

Conclusion

Seeking Conceptual Links for Changing Paradigms

Ersel Aydinli

UNDERSTANDING GLOBALIZATION

Scholars of globalization studies have suffered from what could be called an uneasy preoccupation with definitional issues. Naturally so, perhaps, when we consider that it is still nearly impossible to attend a conference on globalization without hearing globalization critics' cries of "Haven't you defined it yet?" Books on the topic of globalization often carry a tone of apology for not being able to offer a precise and generally agreed-on definition. Efforts to respond to the need for definition may have, to some extent, delayed scholarly inquiry from moving in what could be a more fruitful direction, namely, looking at globalization's interaction with other forces and subsequent impacts. For those still preoccupied with definitions, an approach that looks at these interactions might well serve as a more effective way of clarifying the essential nature of globalizing phenomena.

Approaching globalization in an interaction context highlights the large extent to which it is a dynamic and contingent process. It has been often pointed out that globalization is not so much a prevailing condition as it is a process (Cerny, 1996; Clark, 1997; Giddens, 2000; Held, McGrew, Goldblatt, & Perraton, 1999; Rosenau, 1997). It is, moreover, a process that shifts, surges, and feeds on dynamic relationships. It is not, in other words, a constant process with unvarying sources. When history encourages liberation from conceptual jails (such as existing paradigms that we cling to as identities) or policy jails (such as certain polarity structures), a booming of interactions between global actors—including individuals—becomes salient. These periods of increased interaction can be considered as surges in the long history of globalization. Moreover, when individual and collective actors experience globalization, they not only go through transformations themselves, but they also reshape the globalization processes with which they interact. For example, the reactions of

major states to globalization are likely to foster new dynamics that, in turn, may serve as inputs for altered relationships and interactions between actors and situations.

Observing and analyzing globalization are most feasible when done in conjunction with probes of major issues and factors in world politics. Thus, you have not read many attempts to define globalization in this volume. Rather its chapters sought to go beyond definition, to explore the interaction of globalization with other major dimensions of international affairs—most notably, with security and the nation-state.

WHY GLOBALIZATION AND SECURITY SHOULD BE STUDIED TOGETHER

Studying globalization and security separately can first be seen as unproductive in the sense that separate agendas do not contribute to the comprehensive accumulation and integration of knowledge. Such an agenda is also impractical in light of the realities of world politics. Most people would agree that processes of accelerated global interactions are bringing countries and regions closer together and creating a growing web of ties both geographically and functionally. These ties lead to new and transformed types of security issues. For example, factors such as the skill revolution, authority crises, and an organizational explosion, feed into so-called “fragmegrative” sources of instability, such as technological, transportation, organizational and economic revolutions, and foster pressure for the diffusion of authority (Rosenau, 1997).

Even traditional security establishments, which for a long time ignored globalizing processes as a major consideration in their planning, now recognize that globalization is indeed having a profound impact on current and future security affairs (Kugler & Frost, 2001). While in some cases the processes of globalization may lessen security dangers, they may also magnify others. The 9/11 attacks are an obvious example in this regard. These attacks revealed the globalization of terror, and showed how globalization may give rise to new military missions, purposes, and priorities in a more global context.

Additionally, the concepts of globalization and security are related at theoretical levels of analysis. There cannot be a preferred level of analysis for globalization studies, since such phenomena unfold at virtually every level and in nonlinear formats. When considering interactions between globalization and security, therefore, it is possible to go beyond the traditional distinction between external and internal—a natural outcome of the state-centric paradigm—which has had a limiting effect on the study of International Relations (IR). While traditional security issues have been largely occupied with external threats, with the advance of globalization, security issues and challenges have become increasingly transnational and multilevel. Security studies must

speed up its efforts to find ways of further conceptualization of multilevel and nonlinear understandings.

GLOBALIZATION AND SECURITY STUDIES

The concepts of globalization and security have, directly or indirectly, been considered together in various studies. Many works have argued, for example, that globalization produces further complications for security agendas, thus placing a heavy emphasis on the negative consequences of globalization (e.g., Cha, 2000; Clark, 1999; Guehenno, 1998; Rodrik, 1997; Scholte, 2000; and Zangl & Zurn, 1999). One could also include in this list most of the contributions to the three-volume work edited by Kugler and Frost (2001). Even Friedman's *The Lexus and the Olive Tree* (2000), generally a pro-globalization book, admits that globalization does not necessarily foster integration or stability.

Studies that have in some way discussed the concepts of globalization and security together can generally be grouped into three main types: policy-oriented studies, socioeconomic studies, and IR studies. Policy-oriented studies (e.g., Kugler & Frost, 2001; Mackinlay, 2002) have been largely produced in response to the 'new' security/insecurity challenges of the present era. These studies, often commissioned by state-supported institutions, seem to assume that the new security challenges are the result of advancing globalization. As such, they attempt to provide policy answers or state strategies to meet these challenges. Also within this strand of research, it is possible to find studies examining the role that technology has played in the development of the current international system (e.g., O'Hanlon, 2000; Skolnikoff, 1993). A general theme of this type of inquiry focuses on how scientific research was at the service of the state in the twentieth century and how this cooperation may now be changing with the advance of globalization and the global spread of technology as a resource of actors other than states.

A second strand of studies that indirectly brings together the concepts of globalization and security are those that pursue a socioeconomic approach. These studies (e.g., Beck, 2000; Giddens, 2000) view globalization as leading to major socioeconomic transformations that generally produce insecurities for domestic/societal and international actors of world politics. This strand has operationalized the relationship between globalization and security in two primary ways. The first of these is that uneven development will create conflict. Particularly at the national level, globalization critics find a direct correlation between globalization-fed corporate profits and global poverty. Poverty is seen as a major source of conflict since national security has increasingly been equated with economic security (Flanagan, 2001). At the national level, globalization produces rising elites and a middle class, both of which demand

bigger shares of the pie than other segments of society. When the gap between these groups grows, the result may be antigovernment movements (e.g., China and Iran) and even violent conflicts (e.g., Indonesia). The second major perspective is that unchecked economic globalization leads to global economic crises that can be devastating for developing state economies. For example, the speed, volatility, and sudden withdrawals of financial flows led some countries into serious recession during the 1997–1998 Asian crisis (Rothkopf, 2001; Stiglitz, 2002).

Yet another example that could be considered in this second group, one that emphasizes the social dimensions of economic factors, is that of Huntington's clash of civilizations (1993). He predicted that violence resulting from international anarchy and the absence of common values and institutions would erupt among and between civilizations rather than among and between states. His argument raises the additional question of whether statehood is losing its primacy with respect to the future of international conflict. The general perspective is that more interaction means more conflict, and more interaction stems from more globalization. For a similar argument based on a clear connection between globalization and conflict on the one hand and religious and cultural identity on the other, see Johnston (2001).

The third strand of studies on globalization and security involves conceptualizations of IR. Some of these works are interested in understanding how traditional security dilemmas have been affected by the dynamics of globalization. Others focus on how the international system and its primary actors—traditionally considered to be states—are affected when attempting to cope with globalizing dynamics. Examples of this type of work include those by Clark (1997); Held, McGrew, Goldblatt, & Perraton (1999); Rosenau (1997); Scholte (2000); and Sorensen (2001).

Yet another cluster of IR studies is focused on economic globalization and security. Although such works may seem more closely tied with the socioeconomic strand, the types of research questions they ask (e.g., what is the relationship between economic interdependence and conflict?) help keep them in line with an IR perspective. Two general types of methodological directions are taken in these works. The first are those historical studies, many of which have been highly influenced by world systems theory and Lenin's imperialism theory. The second group is of a largely comparative and quantitative nature (e.g., Barbieri & Schneider, 1999; Dorussen, 1999; Gowa, 1994; Mansfield, 1994; Mansfield & Pollins, 2001).

Within all types of globalization and security studies, in fact, those with economic dimensions seem to be the most numerous. This is perhaps to be expected since, even before globalization studies began to accelerate in the 1990s, there was already an IR research agenda on interdependence and conflict. Often interdependence then came to be equated with globalization. Since economic dimensions were generally seen as the first factors to expand as a

result of interdependence and globalization, both of these concepts were first identified and presented in terms of their economic aspects.

The works in this volume can be considered as fitting within the third, or IR, strand of studies incorporating concepts of globalization and security. While an extensive literature has often linked these two concepts, it has been pointed out that work still needs to be done to more fully develop the conceptual connections between globalization and security (Cha, 2000). The diverse literature on these matters could well be strengthened by the development of a taxonomy consisting of key variables that sustain the relationship between these dynamics. Primary causalities could be hypothesized and explored in more depth, and all of this is best done without paying heed to disciplinary boundaries or limiting levels of analysis.

A major aim of the chapters in this volume, therefore, was to contribute to further conceptualizing and operationalizing of the relationship between security and globalization. In consideration of the preceding chapters and in conjunction with the broader literature outlined earlier, it becomes possible to distinguish certain emergent conceptual links, which may serve as starting guidelines for a much needed focusing of research inquiries.

CONCEPTUAL LINKS BETWEEN GLOBALIZATION AND SECURITY

Change

Three initial issues seem to provide an appropriate framework within which to link the phenomena embraced by globalization and security. The first of these issues is "change." One of the greatest challenges now addressed in security studies involves the processes of change and the uncertainty they can generate in global affairs. With security often understood as an aspect of control, maintaining the status quo, mastering it, or adapting to it thus becomes one of the primary aims of actors in the international system. Changing environments and the resulting insecurities have become a primary research inquiry for security studies.

At the same time, change can be seen as very much a factor associated with globalization. However one may choose to define globalization (e.g., acceleration and constriction of historical trends, universalization/diffusion of world values and traditions, or rapidly growing and uneven cross-border flows of goods, services, people, money, technology, information, ideas, culture, crime, and weapons), change is likely to be treated as a central feature of the processes that unfold. Globalization has thus been a constant source of the change and uncertainty that have inspired security studies in the post-Cold War era. By studying the changes in security wrought by globalization,

research can benefit and help generate an accumulation of generalizable knowledge on world affairs.

Power

Security studies have also long been preoccupied with the concept of power, which provides a second useful issue on which to base a conceptualization of the links between globalization and security. Since reconfigurations of power distribution and their implications in the international arena often lead to conflict, they have always been a primary research focus of security. Power reconfigurations present a conceptual linkage between globalization and security in the sense that globalization tends to generate new contexts both at the national and international level for power reconfigurations, or what might be called shifting spheres of authority. Examples of how authority is shifting can be seen in the conduct of international terrorist groups or organized-crime units, which have been moving their activities increasingly from the national level into the transnational arena. Other examples include some national level entities such as NGOs and business corporations, which were previously treated as trivial in terms of their capacities but are now enjoying a greater degree of deference at the expense of formerly unquestioned power centers such as state security establishments.

Duality

A third reason why the links between globalization and security should be studied is related to the ways in which globalization has generated a bifurcation of global structures. Along with the advance of globalization studies, IR scholarship has observed a duality between a traditional state-centric system and an emerging multicentric one (Rosenau, 1990). While security and security studies represent clear reflections of a state-centric world, globalization has fostered and sustained a multicentric one. Perhaps most important to this formulation is the idea that globalization and the emerging multicentric world have not replaced the traditional foundations of the state-centric world. In fact, a large scholarship—including several of the authors in this volume—now implicitly or explicitly suggests that both worlds coexist, sometimes cooperatively, often conflictually, and always interactively. As Mittleman notes, international studies have entered an “interregnum between the old and the new” (2002: 12).

In terms of security, globalization and the emerging multicentric world have not eliminated traditional geopolitical concerns and conceptualizations.

The images and understandings of the state-centric world are still very much preoccupied with traditional security considerations such as the primacy of state interests, state-to-state alliances, balancing against threat as well as many lingering geopolitical conflicts over geography, military competition, and ethnic issues. On the other hand, the advent of globalization and the multicentric world have created several alterations of the traditional security concepts at various levels.

Both conceptually and as policy issues, in short, stability and security emerge as significant research challenges within this dualistic epoch—an epoch that has been characterized by innovative terminology such as “fragmegration” (Rosenau, 1997) (fragmentation and integration), “glocalization” (Robertson, 1995) (globalization and localization), or “chaord” (Hock, 1995) (chaos and order). Hoffman (2002) draws on one of these characterizations: he views the 1990s as a period dominated by the tension between the fragmentation of states that border on or slip into failure and the progress of economic, cultural, and political integration fostered by globalization. He refers to 9/11 as the “bloody link” between the two worlds of interstate relations and global society.

WHY THE STATE SHOULD BE INCORPORATED INTO GLOBALIZATION AND SECURITY STUDIES

The foregoing discussion suggests possible links between the processes of globalization and the processes of change, power reconfiguration, and systemic duality. Likewise, the state itself can be relocated and reframed in terms of its interaction with these three processes.

Duality and the State

In terms of duality, the emergence of a multicentric world has brought new actors into the global arena alongside the states of the traditional state-centric world. The globalization literature tends to talk about transnational non-governmental actors (e.g., NGOs, corporations, and global civil society), global governance structures (e.g., the United Nations, the IMF, and the World Bank) and their roles in terms of controlling, taming, and managing globalization. Whether as the controllers of ‘chaos’ in the globalization era, or as fine-tuners to meet changing global norms, states are still recognized widely as actors that can and will continue to play important management roles. Taming both the geopolitics and globalization of the current duality has been described as a “key challenge of statecraft” (Flanagan, 2001: 10).

If we accept that the state's role remains important, we also need to ask which states should be the focus of inquiry. The answer is that a research agenda incorporating states, security, and globalization must be a truly global one. Particularly after the events of 9/11, the lines between core and periphery (in terms of security) have disappeared, weakening arguments of an insulated duality between zones of conflict and zones of peace (Singer & Wildavsky, 1993). Insecurities in the periphery have the ultimate potential to threaten and even hurt the core. Globalization, security, and the state studies cannot follow the mistakes of IR in ignoring the periphery and arguing that small states do not matter (Ayoob, 1998; David, 1997).

Globalization and the state literature has also questioned whether the state itself is likely to remain the same, be transformed, or has already lost its primary mission as a result of globalization. Though this debate is far from concluded, a transformationalist strand, arguing that the state neither remains the same nor has lost its strength but is transforming in response to globalization, seems to be the most widely accepted interpretation. If this is so, such a transformation would have significant consequences for security studies. Depending on the way that the role of the state is conceived, security studies may have to redefine its treatment of this 'primary' reference object.

Power, Change, and the State

Within a duality as previously described, competing actors will emerge and, subsequently, various shifts of power configurations are likely to follow. Studies should identify, for example, how the state will deal with such power reconfigurations and also how it will manage to project its remaining capacities on behalf of its international and regional missions (e.g., building up regional economic organizations as well as security ones, such as ASEAN and MERCOSUR, are among the mechanisms states employ for this purpose). In general, such reconfigurations affect the states themselves as well as their abilities and choices in managing the changes they face in the new epoch.

While traditionally states could respond to many international phenomena as unitary actors, globalization makes such responses less and less likely (an inadequacy that itself presents a security challenge worthy of study). Rather it is very likely that a variety of responses will emanate from the different agencies of states and governments. In other words, the globalizing processes of different segments of a nation-state might evoke different reactions from its various parts that result in domestic power shifts and reconfigurations. For example, a state's business sector might take advantage of globalization and thereby gain power vis-à-vis other state branches such as the bureaucracy or the political elite.

Even in the most developed countries, which are supposed to be managing and adapting best to globalization, one can observe this variation. In the case of the U.S. government, for example, security, economic, science and technology, and law enforcement policies essential to coping with the challenges of the global era are still developed largely in isolation from one another (though the recent construction of the Homeland Security Department implies that there is awareness of the need for change).

The situation is even more problematic when it comes to less developed countries. Here one can see even clearer fault lines between various state segments. It is not surprising, therefore, that foreign service bureaucracies or business elite of some governments in the developing world, such as Russia, China, Turkey, and Iran, have been involved with different dimensions of globalization than have these countries' armed forces. The number of varying categories of relationships with globalization can rise exponentially when you look at the individual level (see, e.g., the "12-worlds" in Rosenau, 2003).

If the state is not ready institutionally to transform itself and adapt in order to accommodate globalization, political and economic stability could suffer, leading to a growth in corruption and bribery, or even criminal networks. The Russian case may be seen as an example here. Its more aggressive units, such as clandestine networks, have taken advantage of globalization and manipulated the "opening up" unchecked by the political authority. The attention-grabbing ability of these groups helps to give the impression that globalization may benefit these groups more than less violent ones. Ultimately, these developments could confuse public opinion about whether globalization is positive or negative. In turn, the state may become distracted from a necessary focus on the management of globalization.

All of this seems to imply that states may be increasingly insecure in this new globalizing world that requires at least a modicum of transformation some states are often not prepared to make. Thus, there can be a pervasive sense of losing control (for a compelling account of this phenomenon, see Del Rosso, 1995). Moreover, it is increasingly evident that the costs of the negative consequences are high if states are not well prepared to directly confront and manage the negative challenges. For example, 9/11 and the global resurgence of terrorism revealed how states and the state system were not ready for such challenges, both conceptually (not expecting the attack from a multicentric actor) and also practically (see T.V. Paul, this volume). Perhaps the best example of this dualistic structure in world politics with respect to security can be seen in the war on terrorism. If individuals without clear state support or involvement can pose a security challenge to which the state system is having difficulty responding with traditional state tools, it clearly indicates the coexistence of dual worlds. It then follows that we must find a way of studying the globalization/security relationship within this dualistic worldview.

CONCLUSION

I have argued here for the need to study globalization and security in conjunction, and have offered three conceptual tools as a step toward an operationalization in future studies. I have also proposed that globalization and security studies could benefit from a concentration on the state as a useful platform for reflecting what happens when globalizing dynamics meet with traditional and new security issues. The state is thus a litmus test for exploring what happens when globalization and security converge.

The works in this volume sought to draw links between the concepts of globalization, security, and the nation-state. In doing so, the various chapters explored the connections between security and global transformations and the changes in state structures in response to the emergent connections. As such, the combined results of this volume represent starting points in a conceptual linking of security and globalization, in identifying how the state concept provides a common ground for studying the interaction of globalization and security, and in projecting the possible effects of this conceptual convergence on the international system.

Attempts to consider large concepts such as globalization, security, and the state in conjunction with one other but without guiding tools will run the obvious risk of becoming lost—an unfortunate result reflected in the often dispersed literature on these issues. Such a lack of coordination is especially likely when these concepts are undergoing rapid change—both within themselves and in their interactions with each other. Thus, we need to introduce guiding conceptual tools to provide a focus to globalization and security studies. Duality, power, and change may offer a starting point for future research.