

## "Global Security Today"

Since the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century the notion of security underwent changes. Gradually there are 'fresh theories' coming to the fore reflecting these changes. They cast doubt on traditional political "beliefs". The notion of sovereignty as established by Westphalian peace order is slowly losing its leverage as the principle of non-intervention is invalid when certain country commits grave violation of the international law. Hence, such concepts emerge as Humanitarian Intervention, Responsibility to Protect –its developed version. These and alike concepts among others emphasize the legitimacy of cause and authority as well as right intention for the use of military force as a last resort for serving the just cause.

There is suggestion that threats to one particular state or security breaches there matter to others as long as these violations can somehow affect the latter. Examples are overarching, Afghanistan, Iraq, Sudan, Lebanon, Israeli-Palestinian issue and just recently Georgia. In the aftermath of the August Georgia-Russia military crisis over S. Ossetia Presidents of Ukraine, Poland and Latvia addressed the UN General Assembly, not to sit on its hands just because Russia is a permanent UN Security Council member and defend Georgia as well as ensure security provisions to them. At the same time they reminded the international community that return to power politics and the buffer zone policies will have devastating impact on peace and security overall.

There are various efforts put to solve problems on the collective basis... or sometimes not that much collectively inspired governments decide to execute actions for what they perceive as a just cause. It is enough to quote ex Secretary of Defence of the US D. Rummsfeld who not long before the Iraqi campaign supported expediency of: "... the mission decides the coalition" instead of a more consensus based "coalition decides the mission" approach within NATO.

Indeed, some powerful global actors are eager to rely on solely military power justifying their behavior by arguing that liberal democracies do not fight each other, therefore to

preserve peace and reduce violence it is not enough only to expand the number of democratic states but to protect the existing ones too, by introducing (or sometimes even enforcing) principles of democracy and protecting them anywhere it is necessary. They think saving democracy where needed is not possible without 'hard power' or at least a clear signal that it will be applied as various cases of Taiwan, S. Korea, Iraq, Iran, etc. illustrate.

Those countries that are far from being democratic follow the suit also. When considering the recent Russian invasion of Georgia there appear to be resemblances drawn by the Russian leadership with other conflict situations in justifying invasion of the sovereign country and violating its territorial integrity. Russia claimed to have its citizens brutally oppressed, human rights violated, further it saw the need of protecting minority against majority and its violent ruling elite; President Medvedev denounced Saakashvili as a political corpse. Further, Russia's Lavrov explains the recognition of the breakaway regions of Georgia, a rough violation of international law, as an only way left to ensure security of the very existence of the peoples of Abkhazia and S. Ossetia. Additionally, the Russian political establishment drew parallels with Kosovo – as a precedent.

Now one can argue how sincere and relevant were the Russian actions– some might have been, this does not grant them legitimacy though, others ridiculously false; however point here is that while taking harsh decisions and implementing them in a hurry one should bear in mind that one way or another they are going to be repeated somewhere else in the world that in turn results in a great negative impact on the security worldwide.

Another good example for this sort of a 'build up' is the US-Russian doctrine based relationship in the closest aftermath of events of the September 11<sup>th</sup>.

When generally discussing the quality of security in a small state and circumstances that affect its safety it is worth mentioning that the advantage the small state has against bigger and more aggressive one, especially when the former aspires for the Euro-Atlantic membership, lies in its stronghold in developing democratic institutions, rule of law, securing freedom of expression and mass-media, respect of human rights, fair elections,

etc. However, when these criteria are partially fulfilled or even ignored the small state invokes doubts within the international community whether it is worth supporting such a leadership or even a state itself. This way it distances itself from being integrated in the institutions mentioned above and is left vulnerable to aggression hence compromising its own peaceful existence and security of its citizens.

Along with traditional threats to peace and security worldwide there are factors that deserve attention for they have great impact on the global security. They became significant relatively later though. These are the threats of socio-economic type, of the chain reaction category which in the epoch of globalization are no less harmful for the peace and security than for example WMD and terrorism.

There are no border regulations functioning among a number of states around the globe for the sake of better existence. A pile of economic theories praise and support postulates ranging from the free trade zones to political unions among countries encouraged by the free market economy.

There is a flip side to this coin though; the threats of various kinds seem to be taking advantage of this situation also. Especially when those “new“ threats are neither apparent, nor of military nature... what happens is that they penetrate into our daily life, people do not suffer them that noticeably nonetheless they are very much present; additionally, every human being is individually very much vulnerable to them.

What first comes to mind is arms and drugs sales, population growth, human trafficking, intellectual property violations. Their danger capacity increases even more while having direct/indirect links among each other.

This time motivation/motivator factor is – financial profit as opposed to religious fanaticism in case of terrorism for example.

Environmental threats as well as food and energy security are last but not least in this list.

A significant contribution covering the controversial issues mentioned above was made by the Commission on Human Security. As this multinational body suggests, the internal and transnational threats can cause even more troubles to global security than the purely external ones.

Additionally, it is important to consider that each region has different set of factors determining its security. When there is a lack of relevant regional analysis and adequate action, it leaves negative impact on security related issues.

When referring to the public opinion in this context, the 2005 Survey of Attitudes and Global Engagement survey is the recent example of how different is the public attitude to the security related issues in the various parts of the world.

All the above mentioned raises many questions when thinking of what security means for individuals, nations, states and for the whole planet.

Additionally, here is a great effort needed for the Caucasus, particularly, not to become the “Eurasian Balkans”, as once was mentioned, this way undermining the global security.