

Reconceptualization of Security in International Organizations: In the UN, EU and NATO

Pàl Dunay,
Geneva Centre for
Security Policy

Institutional Adaptation (ch. 46-58)

- New topics – change of emphasis.
- The scene dominated by change in the UN.
- Move from the Cold War agenda to a new one dominated by non-military aspects of security.
 - Is this change universal?
 - Don't we have a fragmented security agenda due to partial change?
- Humanitarian intervention.

Redefinition and Resistance

« broadening the definition of national security to include resource, environmental and demographic issues. »

(Jessica Tuchman Mathews, 1989)

« Legitimate concern for the well-being of civilians should not serve as a cover for intervention by powerful states. »

(India, 1999, UNSC)

Illusions and the New Agenda

- Human security v. state security
 - Are those advocating state security on the defensive?
 - The relationship between state security and regime security.
- Military intervention and its effect on human security. (The Iraq debacle.)

Practical Implications of Conceptual Change

- Collective security in crisis;
- Terrorism;
- Non-proliferation (UNSCR 1540)
- The continuing separation of development and security.
 - Any chance to overcome it?

How About Europe?

- Most institutionalized region;
- Every institution moves in the same direction: The field gets crowded. Comprehensive security.
- Debates on security are Euro-Atlantic debates:
 - broad (aspects),
 - securitization.
- The complexity of the approach and the resources available determine who calls the shots.

The OSCE

- Move to the human dimension within a comprehensive security concept.
- The abuse of human security. Where is the emphasis? (And where it is not...)
- The use of the OSCE as a transmission belt.
- Recreating the balance between the politico-military and humanitarian dimensions for no(t much of a) purpose.

EU and NATO

- EU: coming in heavily with a fairly comprehensive concept into a crowded field.
- Security by other means.
 - Inconclusive, tough predictable...
- NATO: Internal divide and external success.
 - Is there a shared agenda?

Conclusion

- Succeeded to present tendencies and lasting changes.
- Changes partly depend on the development in practice.
- Is our security indivisible?
- If not: Whose security (agenda) prevails?