CHAPTER 1
CHAPTER I: SECURITY DEFINED

Definition and Concepts of Security

Security can be largely defined in terms of the ability of states to defend against external military threats. According to Walter Lippman "a nation is secure to the extent that it is not in the danger of having to sacrifice core values, if it wishes to avoid war, and is able, if challenged, to maintain them by victory in such a war." A clear echo of this view of security is to be found in a 1988 definition of security studies by Nye and Lynn-Jones as "the study of the threat, use and control of military force."¹

There are also four notions of security -- that is, common security, collective security, cooperative security, and comprehensive security. In Asia, a broader notion of security has been preferred. The notion of comprehensive security developed by Japan and the ASEAN states is a good example. However, there is considerable overlap in the meaning and scope of these four concepts as they share many common features.

Common Security

The idea of common security, which was first

articulated by the Palme Commission in 1982, is that lastig security does not lie in an upward spiral of arms development filled by mutual suspicion. But the essence of security is the commitment to joint survival, to taking into account the legitimate concerns of others, and to working cooperatively in a number of ways to maximise the degree of interdependence between nations. In other words, the idea of this concept of common security is to achieve security with others, not against them. Most discussions of common security have had overwhelmingly a military focus, emphasising force structures based on the principle of non-provocative defence and military confidence building.

Collective Security

The concept of collective security is a familiar and useful one, but inherently military focused. It involves the idea of all members of a particular security community - be it the United Nations, or some regional grouping - renouncing the use of force among themselves and agreeing to come to the aid of any member state attacked by a defector from the ranks. In other words, the theory of collective security assumes that all states in an international organization share an interest in safeguarding each others' independence from challenge. In
ASEAN, collective security among member states has been achieved without military commitment.

Comprehensive Security

Comprehensive security conveys the notion that security is multi-dimensional in character, demanding attention not only to the political and diplomatic disputes that have so often produced conflict in the past, but to such factors as economic underdevelopment, trade disputes, unregulated population flows, environmental degradation, drug trafficking, terrorism and human rights abuses.

Cooperative Security

The virtue of cooperative security as a descriptive theme is that it does embrace and effectively capture the whole content of both "common security" and "collective security", neither of which by itself tells the whole story. At the same time, "cooperative security" picks up some of the multi-dimensional flavour of "comprehensive security" as well. Cooperative security has been usefully described as a broad approach to security which is multi-dimensional in scope; emphasises reassurance rather than deterrence; is inclusive rather than exclusive; is not restrictive in membership; favours multilateralism over bilateralism; does not require the creation of formal security institutions, but does not reject them either.
In respect to national security, the equation of national security can be solved by attempting to achieve a balance between the threats to the state on one side, and its degree of vulnerability on the other. If threats are low, then vulnerabilities do not matter much. But as threats rise, vulnerabilities must be reduced if security is to be maintained.

Security can also be pursued by trying to reduce threats, this has the drawback of making one's security highly dependent on the behaviour of others. Arms control agreements, non-aggression pacts, and free trading arrangements are examples of this approach. Defensive (military), isolationist (political) or protectionist (economic) measures taken by one state in pursuit of its own national security may easily be seen by other states as adding significantly to the threats that they face.

Although the nation-state is the prime focus of national security, trying to apply the concept to it in concrete terms raises many questions, national security is not wholly, or even primarily, about the sum of the individual securities of the citizens. The security of nations and other ethnic collectivities is often at odds
with the existing state structure, such as in Ethiopia, Lebanon, the former Soviet Union, India, Sri Lanka, Pakistan, Nigeria, South Africa, Fiji, Burma, Malaysia and many others.\textsuperscript{2}

The regional level of analysis fills an important gap between the individual state and its surrounding. For most states, the major component of the national security problem is defined by their immediate neighbours. Adjacency maximizes the amount of political, military, and sometimes economic, pressure that states can bring to bear on each other. The majority of security concerns focus on nearby states. India and Pakistan are locked together in a local rivalry, as are Iran and Iraq, Thailand and Vietnam, and the two Koreas.

Security Complex

Regional security relationships interact with the global pattern of great power security in such a way as to determine many key aspects of the national security problem for developing countries. One can focus on the case of Southeast Asia by applying the concept of security

complexes to the region. A security complex as described by Barry Buzan is as follows:

"... local sets of states exist whose major security perceptions and concerns link together sufficiently closely that their national security problems cannot realistically be considered apart from one another ... security complexes rest, for the most part, on the interdependence of rivalry rather than on the interdependence of shared interest ..."\(^3\)

The Southeast Asian security complex is composed of nine states sharply divided into two groups: a communist-led, and Vietnamese-dominated group of two (Vietnam and Laos); and an anti-communist, western-orientated group of six organized since 1967 in the Association of Southeast Asian Nations or ASEAN comprising Malaysia, Singapore, the Philippines, Indonesia, Thailand, and Brunei which joined the Group in 1984. Burma or Myanmar, in security terms can most accurately be described as a buffer state. Myanmar separates the South Asian and Southeast Asian complexes by being neutral in orientation. Since independence, there has been relatively little direct security interaction between Myanmar and any of its

\(^3\)Ibid., p. 8.
neighbours when compared with the levels of interaction among the groups of states on either side of its border. Cambodia is arguably a tenth member, a country which have gone through great turmoil over the past years. However, the newly elected government in Phnom Penh is committed to achieving lasting peace in a new Cambodian state.

To the north lies China, a regional great power whose presence is a major factor in Southeast Asian security. China's principal security rivalry is with the former Soviet Union, and the two of them together constitute a higher level security complex in which these states are great powers, whose reach and interests stretch beyond their immediate borders. The Sino-Russian great power rivalry forms the core of an emergent Asian supercomplex in which the competing security interests of these two regional great powers increasingly penetrate the three lower level, or local, security complexes on its periphery: South Asia, Southeast Asia, and Northeast Asia.

The formation of ASEAN facilitated the development of a major security community incorporating three of the region's four most populous countries. The Southeast Asian security complex used to be polarized between ASEAN and Vietnam, eventhough the Vietnamese is viewed as a less of a
threat after the Cold War. This local pattern looks stable, and seems likely to define the internal dynamics of the Southeast Asian security complex for the foreseeable future. However, the principal unresolved security issue concerns the status of Cambodia as we have yet to see a lasting peace in that country, and to a lesser extent Laos.

The case of Southeast Asia illustrates a relationship among domestic, regional and global security that can be found throughout the Third World. The governments of Third World states, particularly weak states, will often trade a degree of support for one side or the other in great power rivalries in return for political support and arms in both domestic and regional conflicts. Thus, in Southeast Asia, Vietnam was supported by the former Soviet Union, and ASEAN in various ways by the United States, China and Japan. Such alignments, especially during the Cold War, demonstrate how local rivalries and conflicts provide the principal means of entry for the great powers into the domestic and regional politics of the Third World. Disputes within and between Third World countries make it easy for outside great powers to gain access in order to pursue their own rivalry.
In analysing the security problem one needs also to think about the different issue sectors to which the concept might be applied: military and economic.

Military Security

In the military sector of the national security problem there is a long tradition of equating security with power. The logic is that the more military power a state has, the less vulnerable it is to attack, and therefore the more secure it is. A more radical approach of having a non-provocative defence is that the state would seek to design its military forces in such a way as to maximize defensive capability while minimizing offensive potential. Non-provocative defence seeks to combine the necessary right of states to self-defence with respect for the rights of others not to be threatened with invasion.

Economic Security

Economic security is likewise filled with ambiguities and contradictions. There is, therefore, a great deal of controversy about what the conditions for economic security might be. One view sees economic security in terms of each state being substantially in
control of the resources, capital, markets, and knowledge necessary for its own welfare and power. Another view sees security arising from the greater efficiency and economic dynamism associated with relatively open trading systems. The former argument is most strongly represented by the former Soviet Union and the communist-led countries. As in the case of the former USSR, security strengths lie in economic stability and self-reliance, but it has cost in terms of low productivity, inefficiency, authoritarianism, corruption, and the danger of conflicts between states over resources and markets. The latter or the liberal system tries to generate security through greater productivity, efficiency, openness and freedom.