

Counteracting Human Insecurities

Noreen Towle
University of North Carolina
Wilmington, NC 28403
noreen.towle@gmail.com

Abstract

Human security directly relates to the national and international security of every state. Underlying all human security issues is the issue of poverty and the insecurity derived from it. Poverty leads to the threat of hunger, disease, unemployment, crime, terrorism, social conflict, political repression and environmental hazards. These insecurities bleed over into surrounding states, which also affects the cooperative security of all states. Human insecurities can lead to violent communication and conflict, which can then be used to achieve a means to an end of those insecurities. In order to counteract violent communication and conflict we need to incorporate conflict transformation and negotiations on a national and international level. Conflict transformation and negotiations will address the issue at the root and will allow for growth and change in order to create security for the individual, security for the state, and security for the international community.

Key Words: Human Security, Human Insecurity, Human Rights, Cooperative Security, Modern Conflict, Conflict Emergencies, Violent Communication, Conflict Transformation and Negotiation, Peacebuilding

Introduction

Modern times have moved beyond the traditional approaches of national and international security. No longer do we base our security solely on the strength of the military force of a nation. In today's day and age it is imperative that we as a global community embrace the "new paradigm" in which we consider the wellbeing of all people beyond the concept of a sovereign state. In order to do this, we must consider the implications of human and cooperative security on national and international security. When we incorporate these two security methods into our global idea of what national and international security means, we will begin to build the foundations of a global society that respects humanity and incorporates diversity of people and plurality of politics.

Human and Cooperative Security

Human security has its origins in a United Nations development program that began in the 1990's and sought to interconnect humanitarian, economic and social issues in order to combat human suffering and create an environment that places emphasis on human security. It focuses on the peace process and societal development in order to protect people. Bringing the focus of security down to a grass roots level, building from the ground up, creates security for the individual, which directly relates to the security of the state. The composition of human

Human Insecurities

security is a people-centered, comprehensive, context-specific, and preventative focus (United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security, 2013).

Underlying all human security issues is the issue of poverty and the insecurity derived from it. Poverty leads to the threat of hunger, disease, unemployment, crime, terrorism, social conflict, political repression and environmental hazards. These human insecurities primarily can be found in failing states such as those undergoing intrastate conflicts. Intrastate conflict is the conflict that occurs within the state such as human rights violations, civil wars, mass ethnic killings and genocide (Jordan, Taylor, Meese, & Nielsen, 2009).

Because of the global interconnectivity that constitutes the world of today, these human insecurities can quickly bleed over into surrounding states and the entire world. “Global effects, such as migrations, reverberations in diaspora communities, environmental impacts, and the exportation of terrorism, are all possible (Jordan, et al., 2009, p. 549).” When the protection, empowerment and the wellbeing of each individual’s needs are addressed, the root causes behind human insecurities will be eliminated. This, in turn, will strengthen governments and actors within a state, which will decrease the threat of terrorism and crime. A narrowed focus on current and emerging threats to human security is necessary in order to counteract the insecurities occurring in different areas of the world.

Lack of human security affects cooperative security. Cooperative security relates to the level of state-to-state interaction where states operate on a multilateral level to promote peace, de-proliferation of weapons, counter-terrorism, border security, legal systems, law enforcement, and human and economic security. When states operate at this level they promote stability of not just one state but all states involved, which holistically impacts the national security of all states (U.S. Department of State Diplomacy in Action, 2013). Cooperative security explores ways of incorporating states into a proactive approach to finding ways to counteract the weaknesses of the international system (Caldwell, & Williams, 2012). “When a state cannot or will not protect its citizens, the international community has an obligation to engage. Scholars have described this forward leaning definition of security as ‘the duty to protect’ (Jordan, et al., p. 549).” The duty to protect is accepted by those who support and promote humanitarians but is not widely accepted by others who see it as neocolonialism (Jordan, et al., 2009). Whether humanitarian or neocolonialist, the fact remains that human insecurities are detrimental to society as a whole.

How Human and Cooperative Security Relates to Modern Conflict

The nature of modern conflict has changed since the end of the Cold War. Human and cooperative security directly relates to this change. No longer is conflict seen as simply interstate wars over territorial control and regional power interests. Today’s modern conflict has taken an evolutionary shape derived from the removal of regional power interests, ideological pressures and the fragmentation of nations, which have developed what is termed a complex emergency. A complex emergency is “a humanitarian disaster that occurs in a conflict zone and is complicated by, or results from, the conflicting interests of warring parties (Woodhouse, & Ramsbotham, 2000, p. 64).” The conflict emergencies of today are intrastate conflicts that came about after major superpowers exited countries and left weak ethno-political issues to fester. These ethno-political disputes have been exploited by warlords who use parasitic extractive means to deteriorate their society. The accessibility of weaponry, which often times comes from outside supportive state government entities, is used by the warlords targeting the civilians in the opposing ethnic group. The reason warlords have great success is because of the decline of their

state's power and the weaknesses in the state's armies, which caused the rules of civil norms to disappear. The militias that are formed do not wear uniforms and do not fight on the frontlines. There is no distinguishing factor between the state, the military or the civilian, which means there are no distinguishing factors between war and peace. Chaos ensues and creates a space where warlords can rise to power. Civilians become victims and have the most casualties during times of violence. Today's warlords control the civilian populations and are less concerned than the state about poverty and hunger. They are extremely skillful at dealing with the international community. In one instance, when international aid and relief came to help a failing country, warlords "not only were adept at seizing cargoes that were useful, but in many cases they did it in a way that encouraged the flow of relief to continue (Woodhouse, et al., 2000, p. 56)." This disintegrates the neutrality stance taken by peacekeepers because it can be seen as siding with the warlords and contributing to the problem. Peacekeepers, when dealing with warlords, have to see the importance of accommodating them for the ultimate purpose of providing humanitarian aid to the civilian population the warlords are exploiting but only to the extent necessary. The civilians suffer extreme civil rights abuses which can even escalate to the point of genocide (Woodhouse, et al., 2000).

So how does a society deteriorate to this level of human insecurity? When the structuralism of a state undergoes a pattern of decline, it creates a space where a predatory group, usually a militia or armed band, can gain control of a territory and begin to utilize its resources for a means of self-profit. The warlords of today have evolved past the feudalist warlords of past but are still parasitic to society. They are defined as leaders "of an armed band, possibly numbering up to several thousand fighters, who can hold territory locally and at the same time act financially and politically in the international system without interference from the state which they are based (Woodhouse, et al., 2000, p.48)." These warlords play a key role in conflict emergencies. They live beyond the civil jurisdiction in their societies and exploit the resources of their failing states, even when those resources are human beings. This exploitive process adds to the intensity of the conflict emergency and creates negative entropy, which leads to the decline of their society.

Looking at the chaotic world we live in today, we see violence being used globally to solve problems. On a continual basis, groups are using bombings or attacks to get media attention or to teach another group a lesson. Groups are using violence to vocalize that they will no longer stand for the injustices they are enduring. They are using violence to tell the world that what they are doing is for the good of their people. But can violence really be used to serve the purpose of good? Can violence really be a form of communication that will invoke transformation? Or is violence just a reflection of how we are globally failing to provide what humanity needs as a whole?

The core issue of society is that every human deserves basic rights. These are rights to human dignity, life, liberty, and security of person. They are the right to work and maintain a standard of living that includes health and wellbeing. They have the right to have fair recognition before the law and to participate in the government of their country (Caldwell, et al., 2012). What happens when the oppressed see that they do not have these basic human rights? Violence. There are global uprisings because people are grouping together to fight for what they believe. But violence only begets violence. When groups use violence as an instrument of communication it compounds the core issue of equal human rights into issues that are reshaped through the lens of violence. It builds layer upon layer until the groups that are fighting have forgotten the real reason they acted out to begin with.

Human Insecurities

So what happens when two parties have conflicting interests and those parties resort to violence as a means of pursuing their interests? When violence is used as a tool for communication the use of violence will degrade communication between those two parties. It brings in another layer of difficulty. It will reshape the interests of the parties, which, in turn, causes a desire to reshape the allocation of resources in order to pursue their interests. The parties will want a redistribution of equity within the society. Violence will also bring about an emotional dimension that will add to and change the dynamics of the conflict. Retribution through counterattacks will ensue. Resentments build and make resolutions more unattainable (Jeong, 2010).

Overtime, the use of violence to communicate can cause the development of a culture of violence. It is taught within communities and to children. People find ways to utilize the conflict for material gain. They try to allocate resources, property, and money to profit one's own status. Aside from material gain people use conflict to promote their own notoriety. Those who are part of a military structure can move through the ranks, gain respect of peers, and be perceived as a hero through their community. Businesses and people both profit off of conflict by selling weapons and other vehicles of violence that can be used for the destruction of a society (Jeong, 2010). All these factors contribute to the many layers that violence creates. Violence can bleed over into surrounding societies and countries. It permeates all borders and can become infectious. Using violence as a tool to communicate breaks down society. It does not fix the problems that were there to begin with, it amplifies them.

Counteracting Modern Conflict

So how do we counteract violent communication? Conflict management promotes focusing on the positive aspects rather than the negative aspects of a conflict, which aims to find a satisfactual outcome where both sides could win, but when violence has degraded the two parties to the point where it is almost impossible to see the positives we must find a way to deal with the layers of issues that have arisen in order to transform the conflict and promote equity of the two conflicting parties. If the primary focus is on conflict management, it is possible for one party to manipulate the management of conflict in their direction making a win-lose situation. It can be an unfair process that could eventually lead back to violence if the disadvantaged party falls back into an oppressive role (Jeong, 2010).

Instead of using the conflict management technique, a third party negotiation can be a preferred method to aid with a transformation process. "Peaceful transformation of conflict relationships can be consigned to a conscience-driven process to reduce violence and empower a marginalized party (Jeong, 2010, p. 37)." The transformation process will change the focus from the immediate behavior and negative relationships of the parties to the renegotiation process, which will stabilize how both parties interact with each other and allow them to rebuild society together. It allows both parties to have an empowering voice in a peacebuilding process. It allows both parties to delve into the deep-rooted issues that began the process of violent communication in order to go beyond a management process to incorporating change.

Positive transformations require restructuring of society to support human rights. Before transformation can begin, a means for the containment of violence needs to occur so that peaceful negotiations can set the standard for peacekeeping. Both parties must be fully engaged, have a desire for change, have access to an economic means to support their wellbeing, and be allowed to participate politically. In order for the transformation to work long-term, agreements

need to address emotional, perceptual and spiritual aspects of conflict, and new behaviors of both parties need to be addressed. Some challenges to the peacekeeping transformation process are changing the perceptions of the “other” and creating legitimacy of parties that were not before perceived as a legitimate political group. Acknowledging grievances without vengeful tactics is an integral part of the transformative peacekeeping process. Teaching parties to use political means to deal with issues instead of violent actions is part of the shift in behaviors. This shift is gradual, not dramatic. Dramatic shifts generally have a Band-Aid effect, which will later hurt both parties. Promoting human rights and increasing public education will aid in the gradual shift from violent to non-violent communication (Jeong, 2010).

The peacebuilding process is not a quick, covert process that will immediately bring about change. It is a transformative process that incorporates all parties of a conflict. It requires a safe and secure environment where the promotion of human rights and diplomacy can occur to help change a conflict from being detrimental to society, to being beneficial to society. It is a long-term process that requires respect for all humanity. It incorporates positive communication techniques in order to build relationships that will utilize the strength that comes with the interdependence of people in order to peacefully overcome differences in interests. Though the transformative peacebuilding process is long-term and requires innovative thinking and relationship building skills, it is a preferred method to conflict management because it will address the deep-rooted issues. It becomes a proactive measure and not a reactive measure of dealing with conflict.

As with the nature of modern conflict, the structure of the international system has also changed since the end of the Cold War. The number of sovereign states has grown from fifty to over two hundred and there are numerous intergovernmental, nongovernmental and transnational entities. Because of this change in the structure of the international system, the necessity for essential negotiation skills has arisen in order to successfully handle citizen diplomacy (which involves human security), the information revolution, and the extensive influences from the multinational businesses and financial institutions which often times exceeds the influences of small states (Jeong, 2010).

Policy Recommendations: Negotiations on a National and International Level

When considering negotiations on a national and international level, it is imperative to understand the context in which negotiations take place. At the macro level, power relations between actors, the systems configurations and the stability of those configurations all play into the international system’s context. Polarity structures in the international system can impact the negotiation process. Polarity is the distribution of power among states and the number of poles or centers of power as well as the way in which power is distributed can have an effect on the way negotiations are handled. Negotiations of a conflict can span over multiple historical systems, which show the importance of continual long-term communication needs. An example of which is the Arab-Israeli conflict which began after WWII when the Jews “returned” to the land of Israel, which was actually occupied by Palestinians. It is important to understand the polarity of powers in the international system because polarity has an effect on the interactions of sovereign nations trying to balance the global power in favor of the Israelis. Since World War II, the global interactions have been defined by nations trying to balance power between what they perceive as allied nations or enemy nations. Because polarity is the general point of view seen by nation

actors today, it must be considered before negotiations can take place between nations (Starkey, Boyer, & Wilkenfeld, 2010).

The climate in which negotiations are conducted bears heavy with the interactions of contributing nations and has an effect on the conduction of negotiations. The level of impact created by a crisis is important to negotiations because of the catalytic effect a crisis has on those nations wanting to participate in the negotiation process. A crisis can set into action major system changes and change the outcome of a negotiation. If one side perceives there is a crisis it is possible that they will be more likely to negotiate alternate outcomes at a quicker pace.

Instances of crisis environments that have effected negotiations are the Berlin Crisis and the Cuban Missile Crisis. At the national level, perception of a threat of crisis is a critical element to expedite negotiations. Characteristics of a perceived crisis are threats to basic values such as territory, population, economy, an awareness that the crisis will not end until action has to be taken, and a fear or expectation that military involvement will occur if change does not occur. A negotiator's perspectives of crisis are threat, time pressure, and the stress that follows these elements. Deadlines add to the stress level of negotiations and require actors to move toward change but can pose possible detriment to the process because the optimal negotiated decision is not met but only progressed at a minimal level. Mediators and negotiators are key to this role because they can facilitate a transformative approach to negotiations undergone during times of crisis. Negotiators and mediators can create a positive environment that is conducive to win-win outcomes. Third-party interventions are introduced to negotiations when it is apparent that progress will not be made without outside aid (Starkey, et al., 2010).

There are multiple actor characteristics that contribute to the background of negotiations. The number of actors and the multiparty coalitions increase the complexities of negotiations because it can create possible cleavages, which means there are different perceptions of what the outcome of the negotiated goals should look like. Another actor characteristic is the cohesive makeup of the teams at the negotiation table. The monolithic model operates on the premise that all team members are speaking with the same voice in order to advance to the same interests. The heterogeneous model operates on the premise that the negotiating team members are conflicted and working towards uncommon interests. These two are extreme models of what the negotiation teams are composed of. Generally, negotiation team cohesion lies in the middle of these two models (Starkey, et al., 2010).

Other actor characteristics that contribute to negotiations are actor capabilities, limits to power, actor norms and actor commitment. Actor capability is the perceived strength of an actor at the bargaining table. The common perception is that the stronger actor will drive a harder bargain and receive greater dividends but because of the complexity of today's international system, the bargaining outcomes go beyond the perceived strength of an actor and are effected by varying circumstances such as military, economic, political, territorial and demographics. Limits to an actor's power affect negotiations because the power and commitment is interconnected, which creates unexpected dynamics of a situation. The dominant power does not always have the upper hand. Actor norms play on the negotiation board by presenting a noticed set value and cultural system for the varying actors. Understanding the negotiation styles of each actor's culture will aid in interactions. There is a developing culture of negotiation which is "washing out" the individual actor's cultures. Finally, actor commitment affects the negotiation board because in order to achieve a goal that will enable success, all parties need to be committed. A lack therein will create a space for possible reoccurrence of old problems, thereby leaving a negative legacy (Starkey, et al., 2010).

Issue characteristics that affect the negotiation board are bargaining dimensions, issue linkage and time frame. Similar to the factor of additional actors to a negotiation, additional issue characteristics or bargaining dimensions will further complicate negotiations. This can actually positively affect negotiations because as the number of bargaining dimensions increases, the more negotiations will go from a zero-sum outcome to a positive-sum outcome. Issue linkage is related to the number of issues in question. One negotiation that is being conducted with an actor can be linked to another negotiation with that same actor. For example if a nation is negotiating human rights issues and is lenient as compared to human rights negotiation in another country, the linkage could be from the necessity to maintain good economic relations (ex. U.S. and China negotiations). Issue linkage will aid in mutually beneficial outcomes for all parties. The perceived role of time, deadlines, and natural disasters can all affect the outcome of negotiations. It is said that ninety percent of the negotiation is completed in ten percent of the time (Starkey, et al., 2010).

Process characteristics of negotiations are public and private forums, outcome, ratification issues, and legacy. When negotiations are held in private forums it is because the parties involved in the negotiations need to have complete secrecy so that the internal pressures and extreme elements that emanate from their societies do not affect the outcome. Public forums are generally conducted when issues of the environment, climate change, Law of the Sea, and Public Declarations of Human Rights are being negotiated. Whether private or public, in certain instances details will be leaked to see how the public will react or to put public pressure on another party. The outcome of a negotiation will be affected by the perceived need to find a mandatory agreement, even when it can take years. If participating parties do not feel that there is a crisis or extreme necessity to come to a resolution, it can prolong the outcome. For example, it took fourteen years to negotiate the Law of the Sea. Domestic constraints such as ratifications can affect the process characteristics of negotiations because what one nation can ratify, another cannot. Finally, a legacy, which is a repetition of negotiations, can carry over from one negotiation to another. This means that the tactics or bluffing that have been used in one instance will be remembered during the next negotiation, making it difficult to establish a bottom line. It is important to remember that it is not necessary to exact everything possible during negotiations but to find a middle line so that parties can save face. This will positively affect future negotiations. When negotiating, it is important to remember the context of each situation. The setting of the international system will frame the negotiation while the individual characteristics will make the impressions on the negotiation (Starkey, et al., 2010).

Conclusions

National and international security no longer lies with the military brawn of a nation. National and international security firmly lies in the wellbeing of the individual. If we change our focus to see that eradicating poverty is more beneficial than building up forces to fight nation and non-nation actors over ideologies, terrorism, and trafficking then we will see that without the poor and marginalized there will be few, if any people, who wish to fight for those means. Pope Francis was noted as saying, “that unequal distribution of wealth inevitably leads to violence (O’Leary, 2013).” Caldwell & Williams notes that due to the security of people being completely intertwined with the security of the state we are compelled to creatively rethink our measures and tactics for dealing with national and international security (Caldwell, et al. 2012). The UN writes that governments play the primary role in ensuring the survival, livelihood and dignity of their

Human Insecurities

populations, but not all governments can control these aspects. In these cases, collaboration from other governments, international organizations and community actors need to interact and contribute to the wellness of the global whole (United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security, 2013). The former UN secretary general has stated that human security is far greater than the absence of violent conflict. “It encompasses human rights, good governance, access to education, and health care and ensuring that each individual has opportunities and choices to fulfill his or her potential (Caldwell, et al. 2012).”

Understanding that international and national security directly relates to the security of the individual should be the road we take ahead. Incorporating policies that aid in individual development will aid in governmental and structural development. Ensuring that all people have the ability to attain personal, economic, political and social freedoms will reduce, if not eradicate, the need for those people to participate in programs of extremism, hate, and violence. Participating in diplomatic negotiations and peace processes will help support the change. This will not be an immediate change; all peace processes are slow and can take generations before positive development is firmly seen. Changing the way we have thought and lived for generations will take time to overcome but it requires us to make a pathway in that direction and not give up when difficulties cross those paths. This process will require us to use conflict resolutions skills through diplomacy, international relationships, and peacebuilding techniques.

Works Cited

Caldwell, D., & Williams Jr., R. E. (2012). *Seeking Security in an Insecure World* (2nd ed., pp.247-260). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc.

Cooperative Security (2013). In *U.S. Department of State Diplomacy in Action*. Retrieved November 24, 2013, from <http://www.state.gov/p/eur/rt/epine/c10610.htm>

Jeong, H. (2010). *Conflict management and resolution; An introduction* (pp. 17-55). New York, NY: Routledge.

Jordon, A. A., Taylor Jr., W. J., Meese, M. J., & Nielsen, S. C. (2009). *American National Security* (6th ed., pp.537-554). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

In *United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security*. Retrieved November 24, 2013, from <http://www.unocha.org/humansecurity/human-security-unit/human-security-approach>

O'Leary, N. (2013, November 26). Pope Francis attacks 'tyranny' of unfettered capitalism, 'idolatry of money'. *Thomson Reuters*. Retrieved November 26, 2013, from http://worldnews.nbcnews.com/_news/2013/11/26/21623507-pope-francis-attacks-tyranny-of-unfettered-capitalism-idolatry-of-money?lite

Woodhouse, T., & Ramsbotham, O. (Eds.). (2000). *Peacekeeping and Conflict Resolution* (2nded. pp. 49-165). New York, NY: Frank Cass Publishers.

Starkey, B., Boyer, M. A., & Wilkenfeld, J. (2010). *International Negotiation in a Complex World* (3rd ed., pp. 35-61). Plymouth, United Kingdom: Rowan & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.