



---

## **“Transformation of the concept of global security after the end of the cold war”**

---

**Enis Fita, PhD**

Faculty of Law and Social Sciences, “Kristal” University of Tirana

DOI: 10.2478/v10306-012-0010-9

### **Abstract**

After the fall of communist system in Eastern Europe, international relations have undergone a process of major changes as a result of two main processes: a) the disintegration of former Soviet Union and Former Yugoslavia, and b) the process of integration of former communist countries to EU and NATO. In view of the new situation, countries of former communist bloc are defining the tendencies of future development in order to outline recommendation on the policies of adjustment to the new models of regional and global security. Early challenges of global security, during four decades of the Cold War, were the defense of the sovereignty and territorial integrity in the face of threat of the Soviet army. Geopolitical and geostrategic changes that swept Eastern Europe after the fall of communism were accompanied by interethnic tensions and conflict. By now, the concept of security is broader and includes the defense of fundamental values and principles of democratic systems.

The end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century brought about sweeping geopolitical and geostrategic changes. Firstly, the start of the integrative process of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe within the structures of NATO and EU demanded that these countries met the economic and political standards required to join these organizations. Secondly, the disintegration of Soviet Union and Former Yugoslavia

brought about new problems with regards to borders, minorities and ultranationalist ideologies, problems that went hand in hand with interethnic conflict, threatening the regional stability. These processes of wide-ranging changes brought to attention the concept of “social security” that focused not only on the countries affected by the process of disintegration of nation-state, but also on the embryonic creation of a global society. \*\*\*\*\*

## Abstrakt

Pas rënies së komunizmit, marrëdhëniet globale janë përfshirë në një dinamikë të vrullshme ndryshimesh si pasojë e proceseve dezintegruese në Evropën Lindore (Shpërbërja e BRSS-së, RFJ-së) dhe më pas atyre integruese të këtyre vendeve në strukturat e BE-së dhe NATO-s. Ato përballe kësaj problematike konkrete përcaktojnë tendencat e zhvillimeve të ardhshme për rekomandimin e politikave të përshtatjes dhe ristrukturimit ndaj modeleve të sjelljes së sigurisë rajonale dhe globale. Sfida e hershme e sigurisë globale, për gati 5 dekadat e Luftës së ftohtë, ka qenë çështja e ruajtjes së sovranitetit dhe integritetit territorial nën presionin dhe kërcënimin e armatës sovjetike. Ndryshimet e mëdha gjeopolitike dhe gjeostrategjike që përfshinë Lindjen pas shembjes së komunizmit u shoqëruan me tensione dhe konflikte ndëretnike. Tashmë, koncepti i sigurisë është më i gjerë duke përfshirë dhe mbrojtjen e vlerave dhe parimeve themelore të sistemeve demokratike.

Fundi i shekullit të XX-të solli ndryshime të thella gjeopolitike dhe gjeostrategjike. Së pari, nisja e një procesi të vrullshëm integrues të vendeve të Evropës Qendrore e Lindore në strukturat e NATO-s e BE-s kërkonte për këto vende plotësimin e shpejtë në nivel makro të standardeve politike dhe ekonomike. Së dyti, shpërbërja e BS-së dhe Jugosllavisë sollën probleme të reja me kufijtë, minoritetet dhe me ideologjitë ultranacionaliste të shoqëruara me tensione ndëretnike, duke rrezikuar kështu stabilitetin rajonal. Këto procese ndryshimesh të thella që shoqëruan botën e pas-Luftës së ftohtë, rritën vëmendjen mbi konceptin e “sigurisë shoqërore” .

## Апстракт

По падот на комунистичкиот систем во Источна Европа, меѓународните односи беа во процес на големи промени како резултат на два главни процеси: распадот на поранешниот Советски Сојуз и поранешна Југославија и на процесот на интеграција на поранешните комунистички земји во ЕУ и во НАТО. Со оглед на новата ситуација, земјите од поранешниот комунистички блок ги дефинираат тенденциите на идниот развој со цел да ги претстават препораките за политиката за приспособување на новите модели на регионалната и глобалната безбедност. Почетокот на предизвиците на глобалната безбедност, во текот на четирите децении од Студената војна, беа одбраната на суверенитетот и територијалниот интегритет соочувајќи се со закана од Советската армија. Геополитичките и геостратешките промени кои ја зафатија Источна Европа по падот на комунизмот беа проследени со меѓуетнички тензии и конфликт. До сега, концептот на безбедност е поширок и ги вклучува одбраната на основните вредности и начела на демократските системи.

Крајот на 20 век донесе убедливи геополитички и геостратешки промени. Прво, на почетокот на интегративниот процес на земјите од Централна и Источна Европа во рамките на структурите на НАТО и ЕУ од овие земји се побара да ги исполнат економските и политичките стандарди потребни за да се приклучат на овие организации. Второ, распадот на Советскиот Сојуз и поранешна Југославија донесе нови проблеми во однос на границите, малцинствата и ултранационалистичките идеологии, проблемите проследени со меѓуетничките конфликти, се закануваа на регионалната стабилност. Овие процеси на големи промени го насочија вниманието кон концептот на „социјална сигурност“ кој беше фокусиран не само на земјите погодени од процесот на дезинтеграција на државата, но исто така и на ембрионско создавање на глобално општество.

## 1. Transformation of the Concept of Security

World and the new security environment have undergone radical changes in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Scholars of international relations, supporters of realistic and

idealistic approaches, have had a hundred-year debate regarding the concept of global security. After the end of the World War I, the idealistic approach spread as a result of their support in creating the League of Nations which aroused great expectations in creating a new order and international security. Before the World War II, global security was thought in relation to issues of war, peace and armed conflict. National security included protection of the nation and its territory from attack from outside or internal turmoil<sup>††††††††</sup>. Whereas, after World War II, during the 45 years of the Cold War, gained pace the realist school of thought which would be based on the theory of balance of power between the U.S. and the Soviet Union as a method for managing power and uncertainty. Under the realistic approach, if one party was trying to increase its military strength, the other party must respond with the same coin, while maintaining some relative equilibrium during the Cold War.

*But will the theory of the efficient balance of power be a method to control security during periods of major changes that followed the dissolution of the Soviet Union and Eastern bloc defensive alliance, the Warsaw Pact?*

The end of ideological, political, and military confrontation, between the East and the West sparked a new vision for global peace and security. According to Fukuyama, the end of the Cold War was not only a rebirth, but a victory of international liberalism as a consequence of universalism of liberal democracy as the best form of human government<sup>††††††††</sup>. According to this optimistic vision, interstate war and violence were already relics of a past that will gradually be replaced by a new era of cooperation between non-state actors and state in ensuring global security.

For more scholars, security is a contested concept and that's why they agree on the idea that security is the emergence of the threat to basic individual and collective values, while disagreeing on the level of its treatment, if security is individual, national or international. In the context of the Cold War, security was treated mainly as "national security" in strengthening the state in terms of military power in order to maintain the balance of power in the bipolar system. Nowadays, this concept of security has been criticized as too ethnocentric and limited. Contemporary scholars argue that the expanding of the concept of national security by including the environmental, economic, social and political dimensions as factors that affect the improvement of peace and stability in the global and local

context. Buzan argues for a vision of security that includes the terms of political, economic, social, environmental and military as well, which should become part of the agenda of global security policies<sup>§§§§§§§§</sup>. According to this vision, national security has to be resized to fit the dynamics of changes of the early 90s.

The end of the twentieth century brought profound geopolitical and geostrategic changes. Firstly, the process of rapid integration of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe into NATO and EU's structures needs the rapid completion at the macro level to political and economic standards for these countries. Secondly, the dissolution of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia brought new problems with boundaries, minorities and ultranationalist ideologies associated with ethnic tensions threatening regional stability. These profound changes that accompanied the post-Cold War, increased attention on the concept of "social security" focused not only for societies affected by the process of dismantling the state-nation, but also on creating an embryonic global society<sup>\*\*\*\*\*</sup>.

The globalization process has been accompanied by new risks to global security. Risks arising out of control at the state level such as the international monetary system crises, global warming, international terrorism, disasters from nuclear accidents etc. So in the new century the debate has focused on global and international security as a result of dramatic changes in world politics under the influence of the globalization process. There is a general opinion that, to cope with this dynamic change, need re-conceptualisation of a common agenda on global security between state and non-state actors.

This necessity is due to the transformation of the concept of national security under the influence of positive and negative effects of globalization process. The positive effect of this process makes the necessary cooperation among states in the context of a globalized economy, interdependence in environmental issues, war, threat of international terrorism, defence against cyber crime, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, etc.,. Laeler argues that the rise of multilateralism caused by globalization helps to facilitate dialogue at national level of decision-making elites in setting common goals for global security<sup>††††††††</sup>. Second, the negative effects of globalization affects national security as a result of rapid changes in social structure, increasing economic inequality, challenges to "shock"

cultural phenomena that produce conflicts between states. This mutual process means that as far as the states do not have the required capacity to cope with these challenges on their own, it becomes necessary to find multilateral solutions to create common agendas for cooperative regional and global security.

## **2. Global security agenda in a multi-polar international order**

The world has changed greatly since the creation of the Western alliance just before the end of World War II. The end of the bipolar order of the Cold War, the collapse of communism as a political system, economic and social change in the geopolitical map of the eastern block (the disintegration of USSR and Yugoslavia), 9/11 and the global fight against terrorism, the rise of China and India as global power and process of globalization, combined together to produce a kind of global system uncertainty<sup>\*\*\*\*\*</sup>. The old division concept, East-West, North-South, NATO-Warsaw Treaty, now no longer helps the perception of changes and challenges of a new international environment.

The complex nature of these challenges calls for coordinated international action, because no country - not even the United States, with its power - can successfully cope with their treatment only. However, the necessity for a common approach on global security is one thing, but practicing it into a sustainable action is quite another. The Cold War was the only period in which the Western alliance, in general, remained united for almost half a century as a result of a common external threat. The United States also played a key role in the completion of the cold war by creating a common Western approach to management of democratic transitions in Eastern Europe, the reunification of Germany, and the dissolution of the Soviet Union.

The end of the Cold War not only brought to an end the old bipolar order, but as well to the role that the United States had played for nearly half a century in world affairs. Common perspectives for the security of the Western Allies gave way to new divergences and frictions. Common approaches found difficulties due to the concern of Europe's focus on domestic issues, the growing sense of

exclusion and victimization of Russia and the failure to include as participants with full rights in the growing global powers like China and India. In the 1990s, the leitmotifs of US in relation to the main global changes were "Europe united and free," "new world order", "democratic enlargement process in view of NATO membership for countries of the former Pact Warsaw "etc. However, the idea of a "new world order" was quickly eclipsed as a result of failure of the international community to resolve tensions arising from the disintegration of Yugoslavia.

This idea would eventually change the events that occurred after terrorists' attacks of 9/11. Because these attacks were run directly on US soil, the US reacted to the terrorist challenge using the functional logic of the Cold War declaring "global war on terror". The document of National Security Strategy of 2002, confirmed the US doctrine of "prevention" which was granted the right to overthrow regimes that represented a potential threat or perceived security of US, highlighting a unilateral approach that US remain a power unattainable and more influential in world.

But in the long term perspective, the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, along with the global fight against terrorism, failed to yield the desired expectations regarding peace and stability in the region and beyond. Therefore, Obama's doctrine is focused towards a more multilateral approach focusing more on issues of international peace and security instead of democratization through radical changes of regimes, in more respect for other cultures instead of implementing of successful American model as the only universally applicable model. Basically, the big change came as a result of new priorities in changing landscape of global security and to face new challenges, such as global financial crisis, threats to the world trade system and issues of energy and environmental security etc. It is natural that national approach concerning to external threats to state security became larger than the states themselves. In this case, is needed a new international agenda for global security and world prosperity, including:

#### **a. Rebuilding of international financial architecture after the 2008 crisis**

Today the international financial and economic crisis, which spread rapidly, highlights the large scale of global financial interdependence as well as the inadequacy of existing mechanisms to develop a joint response against the dangerous spirals created by it. International action, in short

term, was based on injecting new capital into the global economy, while in long term to reform the international financial system.

However, the consensus on global challenges will not necessarily increase world security. The dilemma between competition and cooperation in the international sphere is more acute because the actors are not only states but also non-state actors which appear even stronger in sectors that have traditionally been state functions. While today's security problems can not be solved by a single state or a group of states, paradoxically, they remain keen to provide solutions to problems in a world that they do not control.

For the first time the International Monetary Fund, since its creation in Bretton Woods conference of 1944 didn't play a role in this huge financial crisis. This was why the Europeans, led by British Prime Minister Brown, called for a summit of Group of 20 (G20) world economic powers to consider the creating a "Bretton Woods II", bypassing not only the IMF but the G7/G8 group. The G20 summit, which was held in Washington, highlighted a growing awareness that the old frame of G7/G8 and international financial institutions do not reflect the current distribution on economic powers and their influence worldwide. The importance of this in relation to safety was confirmed in the debate of the General Assembly of the UN in July 2009 that was focused specifically on the extent to which peace and stability are threatened by poverty reduction and insufficient resources, environmental changes and weak capacity of the state.

#### **b. Strengthening energy security, developing a sustainable environmental policy and strengthening the nuclear non-proliferation regime.**

Global energy demands are projected to be double over the next two decades, driven largely by the increasing demand of China, India and other developing global economic powers. These development trends pose risks to energy security, due to interruptions of supply, competition for resources and control of severe climate impacts arising from rapid growth of greenhouse effects.

Global challenges are different: from the promotion of efficient energy markets, diversification of energy supply alternatives, development of mechanisms to moderate the pace of supply and demand in order to offset the shocks from price fluctuations, promoting finance global considerably, to promote energy efficiency and energy of renewable technologies, etc. Similarly, the International Energy Agency can play an important role for legal commitments embodied in the ECT



procedure. To get these functions, IEA has needed to expand its membership beyond the members of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), including other large consumers like China and India. Besides this, China and India are not only big consumers but also are becoming big energy pollutants of planetary environment. Thus, the major international challenge will be to bring these countries together with developed Western economies, in a workable regime of the global climate change.

Regarding the non-proliferation and disarmament of nuclear weapons, although for a very long time major military powers have regarded nuclear weapons as a symbol of state authority, today is visible on their self awareness concerning devastating effects due to the principle of self-defense. At the summit of the UN Security Council's, which took place in September 2009 on non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament, Barack Obama recalled former President Reagan's statement that: "a nuclear war can not be won and should never be fought".

The old paradigm of security, as a result of the impasse created by a bipolar military order for nearly five decades of the Cold War, is no longer valid. New challenges of the 21st century that affect global security and prosperity arise from insufficient resources and nationalist trends, impacts of climate change including massive migrations that can produce new intercultural conflicts and management of humanitarian emergencies which exceed local capacity etc. Therefore, is needed a new paradigm of security in symbiotic with remodelling of institutions and interstate relations. Cooperation and consensus become indispensable for achieving the goal of global security. As Kofi Annan said, in 2004,: "The war in Iraq, terrorist attacks against U.S. and other events of recent years have succeeded in splitting of consensus and on what we must consider today as threats to global peace".

### **3. New threats to global security**

Immediately after the fall of the Berlin Wall, it became quite clear that collective security can not be defined simply as the continued lack of international armed conflict, as it had been considered during the Cold War. UN Security Council, in the decades of 90s, will describe the humanitarian crises and the massive displacement of population, as threats to regional and global security. In parallel, the international dimensions of security such as: AIDS, arms and drug trafficking, international terrorism and environmental disasters, have been

discussed by experts and representatives of national governments, sparking a trend that has been described by critics as a national and global challenges security.

National security doctrines have a clear tendency to support the principles of sovereignty and national interests, but already threats to national security can be converted quickly to threats to global security. It is clear that more powerful states today share the concerns in their respective areas, which indicates that security still has a traditional geo-strategic dimension. It is also clear that the list of problems, that are common to these global players, is expanded significantly to include and so-called non-traditional or asymmetric threats. Such threats are common threats to global players in a global context. Below are listed three categories that represent a large-scale the modern threats:

1. Geographical dimension of security, give support to the creation of stable and developed regions which can increase their security by trying to avoid the consequences of problems at their borders. Given that a conflict of global proportions is not inevitable, the conflicts - either internal or regional – mainly belong in the category of geographical threats. For example, perception of safety in South Africa is closely linked with security in the region and Africa in general. Armed conflict in August 2008 between Georgia and Russia, also demonstrated the ideological divisions within the EU and exposing clearly the need to be groomed interests of Russia, EU and NATO in areas of their common neighborhood.

However, there is dissimilarity between consolidated powers and new powers. Internal threats tend to be analyzed in the same framework as external threats. Poverty, food, water, energy security and unemployment are also considered as internal threats, but also as regional ones. This report illustrates the close proximity of the acute problems within regions, especially when they are problems of human security. As in the case of human displacement situations can generate a mass exodus which presents immediate problems for neighboring countries, as well as human traffic and smuggling structures can have a lasting impact beyond the borders of the region. In any case, only regional solutions can fight the spread of the impact of human emergencies.

2. In contrast, the new catalog of threats - those that actually should be called more than contemporary, non-traditional - is not closely related to the geographic dimension. Transnational crime networks operating from different locations simultaneously and can affect the

national interests of overseas trade; cyber attacks initiated by a simply computer from a remote location can paralyze a country, as well as and infectious diseases can spread today, traveling across the globe with the same speed with planes and trains. These new challenges are created mostly by non-state actors who possess the means and opportunities offered by globalization. For threats in this category is significant that terrorism, today, is not in the top list of security agenda for the most important global actors. U.S. President Obama has erased from the official lexicon the phrase, "war on terror", as well the reducing as the core priority of the anti-terrorist challenge set by the Bush administration. Qualitative difference is that U.S. policy now seems to be mainly carried out within the framework of international law.

3. A third category, which includes both contemporary and traditional threats, includes those threats that potentially affect the existence of humanity, such as nuclear proliferation and climate change. However, the level of international solidarity that is needed to avoid and eliminate such threats is particularly high, especially in the absence of a central authority with sufficient resources. However, today the priority for all global actors is, to rescue the global economy without losing the competition, which leaves little room for policies of redistribution and global solidarity.

According to some recent reports, the realization of the UN Millennium Development Goals is at stake, and contributions and international commitments are deferred while poverty is speeded in the regions of the globe which are now in a status of extreme poverty. Global actors seem to be concerned mainly in domestic economic growth as an internal dimension to their safety, and usually try to link economic success with leadership in addressing current challenges and threats common. In the context of "green revolution", Brazil is trying to promote the production and export of clean energy, while China seems to be particularly interested in achieving financial autonomy and even it is becoming challenging of the dollar as reserve currency. In this and in other contexts, new actors feel the need for representation of their weight in international institutions, so that negotiation and compromise can transform the register of threats of the potential conflicts in a register of common challenges.

## Conclusion

The fact that more and more new global actors are engaged in global issues, presents a unique opportunity for an effective multilaterals approach. Also, the solution of financial and economic crisis can be turned into an opportunity to rectify abuses of dominant economic system, starting with the norms that should keep internationally under the responsibility private actors whose their decisions have global consequences. Perhaps it is time to strengthen the law and international architecture in regional level, including the guarantees that fundamental human rights would not be violated again in the name of democracy, it is time for negotiation and compromise through a vigorous diplomatic action based on values and principles.

Also, both a critical and urgent task is to find concrete solutions for a sustainable development that could prevent dangerous climate change and the beginning of a real nuclear disarmament. Some of these processes have started or have recently resumed where new actors have shown their willingness to help the global consensus on the most pressing challenges. All global players are aware of the urgency in taking drastic measures to try to prevent climate change. Despite these positive steps, the dilemma is whether powerful states are willing to provide necessary contributions that could pave the way to effective engagement to establish appropriate mechanisms to face of with new realities. The most notable feature of the international order is difference between, identifying acute threats and sustained challenges and the availability of resources to meet these challenges. Mechanisms of action are scarcer and global actors, despite the broad consensus that the use of force can not stop terrorism, yet increase their defense budgets to justify the need to combat terrorism.

Sovereignty, today, can not be the foundation on which states face of the threats, based on the traditional model under which the state is the guarantor of security of citizens, including protection against threats "external". In parallel, the fragmentation of the world makes even more difficult the forum to find solutions to challenges that are more deeply connected. Perhaps the time has come for a major global agreement which legitimate interests of states based on solidarity and international cooperation.

## References

1. Baylis, J. (2001). *Globalization of World Politics: an introduction to international relations*. Oxford University Press
2. Mingst, A.K. (2007). *Essentials of International Relations*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. The Norton Series in World Politics
3. Fukuyama, F. (1993). *The End of History and the Last Man*. Penguin Books Limited
4. Buzan, B. (1983). *Peoples, States and Fear: the national security problem in international relations*. London: Wheatsheaf Books
5. Baylis, J. (2001). *Globalization of World Politics: an introduction to international relations*. London: Oxford University Press
6. Weaver, O. (1993). *Identity, Migration and the New Security Agenda in Europe*. London: Pinter Publishers Ltd.
7. Hutchings, R. (2009). *The United States and the emerging global security agenda*. Chaillot Paper