**Statecraft Simulation International Security**

**Week 2: Collective Security, Alliances and Security Cooperation**

**Collective Security and Collective Defense**

Though the concept of cooperation and alliances between families, tribes, and states, the terms Collective Security and Collective Defense have been a common feature of mankind, of the last century. Both concepts imply a long–term, formal commitment between groups of states to protect the security interests of individual members within their common spheres.

Under collective security, states agree to abide by certain norms and rules to maintain stability and, when necessary, band together to stop aggression. Stability as the absence of major war is the product of cooperation. In a world of balancing under anarchy, states fend for themselves according to the dictates of a hostile international environment. Collective security is preferable to balancing under anarchy, not that collective security is the ultimate answer to preventing war.

**Collective Security** looks inward to attempt to ensure security within a group of sovereign states. The first modern Collective Security organization was the League of Nations founded in the aftermath of World War I. Its members pledged to protect each other from attack by other nations within that organization. The idea was simple: an act of aggression by one or more members against another would be opposed, if necessary, by force, by the other member states of the League. For a variety of reasons, the League of Nations was ultimately not successful in achieving security and stability. This was almost certainly due in large part to the fundamental incompatibility of liberal democracy, fascism and communism that co–existed within its membership.

At the end of World War II, the newly formed United Nations (UN) took up the mantle of Collective Security from the League of Nations. Articles 41 and 42 of the UN Charter provide for action by member states to preserve and restore international peace and security. In the 1970s, the Conference on Co–operation and Security in Europe (CSCE), now the Organization for Co–operation and Security in Europe (OSCE), was formed to provide Collective Security to all of the states of the Eurasian–Atlantic region. However, both of these organizations have been only partially effective.

**A Collective Defense** organization looks outward to defend its members from external aggression. Collective Defense organizations blossomed during the days of the Cold War. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the Western European Union (WEU), the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO), the South East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), and the Warsaw Pact were founded in the aftermath of World War II. Collective Defense commits all nations, bound by treaty, to come to each other’s defense in the event any member is threatened by, or is actually subjected to, military attack by a state or states outside the treaty area.

**What is Cooperative Security?**

The term Cooperative Security has become popular since the end of the Cold War. Although it does not yet have a generally accepted definition, it has been widely used to herald a new approach to international relations. It appeared to offer an escape from narrow Cold War “zero–sum” strategies into the broad sunlit vistas of international peace and harmony. However, as is often the case in life, events have demonstrated that this early burst of optimism was premature.

**The concept of Cooperative Security** is not a post–Cold War invention. Indeed, Immanuel Kant introduced the idea in the late 18th century in his “Article of Perpetual Peace.” Kant proclaimed that “The law of nations shall be founded on a federation of free states.” In the early 1990s, the term Cooperative Security became a new phrase for an idealistic approach to the changing international climate. In 1992, three leading American strategists — Ashton Carter, William Perry, and John Steinbruner — spoke of Cooperative Security in terms of providing new avenues toward world peace: “Organizing principles like deterrence, nuclear stability, and containment embodied the aspirations of the cold war . . . Cooperative Security is the corresponding principle for international security in the post–cold war era.”

In 1994, writing in Foreign Policy, former Australian Foreign Minister Gareth Evans described Cooperative Security as tending “. . . to connote consultation rather than confrontation, reassurance rather than deterrence, transparency rather than secrecy, prevention rather than correction, and interdependence rather than unilateralism.”

These attempts to define and shape the concept of Cooperative Security generally reflect a liberal/idealistic view of the future of world security. Unfortunately, this vision has been rudely jolted by an unwelcome “return of history” in the Balkans, in parts of the former Soviet Union, and elsewhere.

**Cooperative Security: Two New Elements**

To be both useful and effective, Cooperative Security must look both ways, inward and outward. But, it also must incorporate two further dimensions not covered explicitly by either Collective Security or Collective Defense. The first of these is the concept of Individual Security and the second is the Active Promotion and Projection of Stability

.

**Individual Security.** Individual Security stands at the center of any real international security system built around liberal democratic ideals. The protection of the basic freedoms of the individual is the nucleus from which all other forms of security must radiate. In an age of growing inter-connectivity between states and peoples, concern about the human condition within a state has become the interest of the world community. Violations of human rights in one state become very quickly known to the citizens of other states. Recent gross violations of the individual security of large numbers of human beings in Balkans, Caucasus, Central America, Southeast Asia have had a dramatic impact on the international community. These examples and others are clear illustrations of what we might call the “globalization of concern.” Individual Security is now at the heart of the international agenda. The Westphalian concept of the absolute right of states to act as they see fit within their own territories is no longer accepted by liberal democratic states nor, increasingly, by nations within international organizations such as the United Nations. The concept of state sovereignty cannot be a screen behind which mass violations of human security can take place with impunity, even within otherwise recognized international boundaries.

**Promoting Stability.** The second new component of Cooperative Security is the active promotion of stability outside the boundaries of the states forming the Cooperative Security system. Instability in areas adjacent to the territory of the Cooperative Security system will become a matter of serious concern. Stability may be upset by the danger of conflict between states, but also by mass violations of individual security within neighboring states, such as that which occurred in Kosovo in 1998 and early 1999. This provoked a strong reaction from NATO and others. How stability can be developed, restored, and preserved in the world around them should remain the active concern of the states within the Cooperative Security system.

Cooperative Security is a strategic system which forms around a nucleus of liberal democratic states linked together in a network of formal or informal alliances and institutions characterized by shared values and practical and transparent economic, political, and defense cooperation. In a Cooperative Security system, individual states’ national security objectives are linked by four reinforcing rings of security:

**Ring One:** Promoting and Protecting Human Rights. The essential basic value upon which a Cooperative Security system rests is an unquestioned conviction by its members to uphold and maintain the Individual Security of its own citizens and those of their fellow members. This is the inner ring of the Cooperative Security system, which will ultimately hold it together over time under inevitable pressures and stresses, internal and external. Only the ideals and values of liberal democracy can keep this vital nucleus together.

**Ring Two: Maintaining Peace.** This ring of Cooperative Security embodies the concept of Collective Security, i.e., protection from threats and aggression by fellow members of the Cooperative Security system. Collective Security will also include close cooperation between members in countering common threats such as terrorism, organized crime, illegal immigration, drugs, pollution, and joint planning and actions in the event of natural or man–made disasters, etc.

**Ring Three:** Mutual Protection. An essential feature of a Cooperative Security organization is that, unlike the UN or the OSCE, it provides its members with “hard” security. That is, it promises reliable and credible military protection against aggression or the threat of aggression from outside the system. This is the Collective Defense ring of Cooperative Security.

**Ring Four:** Actively Promoting Stability. Finally, a Cooperative Security system attempts to prevent and preempt instability, which will almost certainly include widespread abuse of human rights, in the area around it. It does so by actively Promoting Stability through a wide variety of means, including, as a last resort, the use of force. This is the fourth and outer ring of Cooperative Security, and arguably its most sensitive element.

It is true that non–state organizations, trans–national corporations, non–governmental organizations (NGOs), pressure groups, and even international criminal and terrorist groups are increasingly influential in the security area. There is, however, no early prospect that a realistic alternative to the system of sovereign states and the institutions they form will be replaced as the dominant providers of security to the citizens of this planet. Second only liberal democratic states can be trusted with the protection and furtherance of human rights in their widest sense, the core of the Cooperative Security system. Because of the ultimate unreliability and fragility of undemocratic states as allies — for example, Iran, Libya, and Yugoslavia have all been, at one time or another, helpful to western interests — it seems abundantly clear that only liberal democratic states are capable of developing and sustaining the common objectives, the spirit of compromise, and the flexibility essential for the long–term maintenance of a Cooperative Security system.

NATO provides a real–life model for such a Cooperative Security system. It embodies all four of the basic functions. The EU is in the process of enlarging this NATO core into a wider and deeper Euro–Atlantic Cooperative Security space. Ultimately, this space should be expanded to include other parts of the Eurasian–Atlantic region, including Russia. Beyond this region, the breadth of a Eurasian–Atlantic Cooperative Security is probably limited by virtue of the non–acceptability to other states of its core values and of its common geo–strategic interests.

NATO’s intervention in Kosovo, in 1999, was an example of an attempt to restore and then to promote stability in an area dangerously close to its borders. In Kosovo, massive violations of individual security were an important factor in swinging public opinion behind the NATO action. No less important was the fact that the organized and widespread persecution of ethnic Albanians by the Yugoslav government risked destabilizing the region and threatened NATO members Hungary, Greece, and Turkey, as well as NATO Partners Albania, Macedonia, Romania, and Bulgaria. This fear of destabilization and the spread of conflict were certainly the determining factors in the decision to use military force once political, diplomatic, and economic tools proved ineffective.

**Conclusion**

Cooperative Security, as we have described it, can become the basis for a more peaceful and harmonious future. It combines four basic security arrangements: Individual Security, Collective Security, Collective Defense, and Promoting Stability in widening rings of security. A Cooperative Security system requires from the democratic states that form it a willingness to closely cooperate with each other and to reach out, if necessary, to intervene in areas outside their territories that might affect their common peace and security.

**The Limits of Cooperative Security**

. . . if a powerful and enlightened people should form a republic. . . this would serve as a center of federal union for other states in accordance with the idea of the law of nations. Gradually, through different unions of this kind, the federation would extend further and further.

– Immanuel Kant

**Concerns for Statecraft Simulation -Discussion Themes**

The Statecraft world fits the realist definition of anarchy and countries must grapple with anarchy’s effects: no world government/enforcer to protect one state from another, stop attacks on Sapphire Island, enforce compliance with treaties, etc.

**Discussion question 1**: in what ways has anarchy affected your behavior or made things

difficult in Statecraft? Have you been able to (at least partially) overcome the effects of anarchy? How?

**Discussion question 2**: which countries in Statecraft have acted most like realists in terms of their priorities and strategies? Give specific examples of this telling behavior/rhetoric.

**Discussion question 3**: which countries (if any) in Statecraft have emerged as rising powers due to growing economic and/or military capabilities? How have other countries responded? Balancing through alliances or military buildups? Bandwagoning for security or profit? Why have you chosen these strategies? Do you find yourself balancing more against power capabilities or the combination of power and perceived hostile intentions (threat)?

**Discussion question 4**: what messages have you received from the nationalists that articulate realist themes? What actions of your government were they praising or criticizing?

**Discussion question 5**: Have trade ties led to greater interdependence, cooperation and peace in your Statecraft world? Or have these ties produced asymmetric dependence and exploitation? Give specific examples and explain precisely HOW trade has produced these outcomes.

**Discussion question 6**: Have IGOs in your Statecraft world facilitated cooperation by increasing transparency, reducing transaction costs, etc.? Give specific examples. If not, explain why they haven’t been effective. Do the most powerful states dominate IGOs, as realists predict?

**Discussion question 7**: What norms have developed in your Statecraft world? How did they originate? Has anyone violated them?

**Discussion question 8**: which countries in Statecraft have acted most like idealists in terms of their priorities and strategies? Give specific examples of this telling behavior/rhetoric.