



BUILDING SUSTAINABLE FUTURES
Enacting Peace and Development
ipra
2008 GLOBAL CONFERENCE
UNIVERSITY OF LEUVEN, BELGIUM
15-19 JULY

Wednesday, 16 July 2008, 20:00-21:30
Sint-Michielskerk, Peace Church, Leuven

Hans Günter Brauch

Reconceptualizing Security and Peace in the 21st Century

Ladies and gentleman, dear colleagues and friends,

Welcome to this very special book launch event from the Peace Pulpit in Sint-Michielskerk in Leuven. I am very grateful to IPRA and our Secretary General Luc Reychler and his team for this unique opportunity. Two friends and co-editors cannot be with us. Prof. Bechir Chourou from Tunisia did not get a new passport to accept the invitation and Prof. Patricia Kameri-Mbote from Nairobi had other obligations in Kenya that prevented her to be with us tonight.

I am grateful to *Naresh Dadhich*, *Frederik Arends* and *Jacob Emmanuel Mabe* who agreed at short notice to share with us three philosophical and religious perspectives on security. Ursula Oswald Spring will introduce into the thinking on peace in three Cosmo-visions, while I will outline the context of this publication project of 11 co-editors from 10 countries.

The *Hexagon Book Series on Human and Environmental Security and Peace* is influenced by the scientific discourse in the peace, security, development and environment community. We are pleased to introduce to you tonight the first of a three volume *Security Handbook for the Anthropocene*. According to the Nobel Laureate, Paul Crutzen, the Anthropocene stands for the new era in earth history where our economic behaviour has contributed to an anthropogenic climate change. Thus, *we are the threat* for environmental and climate security!

The 'Hexagon' of this book series stands for six factors that are contributing to global environmental change: three anthropogenic factors: demographic change and our life, work and consumption in urban and rural systems, as well as three ecosystem factors: climate change, water scarcity and degradation and soil erosion and desertification. These six determinants interact in a non-linear way posing manifold threats, challenges, vulnerabilities and risks for international, national and human security.

This *Security Handbook for the Anthropocene* aims at a global conceptual mapping of the reconceptualization of security beyond the dominance of Western thinking that has often ignored the thinking of other cultures, religions and philosophical traditions or has used the cultural dimension for the justification of Western military power. Peace requires respect for the diversity of other cosmovisions that enrich our life on earth. A key assumption of this handbook is that three factors triggered this reconceptualization:

- the *end of the bipolar Cold War* in 1989, symbolized by the fall of the Berlin Wall;
- *globalization* with its new security dangers posed by non-state actors (organized crime, terrorists but also those bankers that are responsible for the global banking crisis); and
- *global environmental and climate change*.

These three factors have contributed to three changes of the conceptualization of security:

- a *widening of security* from the political and military dimension of national security to a wider concept that encompasses the economic, social and environmental dimension;
- a *deepening of security* from state-centred concepts of national, regional and international security to people-centred concepts of human, communal and gender security;
- and a *sectorialization of security* that applies to energy, food, health and water.

Since the Brundtland Commission's report on '*Our Common Future*' this conceptual linkage has gradually widened to a "conceptual quartet" that combines peace and security with development and environment. For Brundtland "the real sources of insecurity also encompass unsustainable development, and its effects can become intertwined with traditional forms of conflict in a manner that can extend and deepen the latter." This volume reviewed the six relations among four key concepts since 1990 for the policy and the scientific realm. These linkages refer to four conceptual pillars: the *security dilemma* among states, a new *survival dilemma* in the context of a people-centred human security concept, as well as the 'sustainable development' concept and the emerging concept of a 'sustainable peace' on linkages between environment and peace. In this volume Ursula Oswald introduces her interpretation of sustainable peace while I compare the security dilemma of states with the survival dilemma of socially vulnerable poor people confronted with severe impacts of natural hazards.

The security concept has changed with the prevailing international order. With the Covenant (1919) the concept of 'collective security' was introduced, after World War II the concept of 'national security' was launched to legitimize the global US role and after 1990 the security concept widened and deepened and new concepts such as 'human', 'environmental', 'gender' and sectoral security concepts were added to the policy agenda.

In the UN Charter the security concept is used as: “international peace and security”, but only threats to international peace and the breach of the peace may legitimate the use of force under the UN’s collective security system. The concepts ‘development’ and ‘environment’ were added to the international agenda in the 1950’s and 1970’s. With each concept a specialized research programme of security studies, peace, development, and environmental research is associated. While these concepts have been widely used in the social sciences, systematic conceptual analyses of these four terms and their manifold linkages have been rare.

‘Peace’ is a religious and a scientific concept, and it has been a goal of national policy-making, of international diplomacy, and of many international organizations. As peace requires a minimum of order and consensus, peace is closely associated with law what presupposes freedom. Peace is no state of nature but must always be created anew by human beings, and thus it often relies on legal agreements that are in most cases backed by power. Internal peace corresponds closely with the defence of the territory against outside infringements.

Since the Westphalian Peace of 1648 the defence of the territorial peace has been linked to the monopoly of force by sovereign rulers. Besides the ‘peace within the state’ that was achieved through its monopoly of the means of force and its use, the ‘peace between and among states’ has become a major concern of modern international law since the 16th century. War was still seen as a legitimate means for the realization of interests among states but at the same time they called for constraints during war, such as a continuation of diplomacy and for neutral organizations. In his *Eternal Peace*, Immanuel Kant (1795) went a step further outlining a legal framework for a permanent peace that called for a democratic system of rule, an international organization (league of nations), and respect for human rights.

After World War I, the liberal Kantian tradition, represented by Woodrow Wilson at the Versailles Peace Conference, was instrumental for the creation of the League of Nation, while after World War II, Hobbesian lessons were drawn from the collapse of the League of Nations. With the end of the Cold War (1989 – 1991), war as a social institution was not defeated but it has returned in the form of resource, ethnic, and religious conflicts, primarily within states but also as pre-emptive wars not legitimized by the United Nations Security Council. Since the 1990’s proposals for a new international order of peace and security in the Kantian and Grotian traditions were gradually replaced by concepts of preventive wars.

Peace has been defined as a basic value and as a goal of political action, as a situation of non-war, or as a utopia of a more just world. Johan Galtung distinguished between a condition of ‘negative’ (absence of physical or personal violence – or a state of non-war) and ‘positive

peace' (absence of structural violence, repression, injustice). In his 'civilisatory hexagon' Senghaas referred to six related aspects: 1. an efficient monopoly over the use of force; 2. effective control by an independent legal system; 3. interdependence of social groups; 4. democratic participation; 5. social justice, and 6. a political culture of constructive and peaceful conflict transformation. No consensus on a generally accepted minimal definition of peace emerged.

Peace research as a value-oriented academic programme emerged during the Cold War in the US and in Northern Europe as an intellectual challenge to the prevailing Hobbesian perspectives in international relations and in the newly emerging programmes of war, strategic and security studies. Wolfgang Huber and Hans-Richard Reuter argued that a basic condition for peace is the survival of humankind, and that "talking about peace does not make sense any longer, if life on the planet is destroyed." Discord exists in those processes that threaten life on earth, e.g. by an exploitation and destruction of nature, that lead to mass hunger and to an endangerment of life by military means. For Lothar Brock peace should be more than the absence of war in the framework of five dimensions: a) of time (eternal peace), b) space (peace on earth), c) society (domestic intra-societal peace), and d) procedure (peace as peaceful dispute on peace), and e) a heuristic dimension to move from the study of the causes of war to the conditions of peace.

This review of peace concept in the Western tradition offers only a glimpse of the many other meanings in the Eastern (Chinese, Indian), Middle Eastern (Muslim, Arab, Turkish), African and indigenous Latin American traditions. These philosophically and culturally-determined meanings of peace influence the legal interpretations of the key concept of 'international peace' as well as of 'threat to the peace, breach of the peace' (Art. 39) in the UN Charter. The linkage between 'international peace and security' is used repeatedly in the preamble and in Art. 1(1) as a goal of the UN "to maintain international peace and security", and in the provisions dealing with the powers of its organs (Art. 11, 24, 33(1), 36(1)).

This linkage between peace and security has been analysed by the English School that distinguishes three basic traditions on international relations they associated with *realism* based on power (Machiavelli, Hobbes), *rationalism* relying on cooperation (Grotius), and *idealism* relying on international law and human rights (Kant). These traditions represent schools of thought that also exist in the political philosophy in the East, but also in the Middle East, African and pre-Columbian Mesoamerican traditions that are often ignored in the Western discourses on international relations, peace and security.

Since 1990, the meaning of the security concept as used in the UN Security Council has gradually changed due to a redefinition of the concepts of sovereignty and non-intervention as a result of the debate on genocide (in the aftermath of Rwanda and Sebrenica), humanitarian interventions, and on the “responsibility to protect”. The security concept as used by the Security Council has both widened and deepened. In 1999, with its initiative to protect civilians in armed conflict, Canada introduced the human security concept while the UK in April 2007 added climate change to the agenda of the UN Security Council.

Since 2004, the Norwegian Nobel Peace Committee has moved to a wider peace concept beyond the classic linkage of peace with security by including the linkages with the environment by awarding the Nobel Peace Prize to Wangari Matthai (2004), the IPCC and Al Gore (2007) and development by awarding it to Muhammad Yunus and the Grameen Bank (2006).

Kofi Annan’s High-Level Panel on Security Threats, Challenges and Reform (2004) referred to a wider conceptualization of security that includes non-military security dangers, while the “Outcome Document” of the General Assembly (2005) requested a debate on human security.

Many governments of the G 77 opposed the widening and deepening of the security concept. For some countries national security implies foremost ‘regime security’. Thus, the debate on the four concepts of the conceptual quartet and their linkages is highly political.

While the Western tradition of the thinking on international peace and security prevailed during the debates on the emerging UN Charter in Dumbarton Oaks, Chapultepec and in San Francisco, with the decolonization process and the gradual shift of political and economic weight from the OECD countries to the BRIC states, the thinking on peace and security in other cultural, religious and philosophical traditions matters. The UN Charter has been a dynamic document that does not freeze the dominance of Western thinking; rather it must reflect the diversity that is fundamental to the UN with its close to 200 member states.

After a survey by Ursula Oswald Spring on three cosmovisions on peace the next three speakers will offer a summary of four of 11 chapters focusing on the religious, philosophical and cultural thinking on security. Naresh Dadhich will speak on the security concept in Hinduism and in contemporary political philosophy and ethics in India, while Frederik Arends will examine the Western realist tradition from Homer to Hobbes, and Jacob Emmanuel Mabe will present us the security thinking in African philosophy, ethics and history of ideas. These cosmovisions on security matter for the discussions on peace and security within the United Nations General Assembly and the Security Council.