

Document Title: Rethinking Security
Author(s): Mladen Bajagic and Zelimir Kesetovic
Document No.: 208034
Date Received: December 2004

This paper appears in *Policing in Central and Eastern Europe: Dilemmas of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, edited by Gorazd Mesko, Milan Pagon, and Bojan Dobovsek, and published by the Faculty of Criminal Justice, University of Maribor, Slovenia.

This report has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. To provide better customer service, NCJRS has made this final report available electronically in addition to NCJRS Library hard-copy format.

Opinions and/or reference to any specific commercial products, processes, or services by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise do not constitute or imply endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the U.S. Government. Translation and editing were the responsibility of the source of the reports, and not of the U.S. Department of Justice, NCJRS, or any other affiliated bodies.

MLADEN BAJAGIĆ, ŽELIMIR KEŠETOVIĆ

RETHINKING SECURITY

In the Post-Cold War international environment concept of security is significantly reconsidered beyond a traditional narrow concept of national security that has been defined in military terms. Globalisation and fragmentation, two contradicting processes that mark new millennium and global society in emerging, as well as appearing of new, global challenges and threats of security, influenced predominantly on extension of concept and system of security in several directions. First of all towards individual, societal and global security. Emphasising some of the main features of globalisation and new challenges and threats to security, this paper is dealing with analysis of terms of individual, societal and global security in relation with national and international security, specifying the areas of human, nuclear and environmental security.

INTRODUCTION

Contemporary discussions about security, one of the core concepts that refer to survival and development of the individual, society, nation and state, are still loaded with the problem of identification its approximate content. Identifying the essence and nature of the security is hard, complex and multidimensional problem and challenge, first of all for the researches that try to be original in scientific (philosophical-theoretical) and political (practical) sense.

In the last decade of the XX century concept of security is displaced from the realistic comprehensions of the national security in terms of power and related mechanisms it was realised with during the cold-war period towards new concepts: individual, societal and global security, including new institutions for reaching, maintaing and improving of the security. Even before the end of the cold-war "traditional state-centric and military-oriented approaches to the security studies were questioned, and the discussion about the character of the security expanded from epistemological and ontological postulates toward its referent object and new agenda of the security" (Hyde-Price, 2001: 29). Concern of contemporary treatises on security is relocated from the national security, prevailing concept inside the cold-war "solid box of international relations", towards new questions: 1/ what is the referent object of security, and what are the necessary conditions for security (Buzan, 1991: 26)? Several authors think that security studies must give answers to following questions: "What is being security; What is being secured against; Who provides security; and What methods may be undertaken to provide for security" (Terriff et al, 1999: 172). In other words for broadening of the concept of security crucial importance had "four areas of controversy: 1/ what is referent object of security, or who or what is to be secured; 2/ what is the the nature of the threat; 3/ who provides security; and 4/ with what instruments can security be provided" (Hyde-Price, 2001: 32). Besides the answers to those questions, and exploration of the causes of the violent conflicts between organized political communities, studies of security should explore also the conditions that conduce to the use of force and establishing the relations of the stable peace and fruitful cooperation (Simić, 2002: 22). In that sense in the content of the subject of the sciences on security should include both dimensions: negative - causes of the war etc, and positive - peace and cooperation, relations between democracy and peace, security and association, and, as the widest, theory of stable and democratic peace" (Ibid, 66).

CHANGED NATURE OF THE CONCEPT OF THE SECURITY

Question of "refinement" of the concept of the security that is traditionally known in political sciences, e.g. identifying its expanded content, implies, however, wider theoretical and empirical awareness about the nature of the concept of security and the terms it is denominated with. One have to keep in mind that exploring possibilities are limited by the fact that it is a complex phenomena, controversial concept of the political sciences, that through the history was often described one-sided and narrow. Security is complex, obscure, and essentially disputable concept (Baldwin, 1996: 139; Buzan, 1991: 3; Baylis, 2001: 254), not only because of its unattainable nature and content regarding the time and space in which it is discussed, but also due to the fact that discussion about security is inexorably connected with other categories: fear (for physical survival), knowledge, absence of the structural violence, peace, welfare and stability, all the way to the freedom in its universal sense.

Even in the ancient period philosophers were concerned with security, discussing the links between security and freedom, and the conflict between security and insecurity asking themselves: how to secure security? How can we know what security is unless in opposite to what is insecurity. Complete definition of security implies concrete relation towards insecurity and vice versa. Security and insecurity goes together - they belong to each other, because insecurity is also product of the mankind" (Dillon, 1996: 33).

As a political conception "security is an obvious precondition for existence of life - individual and societal" (In Burke, 1986: 20) and it refers to absence of threats and protection from them. Security is built in human mind as a biological mechanism, strive of the organism to survive, its adjustment to the threatening influences of the environment. It refers to advisedly endeavor of every individual for physical survival, and all the dimensions of his/hers sociability, existence and acting on universal civilization level. Comprehension of the security as a aboriginal interest of every individual and wider human collectivities (family, society, nation, state, international system) indicates on the need for broadening the concept of security towards those collectivities, so that in theory have shaped concepts as national and international security, and recently individual, societal and global security, which indicates considerable expanding of the seizures onto new dimensions of security.

Need for security has an important place on the scale of the human needs. Reaching the security is an essential precondition for reaching freedom. Security is "the ultimate and overriding human value, the basic condition for life and freedom: security is the paramount value for self-conscious, rational, thinking individuals....; not just an external (and therefore optional) condition of life and freedom but also simply another word for life and freedom" (Ibid).

It is much more easy to define the word security by its absence, then by presence. Sidel and Levy in analysis of this concept keep in mind both components: presence and absence of security. For presence (positive defining of security) they use neologism "freedom from fear" and "freedom from want", two, among four, freedoms that have expressed people's aspiration for security form fear and want (Sidel and Levy, 2002). Arnold Wolfers defines security in objective sense about measures the absence of threats to acquired values, and in a subjective sense, the absence of fear that such values will be attacked (Wolfers, 1963: 10). For Laurence Martin "security is the assurance of future well being"; John E. Mroz defines security about the "relative freedom from harmful threats". In the case of security, said Barry Buzan, "discussion is about the pursuit of freedom from threat", and when discussion is in the context of the international system, security is about the ability of states and societies to maintain

their independent identity and their functional integrity" (Buzan, 1991: 18). According to D. Lake security is "ability of using, investing or using in a some other way of national resources..., e.g. country is secure when enlarging of its resources is not hampered in any way." (Lake, 1996). Ole Weaver thinks that security is least-ways, "question of survival" and that "security means survival", having therefore in mind that security and survival do not have the same meaning for different groups (Weaver, 2003: 365). From Christopher J.L. Murray and Gary King "word security denotes freedom from various risks. Security is not synonymous with the average level of future well-being, but instead focuses on the risks of being severely deprived. My security today is not only a function of my well-being today, but also the prospects of avoiding states of great deprivation in the future" (King and Murray, 2001: 585-611).

Three key elements makes the concept of security very wide area: "the changing priority among security issues caused by rising density; the useful political qualities of the concept; and its integrative intellectual qualities" (Buzan, 1991: 368). The first element refers to the links between the structure of the political fragmentation and the increase of the correlated activities in different sectors that have common fate and security interdependence. Second element refers to the conflict between idealism and realism, conflict between realistic concept of the national security based on power and self-protection and naive presumptions that interdependence and creating the world government could finally contribute to the reduction of the danger of amplification of power in anarchic world. At last, third element refers to the fact that, when talking about the security as an aim, in mind should be kept not only its military, but also political, economy, societal and ecological dimension. So comprehended, concept of security must be seen as enough wide to unite the field of international relations, international economic relations, peace studies, studies of human rights, development, history of international relations, and other fields of science and technology (Ibid).

In Buzan's wide concept "security is one of the most fundamental human needs: an irrefutable guarantee of safety and wellbeing, economic assurance and possibility, sociability and order; of a life lived freely without fear or hardship. That security is a universal good available to all, and a solemn pledge between citizens and their political leaders, to whom their people's security is "the first duty," the overriding goal of domestic and international policy making". In short, security remains one of modernity's most stubborn and enduring dreams of every individual and whole human civilisation; and first requirement of security is survival" (Prins, 1995).

For profound treatise on concept of security it is of utmost importance to define the term security very carefully, which implies at least two things: "agreement on the source of meaning of the concept of security and the widest description of the term; how much security; against which threats to security; and what are the means of security". It is necessary to answer this questions in order to use the term security, as an analytic term in correct way, but two of those are fundamental: security from whom and security of which values (Moller, 2000:7). However, this is not a final list of important questions for the researchers. Concept of security can be extended beyond national security "along different axes, e.g. extension might have the form of the answers to the different questions: "Security of whom?; Security of what?; Security from whom? Security from what; Security by whom?; and Security by which means? (Ibid, 9-10).

As an activity, security is associated with protective function of the state, where this activity implies practicing a number of concrete operations and doings of different state organs and agencies and/or other subjects that participate in realizing this protec-

tive function (Stajić, 2003: 12-13). Security, as an activity is inseparable attribute of the state, implying practicing security tasks in order to protect certain values.

Security is also defined as a "state in which balanced physical, spiritual, mental and material survival of the individual and societal community towards other individuals, societal community and nature is assured" (Grizold, 1998: 27). It represents "by legal means established and provided and by social relations embedded, maintained and improving conditions in the state that enables effective protection of the state and its citizens against all (external and internal) illegal acts (activities) aimed to endanger the constitutional order, sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity, work of the state organs, economy and social activities and realizing freedoms, rights and obligations of the men and citizen" (Miletić, 1997: 13).

State, consequently, has and can have only three functions: 1/ to protect security, collective security of the whole nation and security of the individual and his rights; 2/ legislation; and 3/ to preserve and transfer the national heritage to the next generations, to preserve forests, protect natural resources, regulate water flows" (Leroa-Beaulieu. - In: Shatle, Diamel, 1993: 542). First, security function of the state reflects full humanistic approach to security at the end of XIX century in domain of individual security, but also national security in the moment when sovereign national states have emerged in full sense.

Having in mind a plethora of researches dealing with national security, as well as system of international security, in this work the concepts of individual, societal and global security, that represent the mainstreams of expanding the concept and system of security, will be treated.

INDIVIDUAL SECURITY

Contemporary discussions about security are not dealing only with the relations between the state and its international environment, but also with the relations that exist inside the state, confirming that the state is not the only factor and referent object of security. Namely, inside every state operate different sub-state factors (individuals, social groups, etc.) as referent objects of security. They also have their own interests in creating national security entering the process of creating the policy of security. Simultaneously, the majority of them have also some other interests that influence their security interests in different ways (Buzan, 1991: 348). The smallest elementary analytic unit on which the concept of security can be applied is the individual, and because of that individual security is good starting point for more extensive analysis, transcending the illusion that the national and international security are simply expanding the concern for individual human beings.

The question of the referent object of the security in the extensive concept of security places the individual in the centre of interest of the contemporary studies of security, not only because of the need for redefining the traditional state-centric approaches to security, but also because of the nature of the development of the international system and emerging of new challenges and threats to security, and the fact that the state with known mechanisms did not succeed to respond completely on security problems that individuals are facing with.

For many reasons, the state has lost its exclusive status as the key referent object of security, which caused expanding national security down - towards individual and societal security.

Security of the individual, beside physical survival, comprise many other complex factors (health, status, wealth, freedom etc.). Because there are many different aspects of individual security, it is very hard to make the difference between subjective and objective appraisal when the man as an individual is secure, which enters in the question of the objective estimation whether the threats to individual security are real or fictive (potential). When an individual is protected against the immediate threats we talk about "objective security", and when we talk about mans feeling that he is secured we are dealing with "subjective security" (Buzan, 1991: 36). These two analytic aspects (dimensions) of individual security can not be observed totally separated, because they rise one from another and they are complement each other building a unique theoretical-conceptual framework for understanding the full meaning of individual security. Men's feeling that he is secure can not derive only from speculative process - it has to be the consequence of certain empiric experience, cognition that in real life individual is not exposed to the threats to his physical survival, status in society, his rights, or generally "decent human life" in broad philosophical sense. Fundamental aspiration of all men is not only to provide their physical existence - survival, health, and private (material) property, but also a specific way of life - that comprise believes about good and bad behaviour, customs, language, art, religion and their place in the Universe.

Individuals strive to meet his needs, including security needs, in relations with other individuals, society and state. So the individual security comprise wide area from guaranteed individual rights that every born human being obtains by birth, and the rights that have to be recognized through the analysis of the relations individual-individual, individual-society, individual-state, and even wider.

What the individual should be protected from? According to some opinions individuals should be protected from the violence, regardless it comes from the state or it is a consequence of social structure or criminal behaviour of other individuals. When we focus on the relation between the society and the individual the majority of the threats to the individuals derives from the fact that men are embedded in human environment that generate social, economic and political pressures that can not be avoided. Among many social threats for individual security we can find four main types: 1/ physical threats (pain, injuries and death); 2/ economic threats (seizure or destruction of the property, deprivation of the access to labour or elections); 3/ threats to the rights (arrests, deprivation of the basic civil rights); and 4/ threats to the position or status (degradation or public humiliation). Existence of the threats to individual security indicates on one of the greatest dilemmas rooted in political philosophy: how to extend the freedom of the society without using force by the government (Buzan, 1991: 37). Individual can be hurt not only by the violence, so he has to be sure for his health, protected from social, economic and political marginalisation and oppression. In order to be secured, individuals have to be free from political, social and economic clamps (Terriff et al, 1999: 181).

We are not neglecting the issues of relations between individual and individual and between individual and society that can cause a violence that directly endanger the individual security, but the greatest importance has the analysis of the relation individual-state, where the key problem is the power that the state possesses over its citizens, e.g. means of coercion by which the state can, for the sake of its own position and preservation, endanger the fundamental rights of the individuals and by that undermine the level of their security. However this is not one-way problem. According to some opinions, individuals wishing to fulfil their "natural" and other rights can have a great influence on the security of the state. Analysis of the relations between the individual and the state opens the question of the form of regulating overall social relations by the

state, its nature and the limits upon which individuals, that have consciously enter the society and lay the foundation of their state, can seek for their own security and fight for its improvement, but in the same time not endangering the foundation of the state. Barry Buzan have tried to solve this problem in his book *People, States & Fear*.

Having in mind that the state is a great source of threats for the individuals, the importance of the discussion upon individual security lays, according to Buzan, in "the network of links and oppositions between the security of the individual and security of the state", but also in the fact that "individuals give a lot of reasons and in the same time some limits that require security activities of the state". Human beings are the main source of the mutual insecurity, so that the question of the individual security covers wider societal and political dimensions, leading directly to the questions connected with the basic nature of the state. Security of the individual is, therefore, inseparably connected with the security of the state (Ibid, 35). The state is at the same time the source and guarantee of the security of the individual, and a source of threats for that security.

Relation between individual security and state security Buzan considers through the analysis relations between the citizens and the state, where there are two models (two faces of the state): minimal (no discrepancy between security of the individual and security of the state) and the maximal (the state as an independent variable with own interests) conceptions of the state (Ibid, 39). But he admits that in practice it is not so easy to make this difference. In real world "dominates the maximal state or something similar", where there is disharmony between individual security and security of the state. But the state is concerned with the needs of the population, and on the other hand, citizens accept the role of the state to control the possible anarchy and civil disorder by coercive means and other state mechanisms. (Ibid, 42-43).

Directly or indirectly, state is a source of a number of threats for the individuals. They can be classified in four categories: 1/ the one originating from domestic legislation; 2/ the one originating from direct administrative or political action of the state against individuals or groups; 3/ the one originating from the struggle for the control of the state machinery; and 4/ the one originating from external political security of the state (Ibid p 44). Each of these categories implies a number of different questions referring to single threats. Threats for individuals come from, for example, excessive or inadequate application of the law, that cause different reactions of the individuals, although they have given to the state the right to use the power and force in solving certain questions referring to their general position in the society. Again we come to the discrepancies between the obligation of the state to deliver the services to the citizens in all areas of life and to care for their position and security, and power and actions of the state with which, in the name of common good, interests and needs of individuals are neglected, or their natural rights are violated. Security of the individual is not in this case endangered by actions of other individuals, but with acting of the state, or, using Galtung's vocabulary, with "impersonal structural forces". Physical and structural violence that comes from the state is one of the utmost threats to the individual security, but it is not the end of the list of all threats coming from the state. Discrepancies between individual and national security relates, beside some specific political questions (different forms of political violence, pollution of the environment, health of the population, chemical and nuclear pollution, etc.) and the widest political questions, such as, for example, human rights. So the problem of individual security becomes the international concern, and consequently "part of the problem of the national security" for many states that neglect this dimension. Adroit states should "provide some security" and comprehend that they are also important source of threats (Ibid, 46-50).

An open question remains "how the actions of individuals, that are motivated with their own needs for security, can effect on national security level"? Self-help (individual level of political action) and acting of individuals through political parties, local community, human rights organizations, and ecological organizations are some of the methods by which individuals can, in relations to the state and concept of national security, realize their own security. However, such individual oriented actions aimed towards reaching certain level of individual security can have also some negative implications on national security, and put different pressures on the state.

Endeavours to individualize the concept of security, according to Weaver, have to keep in mind several important facts. First, it is very hard to understand how it is possible from individual security come to the security of the state and nation, because the security of the state can not be reached by adding a great number of security of the individuals. Second, concept of security does not have the same meaning depending on the object that it refers to. On the individual level there is no clear interpretation of the concept of security, and because of that in the meaning of security is everything that is good (in insecurity is everything that is bad). And third, individualization of security contributes to the spreading of security on the question such as securing the environment, security of migrants etc. (Weaver, 2003: 363).

Full, stable (individual) security can be reached by those individuals and groups that do not endanger others, where security is reached as a process of emancipation - release of people (individuals and groups) from social, economical, political and other limitations that block them in caring out what they freely have choosen to do. Emancipation, not power and order, creates the conditions for real security.

Direction of emancipation is designed to provide "theory of progress", policy of hope and leads to the policy of survival" (Booth: 1991: 319). According to this, statement that security can be reached through emancipation fully confirms the importance of widening the concept of security on individual security, having in mind its both aspects: absence of fear and absence of threats. Research of the content of the individual security can be defined as research of all the factors that leads to its endangerment, and conditions in which it can be reached, preserved and improved. Nevertheless, one has to keep in mind that individual security has to be observed though the prism of connected and often opposite relations between the citizens and the state, and external environment. Besides that, the concept of individual security comprehend also some wider political questions that refer to the relations of the individual toward nature, e.g. mutual relation between man and environment, problem of the weapon for mass destruction etc.

SOCIETAL SECURITY

Development of the concept of societal security is also a consequence of the fact that traditional concept of "national security" was not able to resolve all the tensions that exist in modern society. Widening of the concept of security toward individual security (down), as historical and humanistic reach of the contemporary studies of security, caused opening the question of content of the concept of societal security, as the society become important referent object of security that has to be secured. (Terriff et al, 1999: 178).

When we talk about the society as a referent object, it is necessary to make the clear difference between the society and the state, first of all in relations to challenges and threats that have influence on the security on each of these two analytic units. In

relations to the state, the nature of challenges and threats for security of the society, determines the society as an object different of the state that has to be secured. When we are talking about societal security in the focus of our attention are, besides the society, also different influences that can change some values as the language, culture, religious and national identity, customs, in an unacceptable way.

For Ole Weaver, societal security comprise situations that society comprehend as a threats to its identity. (Weaver, 2003: 371). Identity, "understood as a difference between what is somebody, and what might be" become problem of security and problem of the highest political circles. (Ibid, 373). Interest for the question of identity is frequent characteristic of the discussions on security several last years. Those questions, according to Weaver, refer to dissidences about minorities and borders, relations between state borders and nations, and nation as a separate category. These problems are more complex with emerging of the new identities in Western Europe, and the request for accelerating integration processes on the European continent in order to avoid spreading of new problems. Requests for integration, on the other hand caused solicitude for the future of national identities. Question of the national identity is now comprehended as a question of survival of certain nation, e.g. its security. So, among new questions related to security, identity became the most important. (Ibid, 369).

However, societal security does not refer only to the problems of further survival and development of the nation, but comprise other questions. Because of that, definition of the societal security concerns communities based on identity, and not only nations (Ibid, 371). By societal security we understand "ability of the society to survive and keep its essential character under changed conditions and possible or real threats. It is a question of sustainability of traditional patterns of language, culture, associations, religious and national identity and customs in framework of acceptable conditions for development" (Weaver - In: Moller, 2000: 21).

The most important attempt of widening the concept of security from the state towards the society as an referent object of security came from "Copenhagens school", whose representatives have suggested acceptance of human groups as referent objects of security (Ibid, 20), and, by that, introduced in theoretical discussions the term societal security (Hyde-Price - In: Gartner et al, 2001: 38). For the representatives of this school, identity for society is the same what the sovereignty is for the state, so that "survival of the society is a question of identity", and discussion about the identity represents the manner in which the society talks about the essential threats: "if that happens we will not be able to live any more as we" (Ibid). Central problem of the concept of societal security, as it is understood in Copenhagens school, is in introducing the concept of "securization", e.g. introducing in discussion about security almost all social questions. (Simić, 2002: 62). That particularly refers to identity. Although it is not disputable that introducing identity of the society in the discussions about security gives a new quality to modern studies of security, "studies of securization" at best can be only one aspect of the studies of security (Hyde-Price, 39), but not the point that represent epistemologically precise creation of the new theoretical concept - societal security.

Concept of societal security is not in theoretic sense completely framed; it has to be gradually developed, respecting integrity of the requests of national and ethnical groups for preserving their tradition, culture, language and customs, and supplementing these elements of their identity with new elements aimed to establishing the confidence and cooperation between different nations and ethnical communities if all areas

of life, including the questions that refer to security. If the traditionally comprehended national security (state security) is understood in "intersection of threats and possibilities" (Nelson - In: Gartner et al, 2001: 356), societal security must be built through the analysis of the intersection between aspirations for identity – its preserving and further construction and processes of integration (internal and external). Constructing of the concept of societal security means also analysing the conditions under which the society can independently, without state interference, with its own capacities solve certain problems that (could) emerge between certain nations, ethnical and religious groups. That effort will have more success in conditions of high level of individual security and the state that allows different forms of articulating of specific group interests. In opposite, societal security would be only a pure idea.

GLOBAL SECURITY

Like in the case of individual and societal security, global security, is an attempt of theoretical shaping new concept of security in conditions of complex and structural changes in international order after the cold-war. In theory there are different opinions about the constitutive elements that can serve as a starting point in defining global security, e.g. how concept of global security can be shaped theoretically refer to "changed reality of international relations" and new challenges and threats to security that emerged with the end of the cold-war.

Variety and interdependence of problems that concern global security (environment, global technological, cultural and political changes, decrement of non-restorable resources, emerge of internal violent conflicts, etc.) imposed the necessity for displacement of discussion about global security outside traditional concepts of national and international security, because the global security follows different approach: it comprehend the mankind as a whole that is exposed to constant and numerous threats, keeping in mind union of the states that is endangered with various problems: overpopulation, nuclear winter and global warming (Lang, 1995: 831). Many authors in global security include also aspect of ecological security because "the threats to security now can arise more likely from the mans relation toward the nature, than from relation of one nation towards another nation". (Brown - In: Ibid).

Global security, according to Sidel and Levy, has two components: human and international security. So it requires international system based on equality and justice, human security and development of the culture of peace, e.g. international order mentioned in article 28. of Universal declaration on human rights. (Sidel and Levy, 2002: 118). This international order implies obeying the agreements on control of the weapons, strengthening the role of the UN, establishing a closer relations among all the nations in the sphere of health protection, rising the level of culture of peace, reduction of tensions and struggle for achieving equality and justice. Global security, conclude those authors, implies nuclear security (abolition of nuclear weapon), biological security (abolishing of biological weapon and improving health protection), and other forms of security (human and international security). Achieving these interrelated forms of security provides the higher level of global security (Ibid, 119).

Conflicts caused by the lack of environment are almost inevitable in the world, thinks Homer-Dikson. There are three main types of violent conflicts according to Homer-Dikson: simple conflicts because of ignoring the problem, conflicts connected with group identity, and conflicts because of relative alienation" (Homer-Dikson - In: Klare, 1998: 359).

When we think about the link between environment and security, key question is "could the lacks of environment endanger international security" (Viotti and Kauppi, 1997: 264). In order to solve this problem we have to answer three questions: do the lack of sources as drinking water and arable land cause resource wars between the states? Do the large migrations caused by environment leads in group-identity conflicts, especially ethnic conflicts? Do the dangerous lacks of environment increase economical losses, disrupt key institutions and by that directly contribute to the civil strife and crisis of authority? Those authors think that conflicts caused by these problems are possible (Ibid, 265-267).

However, some author deny any links between environment and security. Ole Weaver thinks that "security is articulating only in the certain place, in the name of the institutions, by the elite". (Weaver - In: Lipschutz and Mayer, 1996: 57). Security and problems of environment can not be put in the same framework; it is more proper to treat the environment within economy than security (Weaver, 2003: 365), because the problems of environment, as well as questions of migrations, are beyond our might's, so it is more practical to treat environment in certain ethical or economic context.

Criticising the writers who, without deeper analysis all the questions related to the environment (like Mayers, Homer-Dikson et al) connect with close causal links a number of contemporary ecological, demographical and other problems and a problem of security, Levi thinks that only specific ecological problems are direct physical threats to security in the situations when, for example, violation of environment directly causes the damage for life and welfare of the citizens of certain state, or in other way damages most important national values (Ibid, 62). Namely, certain factors of environment, although contribute to some regional conflicts, are very seldom their only cause.

Effort in detecting the nature of new security problems and building a new concept of global security are not so simple, first of all because of the fact that "conventional security analysts are apprehensive about any enlargement in scope of the concept of security beyond the familiar strong box of interstate relations, containing the well-honed agents of military force and diplomatic guile. Therefore, first task is to describe the arena within which issues of global security are found... and define the characteristics that distinguish the new approach required to address emerging global politics and society. (Prins, 1995). Global security studies need to be built up in three dimensions, each of which sets a particular group of tasks. The first task is to describe trends that bound the field The second task is to analyse special characteristics that distinguish global security problems from other sorts of security problems and other sons of global issues. The third task, which is the most ambitious and links analysis to action, is to conceive the new culture of global society and, in particular, the reconceived political culture of a newly self-conscious global society (Ibid).

Even other authors discuss some aspects of global security. In his analysis of threats to national security Barry Buzan specifies, among others, also ecological threats that, similar like military and economic threats, can damage the physical base of the state. Claiming that ecological threats are traditionally seen as a product of natural conditions, and as that are more subjects of fate, then questions important for agenda of national security, Buzan thinks that some ecological phenomena (earthquakes, storms, plagues, floods, tidal waves, and droughts) can be seen as part of the struggle of humans against nature, whereas national security issues arose much more from the struggle of humans with each other (Buzan, 1991: 131). He does not completely exclude the influence of ecology on security, but he thinks that only when ecosystem is a variable of human manipulation or has influence on relations among states, becomes a political question and a legitimate field of studies of security. (Ibid).

Question of link between environment and security still persist, because including the concept of environment protection in general security makes the concept of security so shapeless that he is losing intellectual coherence, being incapable to find solutions for concrete problems. As Hyde-Price estimates, "indiscriminate broadening and widening of the concept of security will inevitably rob it of any analytical utility.... so that there is a danger that security studies simply dissolved into international relations, if not into the social sciences and humanities more generally. To retain its analytical utility, and to give security studies as a sub-discipline some coherence, the concept of security needs a clear focus and distinct boundaries. In this sense, the central problem facing contemporary security studies is where the boundaries of security as a sub-discipline lie; what are the boundaries between security policy and public policy; when is environmental or ecological degradation a security problem rather than an issue of acute political and economic concern? (Hyde-Price, 2001: 34-35). Security has two dimension: avoiding war (its negative dimension) and building peace (its positive dimension)... Security studies cannot - and should not - attempt to address all aspect of human injustice, poverty, suffering, misery, and underdevelopment. Issues such as poverty, immigration, and environmental degradation are not intrinsically security issues. They become a concern for security studies only when threaten to provoke conflict and insecurity. The core concern of security is thus conflict (particularly, although not exclusively, violent conflict) between organized political communities - that is, managing conflict and creating the condition that prevent its occurrence. (Ibid, 28).

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Period of the cold-war and bipolar structure of the world was characterized by struggle for power, based on the concept of national interest, while the content of the question of security was thought in terms of national security. In the last decades of XX and beginning of XXI century, under the influence of changed reality of international relations and global society (globalisation and regionalisation, demographic and environment problems etc.), the research field of security is widen on new and important issues as individual, societal, regional, international and world interests, and in that context concepts of individual, societal, regional, international and global security. Today conception of security is linked with overall changes, including politics, military, geopolitical, economic, societal and ecological questions. In reshaping of the concept of security in emerging global society, key questions are: who are the "referent" objects of security, whose security is in question, what security means and what is necessary for its fulfilment.

As XXI century brought new fears and challenges that are concrete threat to security (individual, societal, regional, international and global), acquiring new knowledge's about their nature in order to be aware of all the dangers, redefining concepts and systems of security, and intensifying actions on all levels in order to improve security.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Mladen Bajagić, MA, Police College Belgrade, Serbia and Montenegro.

Želimir Kešetović, PhD, Police College Belgrade, Serbia and Montenegro.

REFERENCES

- Albin, C. (1995). "The global security challenge to negotiation: toward a new agenda". – In: *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 38, No. 6 (May 1995), 921-948;
- Art, R. J., Jervis, R. (eds) (2003). *International Politics: Enduring Concepts and Contemporary Issues* (sixth edition), New York: Longman.
- Baldwin, D. A.. (1996). "Security Studies and the End of the Cold War". – In: *World Politics*, Vol. 48, No. 1, 117-141.
- Baugh, W.H. (2002). "What is Security"? – In: *International Security*, Fall Term 2002 CRN 14073/14080, Internet 12/11/2002, www.uoregon.edu/polisci/syllabi/PS4-596F02.html.
- Baylis, J., Smith, S. (2001). *The Globalization of World Politics: An introduction to international relations*, (second edition), New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, C. (2001). *Understanding International Relations* (second edition), New York: St. Martins Press. (short).
- Booth, Ken, "Security and Emancipation". – In: *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 17, No. 4 (October 1991), 313-326.
- Burke, A. (2002). "Aporias of security". – In: *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, Vol. 27, No. 1 (Jan-Marc 2002), 1-27;
- Buzan, B. (1991). *People, State & Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era* (second edition), London: Pearson Longman.
- Dillon, M. (1996). *Politics of Security: Towards a Political Philosophy of Continental Thought*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Gartner, Heinz, Hyde-Price, Adrian, Reiter, Erich (eds) (2001). *Europe's New Security Challenges*, London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder.
- Grizold, A. (1998). *Međunarodna sigurnost*, Zagreb: Fakultet političkih znanosti.
- Grizold, A., Tatalović, S., Cvrtić, V. (1999). *Suvremeni sistemi nacionalne sigurnosti*, Zagreb: Sveučilište u Zagrebu i dr.
- Hadžić, Miroslav (ed) (2003). *Reforma sektora bezbednosti (zbornik radova)*, Beograd: Institut G17, Centar za Civilno Vojne odnose.
- Homer-Dixon, T. F. (1994). "Environmental Scarcities and Violent Conflict". – In: *International Security*, Vol 19, No. 1 (Summer 1994), 5-40.
- Homer-Dixon, T. (1995). "The Ingenuity Gap: Can Poor Countries adapt to Resources Scarcity". – In: *Population and Development Review*, Vol 21, No. 3 (September 1995), 587-612.
- Kenedi, P. (1997). *Priprema za dvadeset prvi vek*, Beograd: Službeni list.
- King, G., Murray, C. J.L. (2001). "Rethinking human security". – In: *Political Science Quarterly*, Winter 2001, Vol. 116, No. 4 (Winter 2001), 585-611.
- Klare, M. T., Chandrani, Y. (eds) (1998), *World Security: Challenges for a New Century*, New York: Martin's Press.
- Lake, D. A.. (1996). "Anarchy, hierarchy, and the variety of international relations". – In: *International organization*, Vol. 50, No. 1 (Winter 1996), 1-33;
- Lang, W. (1995). "Negotiation in the face of the future: Negotiation and Global Security: New Approaches to Contemporary Issues". – In: *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 38, No. 6 (May 1995), 830-841.
- Levy, M. A. (1995). "Is the environment a national security issue?". – In: *International Security*, Fall 1995, Vol. 20, No. 2 (Fall 1995), 35-62.
- Lipschutz, R. D, Mayer, J. (1996). *Global Civil Society and Global Environmental Governance*, Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Masleša, R. (2001). *Teorije i sistemi sigurnosti*, Sarajevo: Magistrat.
- Mathews, J. T. (1989). "Redefining Security". – In: *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 68, No. 2 (Spring 1989), 162-177.
- Милетич, А. (1978). Национални интерес у америчкој теорији међународних односа. Савремена администрација.

- Moller, B. (2000). "National, Societal, and Human Security". - In: Paris: UNESCO, 27-38 November 2000.
- Paul, T.V., Hall, J. A. (eds) (1999)., International Order and the Future of World Politics, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Prins, G. (1995). "Notes toward the definition of global security". – In: American Behavioral Scientist, Vol. 38, No. 6 (May 1995), 817-830;
- Rothchild, E. (1995). "What is security? (The Quest for World Order)". – In: Daedalus, Vol. 124, No. 3 (Summer 1995), 53-98.
- Sidel, V. W., Levy, B. S. (2002). "Security and public health". – In: Social Justice, Vol. 29, No. 3 (Fall 2002), 108-119.
- Simić, D. R. (2003). "Savremene teorije bezbednosti". – U: Reforma sektora bezbednosti (Zbornik radova), Beograd: Institut G17, 11-41.
- Simić, D. R. (2002), Nauka o bezbednosti – savremeni pristupi bezbednosti, Beograd: Službeni list.
- Simić, D. R. (1993). Pozitivan mir: shvatanja Johana Galtunga, Beograd: Akademija Nova, Arhiv Kljakić.
- Stajić, L. S. (2003). Osnovi bezbednosti, Beograd: Policijska akademija.
- Šatle, F., Dijamel, O., Pizije, E. (1993). Enciklopedijski rečnik političke filozofije (A-L), Sremski Karlovci, Novi Sad: Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića.
- Terriff, T., Croft, S., James, L., Morgan, P. M. (2001). Security Studies Today, Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers Inc., Polity Press.
- Viotti, P. R., Kauppi, M. V. (1997). International Relations and World Politics: Security, Economy, Identity, New Jersey: Simon & Schuster.