Chapter 13

Security as a Global Public Good: Common Issue for the EU and G8 Agenda

Sergey Medvedev, Igor Tomashov

Security and International Peace as Global Public Goods

The provision of international peace and security is perhaps the most important global public good. In fact, conflicts and wars are usually accompanied by the violation of human rights, destruction of the environment, erosion of institutions and other public bads. Moreover, they cause negative effects, which may destabilize situation at both regional and global levels.

Civil wars and ethnic conflicts trigger refugee flows, growth of crime, and may directly or indirectly influence the situation in neighboring countries. For example, the genocide in Rwanda in 1994 led to the destabilization in Burundi and Zaire (Collier 2006). As pointed out by the International Task Force on Global Public Goods, "In the absence of an effective collective security system, not only will the levels of war, terrorism and other forms of strife increase, but international prosperity will be at risk or even reversed. War, conflict and terrorism will erode international confidence, weakening financial markets. And isolationism and distrust between peoples will infect trade regimes, bringing protectionism and economic reversal. International public health and efforts to combat climate change will suffer in an atmosphere of eroding security" (International Task Force on Global Public Goods 2006).

From the one side, security and international peace are essential global pubic goods, non-excludable in provision and non-rival in consumption. The only argument against this thesis is a geographical remoteness of the conflict region. However, although remoteness to some extent influences the perception of the situation, it does not change the basic characteristics of this type of global public goods. Moreover, the role of the geographical factor is decreasing, considering the "globalization" of the notion of security and peace, and the elimination of the problem of "free-rider" in international politics: in today's world, there are no "free-riders" in the sphere of international security.

However, the study of concrete examples shows, firstly, an existence of different interpretations of security and peace as global public goods, and, secondly, an absence of the mutual dependence between security and peace. When only few countries possess nuclear weapons, it may be seen as a global public good, playing a stabilizing role in the international system. But the borderline between good and bad in this situation is thin: in theory, the aspiration of North Korea and Iran to possess nuclear weapons strengthens their national defense capacity (which may be not the case in reality) at the price of international security. Another fundamental question is to which extent the existence of armies guarantees security and peace and to which extent it precludes peace and security. "Military lobby" has a vested interest in the accumulation of arms and in the perpetuation of conflicts; millions of people all over the world earn their living by working in the military industry or dealing in the "markets of violence". For them, wars are a kind of "club good".

An example of the USSR is an extreme case of the overproduction of the defense capability of the state and of security of the whole Soviet bloc. Meanwhile, the situation of the second half of the 20th century was hardly peaceful. The US and the USSR faced each other during the Cold War, intensifying the arms race and engaging in numerous peripheral conflicts. At times, the world was put at the bring of the nuclear catastrophe, as it happened in the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis. The military might of each other coerced them to peace but did not establish it. This problem is broader than it looks at first glance: a search for balance between guaranteeing the security and peaceful development requires a reassessment of the role of the military factor; meanwhile conflict management and institution building require different types of political management.

In the era of globalization, the concepts of security and international peace are evolving as well. On the one side, the notion of security acquires a "civil" dimension and becomes more elusive: apart from prevention of wars, terrorism, organized crime, and proliferation of the weapons of mass destruction, nowadays it includes financial and energy security, struggle against infectious diseases and against environment degradation. On the other side, the prospects of international peace are vague in the conditions of the growth of global inequality, erosion of the world order, discrediting of the Western "liberal imperialism".

During the Cold War, security was a kind of one-dimensional and homogeneous problem field. It existed in a single political and geographical space, determined by the ideological rivalry between capitalism and socialism. These

days, the provision of global security is a multi-dimensional and multilateral process. This is perfectly seen form the example of Europe, whose security is provided by such different organizations as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the Organization for Cooperation and Security in Europe (OSCE), the European Union (EU), and the Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO) of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). The UN is gradually losing its legitimacy at the global level, not being able to assume the role of the universal mechanism for the solution of security problems. States tend to prefer unilateral actions, or build "coalitions of willing", when engaging in military actions or in conflict management. In these circumstances, the security role of new actors such as the EU is coming to the fore.

The EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy: Providing for Global Security?

Gradualness and consistency in pursuing the goals have always been EU's mode of operation. A move from the economic community to a political union was not easy and took several decades. This process still continues: trying to adapt to the consequences of the recent enlargements and to overcome a crisis of integration, the EU now faces a challenge of political institutionalization and implementation of the common foreign and security policy. And although the citizens of the European countries are not quite ready to see further weakening of their countries' national sovereignties, as indicated by the hardships of the ratification of the European constitution and the Lisbon Treaty, at the level of values, the preconditions for further integration are all in place. An aspiration to peace, commitment to peaceful resolution of conflicts, the rule of law, human rights, and democracy are all essential parts of the European identity. Opinion polls shows that European citizens would favor the adoption by the EU a more effective foreign and defense policy in order to pursue these goals (Emerson 2008).

The establishment of the Western European Union (WEU) in 1948 and of NATO in 1949 are one of the most notable landmarks in the history of the cooperation of European countries in the field of security. These two organizations have guaranteed security of Europe during the second half of the 20th century, until the WEU and the EU merged in 2000 and NATO became oriented towards the solution of global rather than regional problems. Nowadays the EU tends to play a more active role at the international stage, pursuing its foreign policy goals within the framework of the Common Foreign and Se-

curity Policy (CFSP) and the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP) (Barabanov 2000).

EC member states first spoke about the prospects of the implementation of the common European foreign policy through more active intergovernmental consultation and exchange of information at the end of 1960s, when an idea of the "European Political Cooperation" was discussed at the European Council summit in the Hague (Barabanov 2000). The Single European Act adopted in 1986 formalized this intergovernmental cooperation in the field of foreign policy and confirmed an aspiration of the member-states to "endeavor jointly to formulate and implement a European foreign policy" (Barabanov 2000). The massive changes of the end of 1980s and beginning of the 1990s further enhanced this desire.

After the signing of the Maastricht Treaty common foreign and defense policy became one of the pillars of integration. Shortly thereafter, the WEU defined new tasks of foreign and defense policy: humanitarian and rescue tasks, peacekeeping tasks, and tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peacemaking (Barabanov 2000). The EU began to position itself as a "supplier" of security as a global public good; building on the experience of successful provision of peace and security in Western Europe, the EU aspired to "export" security to the global markets. Since that time the EU has become a significant international actor and has participated in conflict management in the Balkans, in Africa and in the Middle East. Another important step was the Amsterdam Treaty, which established the post of a High Representative for Common Foreign and Security Policy. Javier Solana, former Secretary General of the NATO, holds this position since October 1999.

The priorities of the EU foreign policy are defined in the European Security Strategy adopted in 2003. The documents specifies the main contemporary security threats: terrorism, proliferation of the weapons of mass destruction, regional conflicts, organized crime – and calls for a more active, efficient, coherent foreign policy open for cooperation with partners. *"The European Union should be ready to share in the responsibility for global security and in building a better world"*[1]. *In this sense, European foreign policy aims at providing security as a global public good rather than at building the isolationist "fortress Europe".*

---

[1] A Secure Europe in a Better World. European Security Strategy. Brussels, 2003, December 12, p. 2, available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/78367.pdf.

During the last ten years the EU led more than twenty anti-crisis missions. Among them are military operation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chad, DR Congo and off the coast of Somalia, as well as civil operations in Kosovo, Georgia, Palestine, Iraq, Afghanistan, and Indonesia[2]. Moreover, the activity of Javier Solana is supported by eleven special representatives of the EU, working in Afghanistan, the region of the Great Lakes in Africa, in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Central Asia, in Kosovo, Macedonia, Moldova, Sudan, in the South Caucasus, the Middle East, and also in the African Union[3].

The scale and tasks of the CFSP are gradually widening. Mission EULEX in Kosovo organized in 2008 is the largest civil operation in the EU history: around 1900 European international police officers, judges, prosecutors and customs officials are contributing to the institution building on the territory of the newly declared state[4]. An important role of the EU in the settlement of the conflict in Abkhazia and South Ossetia is also worth mentioning: it was Nicolas Sarkozy, the leader of France holding EU presidency at that moment, who mediated in the conflict management between Russia and Georgia in August – September 2008. Nowadays stability is the region is backed by the EU Monitoring Mission in Georgia[5]. Finally, in 2008 the EU announced its first naval operation, planning to fight piracy in Somalia by sending there around twenty ships and aircraft during 2009[6].

The Role of the EU and G8 in the Provision of Global Public Goods

The domain of public policy is not limited any more by the borders of nation-states. Public policy has gone global, which opens new opportunities for collective action but also causes new problems. Guaranteeing international peace and security is one of the main points on the global agenda. However, despite the recognition of this fact by all significant international actors, the level of

---

[2] Overview of the missions and operations of the European Union, 2009, April, available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/map-ENApril09.pdf.

[3] EU Special Representatives, available at: http://ue.eu.int/showPage.aspx?id=263&lang=EN.

[4] European Union Rule of Law Mission in Kosovo (EULEX KOSOVO), available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/showPage.aspx?id=1458&lang=en.

[5] European Union Monitoring Mission in Georgia (EUMM), available at: http://ue.eu.int/showPage.aspx?id=1512&lang=en.

[6] EU Naval Operation Against Piracy (EU NAVFOR Somalia – Operation ATALANTA), available at: http://ue.eu.int/uedocs/cmsUpload/090422-Factsheet_EU_NAVFOR_Somalia-version6_EN.pdf.

violence in the world does not decrease, new conflict areas continue to emerge, and an amount of terrorist acts grows every year. Although Western countries make considerable efforts, struggling these types of global public bads, the demand for security and peace by far exceeds their supply.

Many actions by the West, and their long-term consequences, also provoke ambiguous interpretations. The lack of aid to the poorest countries is seen as an evidence of the "predatory nature of capitalism"; but the increase of assistance conditioned by launching political and economic reforms is often called "another manifestation of neocolonialism". Moreover, the research indicates that the increase of humanitarian aid and official development assistance may not reach their aims because irresponsible local leaders in the recipient countries use released government resources to raise their military spending[7] (Collier 2006). The countries of the G8 are also criticized for the fact that its members, speaking about global security and struggle with poverty, in reality are not ready to build a better world, having a material interest in selling arms to the same countries, which receive their humanitarian aid: Congo, Sudan, Myanmar, etc.[8] But if they one day refuse to sell weapons, this will quite probably result in the new accusations of the developed countries, that seek to preserve their hegemony by preventing the developing nations from guaranteeing their security.

One of the most disturbing trends of the 2000s is a slowdown in the pace of world's democratization. Nowadays an amount of democracies is roughly the same as it was ten years ago[9]. The United States' attempt to establish democratic regime in Iraq did not only taint their global image but it also seriously destabilized global security. The question is paradoxical: is it possible to wage wars for the sake of the ideal that democracies do not fight each other?[10]

---

[7] "Recent research has been able to estimate this leakage; typically about 16% of aid indirectly augments military spending. This is not a high percentage, but in Africa, where aid is large relative to military spending, this estimate implies that on average more than half of military spending is inadvertently financed by aid." See (Collier 2006), p.10.

[8] "Bolshaya vos'merka rasoryaet beneishie strany pri pomoshi postavok oruzhiya (The group of Eight Ruins the Poorest Countries by Selling Them Arms), available at: http://www.lenta.ru/news/2005/06/22/g8/.

[9] The summary of a roundtable discussion titled "The State of Democracy in the World and the Western Effort to Promote It: Why Has Progress Stopped?" The Carnegie Moscow Center, 30th of July 2008, available at: http://www.carnegie.ru/ru/news/78748.htm.

[10] A striking answer to this question was given in 2002 by an English diplomat and supporter of the invasion of Iraq Robert Cooper. He tried to argue the positive role of the

However, difficulties in finding the consensus is not a reason to give up. The EU provides the example of best practice here. The size of the European aid, which comes from the EU budget and the budgets of its member-states, amounts to approximately EUR 50 bn, accounting for more than 50% of the world's official development assistance[11]. Moreover, the EU is the largest trading partner for the world's poorest countries. The Union also supports non-governmental organizations and fulfils commitments, undertaken during the summits of the G8. E.g., accomplishing the project "G8 Global Partnership against the Spread of Nuclear Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction", the EU has committed more than EUR 850 million for a more effective control over chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear weapons and materials[12].

Establishment of humanitarian and military missions makes it possible for the EU to use its authority and resources for the provision of global security. However, the EU is often criticized for inability and even fear of a more active engagement in international affairs. In fact, can the dispatch of a few dozens of police officers and diplomats to several countries change anything in reality? The only exclusion is the Balkans, but this region has a prospect of joining the EU and that is why the operations there cannot be seen as an accomplishment of a purely global mission. And even in the Balkans the EU follows the principle of the "visibility" of the uniformed military and police forces, whose symbolic presence should prevent new violent conflicts (Emerson, Gross 2007). In this sense, the "post-heroic" approach of the EU can be either praised as a new post-modern type of foreign policy or criticized for its passivity. The reality is that it is in many ways predetermined by the US mil-

---

idea of "double standards" in inthernational relations: "The challenge to the postmodern world is to get used to the idea of double standards. Among ourselves, we operate on the basis of laws and open cooperative security. But when dealing with more old-fashioned kinds of states outside the postmodern continent of Europe, we need to revert to the rougher methods of an earlier era – force, pre-emptive attack, deception, whatever is necessary to deal with those who still live in the nineteenth century world of every state for itself. Among ourselves, we keep the law but when we are operating in the jungle, we must also use the laws of the jungle". See: Cooper R. (2002) "The New Liberal Imperialism", The Observer, April 7, available at: http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2002/apr/07/1.

[11] Tackling Poverty, available at: http://ue.eu.int/showPage.aspx?id=1245&lang=EN; Europe gives more and better aid, available at: http://ue.eu.int/showPage.aspx?id=1248&lang=EN.

[12] G8 Global Partnership, available at: http://ue.eu.int/showPage.aspx?id=1226&lang=EN.

itary might, which makes it possible for Europe not to think about military aspects of its security.

In general, the EU nowadays is one of the largest suppliers of global public goods. Establishing peace in Europe and the creation of a stable zone of freedom and security on the continent are one of greatest achievements of humanity in the second half of the 20th century. The tasks for the 21st century are a further accumulation of these goods and the spread of European values and high political and economic standards to the territory of at least "Wider Europe", which includes the Mediterranean region, the Middle East, Russia, and Central Asia. The development of the Common Foreign and Security policy is undoubtedly the main instrument of the provision of international peace and security as global public goods.

References

Commission of the European Communities (2003) A Secure Europe in a Better World. European Security Strategy, Brussels, December 12, p. 2, available at: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/78367.pdf.

Cooper R. (2002) "The New Liberal Imperialism", *The Observer*, April 7, available at: http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2002/apr/07/1.

Barabanov O. (2000) "Tendencii razvitiya OVPB ES i ZES: nezhdannyi vyzov dlya Rossii?" (Main Trends in EU Common Foreign and Security Policy Development and the WEU: An Unexpected Challenge for Russia?), in: D. Trenina (ed.) Russia and European Security Institutions: Entering the 21st Century. Moscow: The Carnegie Moscow Center, S&P, Chapter 3, available at: http://www.carnegie.ru/ru/pubs/books/volume/36469.htm.

Collier P. (2006) "Peace and Security", *Expert Paper Series Five: Peace and Security*, Stockholm, Sweden: Secretariat of the International Task Force on Global Public Goods, p. 26, available at: http://www.gpgtaskforce.org/uploads/files/204.pdf.

Emerson M. (2008) "The Struggle for a Civilized Wider European Order: Elements for European Security Strategy", *CEPS Working Document,* no. 307, October, p. 25.

Emerson M., Gross E. (eds.) (2007) Evaluating the EU's Crisis Missions in the Balkans, *CEPS Paperbacks*, p. 11, available at: http://shop.ceps.eu/BookDetail.php?item_id=1538.

Meeting Global Challenges: International Cooperation in the National Interest. Final report, 2006. Stockholm, Sweden: International Task Force on Global Public Goods, p. 55.