the U.S.-Japanese Security Treaty; and (3) the CIS, or Commonwealth of Independent States made up of 12 former Soviet republics. Within the realist tradition of international relations, when nations join a weak coalition to fight a stronger enemy, this is called balancing. When they join the strong coalition, this is called bandwagoning. Balancing can occur internally or externally. Internal balancing is when a state strengthens itself via greater mobilization of resources within its own borders, and external balancing occurs by forming coalitions with allies to pool resources against a common enemy.

(2) The collective security approach was devised in 1914 during World War I as a substitute for the balance of power approach, although historically the origins of the idea go back to Immanuel Kant who first proposed an alternative to just war theory based on an ethical obligation toward mutual disarmament and renunciation of aggression. Hugo Grotius could also be seen as having made some philosophical contributions in the realist direction, although Grotius is better known in balance of power theory. If one goes back far enough, the ancient Greek Stoics could be mentioned for their “international citizenship” concept. Collective security is an approach which sees national security as a side benefit of world order to be managed by some transcendent authority from above. It is the theoretical foundation upon which the organizations known as the League of Nations and the United Nations were built. It rejects the notion that alliances and neutrality can work, and substitutes the idea that “an attack against one is an attack against all. The basic idea is to relieve nations from the burden of having to provide national security by themselves because weaker nations cannot possibly defend themselves, and stronger nations often become involved in never-ending arms races which usually detract from their security over the Long term. It tries to encourage cooperation and peaceful change, and as such, is a peace theory that can be distinguished from the notion of “collective defense” which it is often confused with. Organizations like NATO are collective defense institutions while organizations like the U.N. are collective security institutions. A fundamental collective security principle, as Claude (2005) points out, is that violence in pursuit of change should be a last resort, and any demands for change should first have their perceptions of interest and claims of justice expressed peacefully in some kind of world forum. If this peace process doesn’t work or proves impossible, the status quo must be respected, and far more important is the pledge that nations make to one another in the name of collective security. While there are many contemporary proponents of collective security (Alderson and Harrell) and even an area called collective security law. The easy criticism is that a lot of states don’t like the idea of giving up their national security interests to some international body like the U.N. particularly when that organization has not lived up to its ideals and promises. One of those promises is that short notice would be needed to act in the name of collective security. Another is that victims would be made stronger afterwards, presumably through humanitarian

intervention. The ideal of the U.N. having a system of timely, flexible interventions has not yet been achieved. Some successes exist, however, in getting nations to not take sides in conflicts (other than on the side of world order), and in at least participating in peace processes first as a prelude to conflict.

The world federalist approach advocates a democratic system of coequal provinces, regions, or communities of global citizens to replace nation-states as the predominant form of government in the world. The word federal comes from the Latin foedus, meaning covenant, signifying a binding partnership among co-equals in which the parties retain their individual identity (indigenous rights) while creating a new entity, such as a body politic, which has its own identity as well. The spirit of the law rather than the letter of the law is believed to have more power in being respectful of diversity and distinctiveness both within and between nations. The basic principles of federalism include the ideas that all decisions in society should not be made on a higher level than necessary, and that each and every individual has the right to exercise maximum influence over all matters which concern them. Certain expressions of the basic idea can be found in places like Federalist Paper No. 20 written by Alexander Hamilton and James Madison, where the authors are addressing the citizens of New York on the possibility of the U.S. adopting the federalist form of government found in the Netherlands.

Some ideas associated with the world federalist approach are derived from notions of cosmopolitanism, especially as espoused by the famous deconstructionist, Jacques Derrida (2001) who advocates cities of refuge asylum/hospitality for immigrants caught up in globalization conflicts. Another term, cosmopolitics is sometimes used by those who protest exploitation of labor and the environment at IMF, G7, and G8 summits. Scholarly attempts at working out the details for making global democracy a reality can be found in the writings of Segall, Archibugi & Held or Linklater. Many, but not all, federalists usually advocate things like appeasement with terrorists, especially those with nationalist or separatist motivations. Cosmopolitanism, for its part, usually advocates peaceful coexistence as a means for achieving global security, although there is a place for collective force as a last resort after all other forms of negotiation and sanction have been exhausted.

The functionalist approach, in the field of global politics, aims at establishing a steady, predictable pattern of growth and development in world by creating a series of necessary and sufficient international organizations which address critical needs or important tasks which need to be carried out in certain sectors or regions of the world in the name of human welfare. Common needs unite people across boundaries. The approach should not be confused with regional integration theory which exists in the field of international economics and is the presumed basis for organizations like the EU, nor should it be confused with neo-functionalism in sociological criminology which is based primarily upon the social systems ideas of Talcott Parsons (O’Connor; Alexander; Fox et al.), although the connection between Parsons’s sociology and international relations is clearly attributable to the work of the founding father of Integration Studies, Karl Deutsch. Neo-functionalism can play a role in global neo-functionalist approaches, but the former might be best restricted to a macro crime control theory while the latter is primarily a “civilized state” theory of governance. All neo-functionalist ideas rest upon the notion of synergy (the whole being greater than the sum of parts) where specialized, well-designed institutions and organizations work in carefully-crafted interlinked ways to fulfill vital functions that a state to assume responsibility for. As a global peace theory, functionalism is best elaborated in the works of Mittrany, Sewell, and to some extent in Ashworth and
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Long. Some basic theoretical ideas include the notions that form follows function (hence function, or what gets done, is more important than how) and to function (vital things get greased, not just the squeaky wheels).

Another important concept is functional spillover (an international economics term sometimes referred to as interpenetration or ramification) which describes the implications (social or psychological) when a highly interdependent system regulates action in one sector which over to easier regulation in another sector. Spillover effects are kind of like feedback loops since they can be positive or negative, and often functionalists talk about equilibrium like balance of power theorists do, at least in the sense that sanctions sometimes shape nation-state behavior. However, functionalists have more in common with federalists in hoping that nation-states will wither away one day and people will come to recognize their basic needs are better taken care of by international organizations, and that nation-states which come to cooperate with such organizations, and that economic cooperation will lead to political cooperation. The functionalist approach in this sense is the politics of pluralism, where a framework of interaction between people of different types leads to mutual respect, tolerance, and cooperation (instead of competition -- the unfettered striving for, of course, is the cardinal root of all evil in anomie-strain functionalist theories). Within such a framework, people are seen as shifting loyalties toward whatever agency or organization best helps them enrich their lives, achieve human dignity, or seek higher values. Enforcement doesn’t take place by judge, policeman, or soldier, but by ethical and effective civil servants working in the global bureaucracy which makes up the series of necessary and sufficient international organizations for functionalism to work. This bureaucratic emphasis in functionalism is also its biggest criticism, that the theory tends itself to the possibility of rule by technocratic elites. There have been many attempts over the years to model functionalism and test for integrative effects.

(5) The democratic peace approach is a theory of “responsible government” based on the idea that democracies almost never go to war with one another, a statement first expressed by the philosopher Immanuel Kant in an essay entitled Perpetual Peace (available online). Scholar Jack Levy has called this idea the closest thing we have to a law in the field of international relations, and indeed, it is borne out as true when one looks at the data, as Prof. Rommel has (see author’s webpage on it where between 1816-1991, there were no wars between democracies, 155 wars between democracies and non-democracies, and 198 wars between non-democracies). The evidence is overwhelming that democracy enlargement ought to be the long term goal of every nation. It might even make a good basis for foreign policy (helping out transitional democracies), if democracies were good at that sort of thing (note to reader, the idea that democracies are better at domestic policy than foreign policy is known as Tocqueville thesis). Moore goes further and only good at preventing war, but they peace time goals too - - things such development, environmental protection, terrorism, corruption avoidance, and however, the data showing democracies that democracies are better at human rights, economic famine avoidance, control of ending mass refugee flows. Don’t go to war is disputed by and Rommel who all, more or less, see democracy as a method of non-violence, and (if one can get past the war counting debates), argue that what makes democracies so great is: (a) the Rule of Law, a complex concept, but one that can be quickly defined as no one gets punished unless in accordance with written laws which were adopted through fair procedures; and (b) the culture of democracy, or a tendency to not see enemies and/or not risk war by putting the nation’s youth at risk. DPT theory is currently the most frequently theorized and debated approach in the field of international relations is quite influential in the subfield of peace studies, and is the subject of much ongoing research involving case studies and the analysis of systems theory concepts like equifinality.
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(6) The incentive approach is the name Moore gives to his democratic governance (or state failure) theory that the best foreign policy consists of a focus on rule of law (not necessarily free elections, but a certain mix of principles mostly having to do with freedom of expression), bilateral trade agreements, and the wealth of nations\(^{24}\) (i.e., enhanced economic growth and concomitant environmental standards). Not all non-democracies are seen as a threat to peace, but democracies usually go to war as defenders rather than aggressors against the illegal acts perpetrated by dictators in nondemocratic regimes who capitalize on the incentive that democracies provide in not having a tendency to go to war. The concept of deterrence (as externally supplied incentives against war and terrorism) plays a key role in this theory, at least for the explanation of where, geographically and strategically, democracies go to war. Deterrence alone is never a good idea as the sole basis for an overall foreign policy, however. The basic idea is that there are settings where democracies have failed to deter a potential aggressor, either through sanctions, diplomatic actions, or otherwise. Wars are predicted to occur precisely when and where a potential nondemocratic regime sees an opportunity to take advantage of an absence of deterrence on democracies. It is important to point out that Moore (2005) is not advocating deterrence in the classical Sun Tzu (The Art of War) sense, nor is he advocating wholesale regime change and democracy building\(^{25}\). Well-managed trade agreements might do the trick, but far better would be a full-spectrum international system of sanctions which represents the totality of incentives that may be waged externally against potential, high-risk aggressors before it is too late. It is obvious that this approach has some resonance with the war on terrorism,\(^{26}\) and how that war could be incorporated into foreign aid and foreign policy, but at least three questions remain about the theory: (1) how the theory might apply to civil (as well as interstate) conflicts; (2) how it bridges the gap between realism and idealism in international relations theory; and (3) how any mix of “incentives” (the term usually referring to what nations want in return for complying with US policy, like nonproliferation policy) would prevent conditions of WMD (Weapons of Mass Destruction) blackmail from arising as well as other unfavourable competition effects from occurring. On the issue of economic sanction effectiveness\(^{27}\).

UNCONVENTIONAL APPROACHES TO NATIONAL SECURITY THEORY

One way of addressing the more-or-less “unconventional” or non-traditional theories is to point to a loosely organized set of ideas found in an academic field called “cultural studies” which is a new and increasingly influential area of scholarly inquiry, emerging late in the second half of the twentieth century. Cultural studies takes as its object of study the production and circulation of meanings regarding cultural practices of all kinds: e.g. mass media representations, literary texts, leisure, political ideologies, oppositional subcultures, and aspects of everyday life. There is good use and bad use of theory in alternative approaches\(^{28}\). Bad use consists of regurgitating theory for its own sake or making it so intimidating that it is indifferent to readers and the world at large. Good use consists of tracking debates, questioning the coherence of concepts, and thinking through the implications for analysis. It is important to note that scholars who work in alternative traditions usually value “critique” rather than criticism. According to Eagleton (1991), the difference is that criticism assumes a disinterested vantage point while critique always takes a position within the object of study to elicit its contradictory tendencies\(^{29}\). This dialectical method of combining theory and practice (praxis) is but one of several Marxist concepts that have stood the test of time, and other important ones include Gramsci’s notions of civil society (as hegemony) and Baudrillard’s inversion of the Marxist model of base and superstructure. Studies of Imperialism have also made significant contributions as have Hegelian notions of totality found in world-systems analysis\(^{30}\). There is no agreed-upon set of useful concepts in radical scholarship. What might be best hoped for here are not “theories” in the classic sense at all, but a theoretical vocabulary that enriches many possible pathways of understanding. Toward that end, let’s explore some theoretical
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approaches which might be viable candidates for making sense of the world and/or the jurisprudence of national security law.

**CHAOS THEORY** -- chaos is a concept developed in the mid-1970s on the basis of Mandelbrot’s findings in fractal geometry. Pay no attention to dictionary definitions of the term since any mathematician will tell you that chaos systems are actually very smooth and ordered. Chaos is extremely sensitive to initial conditions, and chaos also refers to the question of whether or not it is possible to make good long-term predictions about how a system will act. Among international relations scholars who have dabbled in it, and there have been many, the preferred term appears to be “complexity theory” which entails the study of complex systems which have multiple components where the system (like a foreign affairs policy) can be described as learning on its own in places where chaos and order interact and are always on the edge of each other. The most commonly seen concepts of chaos theory are the “butterfly effect” (unforeseeable effects follow from small causes) and “strange attractors” (certain forces that trigger instability from the “magnetic basins” at the heart of the system). The most common mistake most people make is confusing the concept of chaos with the Marxist concept of over determination (when contradictions are internalized by further contradictions). Most debates over chaos theory are debates over how much the concepts are based on exact mathematics or how much the concepts are just literary metaphors. Theoretical developments tend to be in the direction of portraying national security law (among other things) as having a predisposition for disorder, complexity, and unpredictability, despite being bound by deterministic, fundamental laws of nature.

**GAME THEORY:** although strict adherents to game theory would say they are more traditionalist than unconventional, the fact remains that relatively recent developments (and much dissertation research), such as the “theory of moves” Brams and n-person, mixed motive games tend to push beyond the standard levels of precision found in pure microeconomic examples such as Prisoners Dilemma and ‘Chicken’ and critics such as Chamberlin can probably no longer say that “due to egoistic nature of actors, political dilemmas cannot easily be solved through the use of game theory.” It is indisputable that game theory has been an essential tool in analyzing national security, international trade, and the global environment since Neumann and Morgenstern introduced it more than 45 years ago. It can at least be said that the game metaphor is (or should be) of interest to cultural studies since there are scholars not only interested in game semantics (logic) but game semiotics (as iconic images, mythologies, or signs). We will skip over the formal aspects of game theory except to explain a couple of basic terms: minimax (the rule of rational behavior, or rational decision-making in situations of conflict); and zero-sum (a situation of pure conflict where a gain by one is a loss by another, but the gains and losses added together equal zero). The most currency that game theory has is its ability to distinguish the best counterterrorism (non-concessionary or concessional) strategy once terrorist (insurgent) hard-liners and moderates can be identified. Game theory has also contributed greatly to models of deterrence, arms race spirals, and the central problem of when an actor such as a state needs to rationally decide when to collaborate and when to “defect” and go it alone. Theoretical developments tend to be in the direction of explaining cooperation in international politics.

**GLOBALIZATION THEORY:** Globalization is the process of forming global institutions, and global institutions are those that operate as though the world were a single place. The term became popular in the mid- to late-1990s and has come to describe the co-evolution of global politics and economics in a postmodernist, late capitalism era of information technology, free trade markets, and reign of multi-national corporations. There are many definitions of globalization, and there is debate over whether it is good or bad, but Prof. Lechner’s website (Lechner a Boli 2000) seems to be influential at organizing the scholarly literature, no easy task since there are just as many proponents of
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the theory trying to reverse the globalization process as there are those who want to encourage it. Brushing aside the debates, it may be helpful to focus on the “mega-cities” idea in the work by Castells on how the Internet is changing the way we self-identify and relate to others\textsuperscript{35}. The theory posits that with proliferation of the Internet (e.g., in third world countries), there will be a decrease in nationalistic competition and conflict, and that the transparent yet anonymous nature of the Internet will help establish some new age of self-reflexive accountability along with increased flow of financial services, images, and culture. Another of the theory’s proponents, Friedman has postulated a “Golden Theory of Conflict Resolution”\textsuperscript{36} which holds that no two countries that both have a McDonald’s had fought a war against each other since each got its McDonald’s. Democratic peace approach theorists also advocate the Golden Arches Theory, but since at least three exceptions have been found (Panama, Pakistan, and Yugoslavia), the paradigm has to the Greens Peace Theory, which holds that golf-playing countries never fight each other\textsuperscript{36}. Globalization theory tends to hold a lot of intuitive appeal for some, and others are quick to jump on its bandwagon or buzzword aspects to make tie-ins with other things they’re studying, like transnational crime, the gap between rich and poor, executive pay, genetic engineering, the growing monopolization of water, or a wide variety of other globalization topics. Specific theoretic developments cannot be readily discerned at this time, and it is apparent that the word “globalization” is often simply used as a synonym for any sort of futuristic vision an author has at any time.

POST COLONIALISM THEORY: Post colonialism is the study of the ideological and cultural impact of western colonialism, and in particular its aftermath, which can be either neocolonialism (continuing influence) or the emergence of newly articulated identity politics. Post colonialism is also heavily involved in historical revisionism, since for most nations in the world to escape the profound experience of colonialism they have to escape their own actual history, a resented past that paradoxically, provides national identity. For our purposes, the theory can be traced to a long legacy in the study of imperialism, with the most popular scholar being Edward Said\textsuperscript{37}, but one might even go further and include certain anti-colonialist tracts by Frantz Fanon\textsuperscript{38}. As a theory of identity politics, it is a theory of doing away with social injustices of all kinds by organizing regional resistance movements that happen to have self-Liberation effects. Contemporary relevance includes the fact that Edward Said’s ideas are quite popular in the world of Islam especially among Palestinian activists. Theoretical development will almost certainly be in the direction of sorting out how much this theory aids or abets terrorism or has other utility.

NEO-MARXIST THEORY: The basic Marxist model has undergone some complex changes, most notably a distancing of itself from class politics and an embracing of Frankfurt School approaches toward the study of fascism and totalitarianism. Other variants have emerged, but the critique of fascism (as the root cause of evil in the world) has some remarkable currency. As such, it is a critical theory of unrelenting denunciation and opposition to mass conformity\textsuperscript{39}. Neo-Marxist research tends to not just focus on authority however, as interventionist policies in the name of national security are often questioned\textsuperscript{40}. Gramscian analysis of hegemony will likely continue to characterize most theoretical developments for years to come since the basic question Gramsci asked - how conventional and dissident impulses could co-exist side-by-side in a conflict-ridden world the masses come to take as normal and “the way things are -- has never been answered. Neo-Marxism needs to evolve, since its emphasis on conflict is quite compatible with the realist or power-politics school of thought in international relations.

FEMINIST THEORY: Other than easy critiques of manliness and the glorification of soldiers, serious modern feminist scholarship concerned with IR theory is usually focused in the post positivist sense, with a changing
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awareness of the many subtleties of identity (of being a woman) — and allied affirmations involving overlapping statuses. No better description of identity politics is to be found than in feminism, where some descriptive factor is chosen from among many and where one factor does predominate but other factors are possible. Other areas where theoretical development might be expected would be something called “neo-feminism” where canonical texts are re-read and re-interpreted.

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

International security consists of the measures taken by nations and international organizations, such as the United Nations, to ensure mutual survival and safety. These measures include military action and diplomatic agreements such as treaties and conventions. International security and national security are invariably linked. International security is national security or state security in the global arena.

With the end of World War II, a new subject of study focusing on international security emerged. It began as an independent field of study, but was absorbed as a sub-field of international relations. Since it took hold in the 1950s, the study of international security has been at the heart of international relations studies. It covers labels like “security studies”, “strategic studies”, “peace studies”, and others.

There is no universal definition of the concept of security, but concepts in international security studies have been defined, such as sovereignty, war, anarchy, security dilemma, etc. The meaning of security” is often treated as a common sense term that can be understood by ‘unacknowledged consensus. As there is no universal concept, the content of international security has expanded over the years. Today it covers a variety of interconnected issues in the world that have an impact on survival. It ranges from the traditional or conventional modes of military power, the causes and consequences of war between states, economic strength, to ethnic, religious and ideological conflicts, trade and economic conflicts, energy supplies, science and technology, food, as well as threats to human security and the stability of states from environmental degradation, infectious diseases, climate change and the activities of non-state actors. While the wide perspective of international security regards everything as a security matter, the traditional approach focuses mainly or exclusively on military concerns.

NATIONAL AND REGIONAL VARIATIONS

The United States is focusing on ‘renewing American leadership so that it can more effectively advance its interests under the international system. This is achieved by integrating all the elements of its power and means of defense, diplomacy and development to meet its objectives, including safety, welfare, values, and a righteous international order. China thinks that “international security should be mutual while not one sided, multilateral while not unilateral and comparative while not absolute.... Security should be based on mutual trust. A country’s role should be evaluated objectively and one country should not seek confrontation with another country through exaggerating its threats.’ China views the safeguarding of national sovereignty and territorial integrity, solving border disputes with its neighbours on the basis of equal negotiation and mutual trust, and having the ability to cope with traditional threats as three prerequisites to its security concept.

Russia’s aim is to protect the national interests of its people, society and nation in broad security terms. It seeks to form a multi-polar world “on the basis of multilateral management of international economic, political, science and technological, environmental and information integration. In a world dominated by US-led unilateralism, Russia continues to play an important role in global processes by virtue of its great economic, scientific, technological and military potential and its unique strategic location on the Eurasian continent.

The European Union has formed a broad security concept and a multilateral approach with the objectives:

- To tackle threats;
- To extend the zone of security around Europe;
- To strengthen the international order.

Many countries in South America especially Brazil, Argentina and Chile, treats strategic stability as its core concept. In terms of traditional security, South American countries tend to solve disputes by peaceful resolution. During the
second half of the twentieth century, only two interstate wars occurred in South America. Non-intervention is still a core value in South America, although human rights and humanitarian crises, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and even state failure have become causes of concern.

The Australian security concept is to safeguard the homeland, maintain regional and international stability, ensure international economy and trade developments and to spread human rights and democracy. Australian security strategy is mainly based on its alliances with the United States and Japan. Africa seeks to promote and maintain international peace, security and prosperity by having closer cooperation and partnership between the United Nations, other international organizations and the African Union.

THEORETICAL APPROACHES

REALISM

Classical realism

In the field of international relations, realism has long been a dominant theory, from ancient military theories of Chinese and Greek thinkers to Hobbes, Machiavelli and Rousseau. It is the foundation of contemporary international security studies. The twentieth century classical realism is mainly derived from Edward Hallett Carr’s book The Twenty Years’ Crisis. The realist views anarchy and the absence of a power to regulate the interactions between states as the distinctive characteristics of international politics. Because of anarchy, or a constant state of antagonism, the international system differs from the domestic system. Realism has a variety of sub-schools whose lines of thought are based on three core assumptions: groupism, egoism, and power-centrism. According to classical realists, bad things happen because the people who make foreign policy are sometimes bad.

NEO REALISM

Beginning in the 1960s, with increasing criticism of realism, Kenneth Waltz tried to revive the traditional realist theory by translating some core realist ideas into a deductive top-down theoretical framework that eventually came to be called neo-realism. Theory of International Politics brought together and clarified many earlier realist ideas about how the features of the overall system of states affects the way states interact: “Neo-realism answers questions: Why the modern states-system has persisted in the face of attempts by certain states at dominance; why war among great powers reoccurred over centuries; and why states often find cooperation hard. In addition, the book forwarded one more specific theory: that great-power war would tend to be more frequent in multi-polarity (an international system shaped by the power of three or more major states) than bipolarity (an international system shaped by two major states or superpowers). The main theories of neo-realism are balance of power theory, balance of threat theory, security dilemma theory, offense-defense theory, hegemonic stability theory and power transition theory.

LIBERALISM

Liberalism has a shorter history than realism but has been a prominent theory since World War I. It is a concept with a variety of meanings. Liberal thinking dates back to philosophers such as Thomas Paine and Immanuel Kant, who argued that republican constitutions produce peace. Kant’s concept of Perpetual Peace is arguably seen as the starting point of contemporary liberal thought.

ECONOMIC LIBERALISM

Economic liberalism assumes that economic openness and interdependence between countries makes them more peaceful than countries that are isolated. Eric Gartzke has written that economic freedom is 50 times more effective than democracy in creating peace. Globalization has been important to economic Liberalism.
LIBERAL INSTITUTIONALISM

Liberal institutionalism views international institutions as the main factor to avoid conflicts between nations. Liberal institutionalists argue that; although the anarchic system presupposed by realists cannot be made to disappear by institutions; the international environment that is constructed can influence the behavior of states within the system. Varieties of international governmental organizations (IGOs) and international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) are seen as contributors to world peace.

CONSTRUCTIVISM

Since its founding in the 1980s, constructivism has become an influential approach in international security studies. “It is less a theory of international relations or security however, than a broader social theory which then informs how we might approach the study of security. Constructivists argue that security is a social construction. They emphasize the importance of social, cultural and historical factors, which leads to different actors construing similar events differently.
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