38.1 Introduction¹

In the Covenant of the League of Nations (1919) and in the United Nations Charter (1945), ‘international peace and security’ have been used together as the key purposes of both international organizations to be achieved by global (chap. VI and VII of UN Charter) and regional systems (chap. VIII of UN Charter) of collective security, as well as by collective and national self defence (Art. 51 UN Charter; chap. 4 by Wæver; chap. 35 by Bothe).

International relations as a social science discipline (chap. 37 by Baylis) has emerged after the Peace Conference in Versailles (1919), relying on knowledge in political philosophy, diplomatic and military history and international law, and it was influenced by the three ideal type traditions the English school has identified with realism (Hobbes), rationalism or pragmatism (Grotius 1625, 1975), and idealism (Kant), that have also existed in other intellectual traditions (Chinese, Indian, Arabic, pre-Columbian) and may be associated with many other thinkers unknown to the Western debate (chap. 3 by Brauch; chap. 10 by Oswald; and chap. 11–21).

Peace research and security studies are two distinct research programmes within the sub-discipline of international relations (IR) and also beyond, due to their multidisciplinary approaches that combine knowledge from philosophy, sociology, psychology, anthropology, and law. Both research programmes are identified with one of the two common goals and purposes of the League of Nations and of the United Nations. While peace research has evolved primarily in the idealist and security studies in the realist tradition, the Grotian tradition has offered a common middle ground for both programmes.

This chapter addresses two questions: How have the concepts of security evolved in both schools during the 20th century? Did the three global changes: a) the global contextual change in 1990, b) globalization, and c) the emerging ‘anthropocene’ (Crutzen/Stoermer 2000; Crutzen 2000) trigger a reconceptualization of security? To answer these questions, books surveying the evolution and results in both schools will be reviewed in the next five parts.

However, much of the conceptual debate on security and on its reconceptualization has taken place in scientific journals: for peace research especially in the Journal of Peace Research and Security Dialogue published by the International Peace Research Institute in Oslo (PRIO), and for security studies in Survival (IISS) that has been interested more in issues of the changing security agenda and International Security (Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University), the leading journal in the US, where many of the new global dangers for US national security have been addressed.²

The evolution of both schools since 1919 will be reviewed (38.2) and the key conceptual disputes between both schools prior to, during, and after the Cold War will be listed (38.3) that provided the framework for the evolution of the security concept in security, strategic, and war studies (38.4) as well as in peace research (38.5) and for the post Cold War dispute between those who adhere to a narrow primarily military and diplomatic security concept and the ‘widerners’ who have combined five dimensions and sectors with five different referent objects and levels of analysis (38.6).

¹ The authors appreciate the critical and constructive comments and stimulating suggestions by Ursula Oswald Spring (Mexico) who commented on two text versions, and by Czesaw Mesjasz (Poland) and Pál Dunay (Hungary) who reviewed the second revised text. Their comments are reflected in this text.

38.2 The Two Schools and Three Traditions

The discipline of international relations was born on 30 May 1919 at the Peace Conference in Versailles (Paris) when policy advisers of US President W. Wilson and British Prime Minister L. George agreed to establish scientific institutes for the study of international relations in their countries that should focus on the causes, conditions, and forms of war and peace, and on the approaches and results of international conflict resolution as its conceptual core (Meyers 1979, 1984, 1993, 1994, 1994a). Meyers (2000) saw this new discipline as a science interpreting and resolving crises. According to this interpretation the study of international relations may be understood as an answer of the scientific community to extra-scientific, socio-economic, and political crises that could not be satisfied by the traditional approaches of diplomatic history, political philosophy, and international law (Meyers 1994a: 231).

In the two decades between the World Wars (1919–1939), in the new discipline of international relations an idealist approach focusing on international organizations and institutions prevailed that was being challenged from a realist perspective (e.g. by Carr 1939; Spykman 1942; Morgenthau 1948, 1960; Waltz 1959, 1979).

During the Cold War period (1947–1989) international relations in the West was dominated by theoretical approaches and concepts developed by and disputes among different schools of American scholars that influenced this emerging field in Europe, in the Asia Pacific, as well as in many Third World countries in Africa, Latin America, and in the Arab world whose IR experts were primarily trained in American, British, Canadian, and French universities and graduate schools. During the period of state socialism (1917–1991), the theoretical and conceptual debate in the East was influenced by the Marxist-Leninist ideology, and in China by Maoist thinking that was gradually revised by Deng Xia Ping during the 1980’s. In the Socialist world many scholars and political leaders from liberation movements and progressive governments were trained in Marxist approaches to international politics. In the South, in Asia, Africa, and Latin America different regional and national traditions prevailed that were often inspired by the political leaders of liberation movements (Nasser, Nkruma, Nyere) and by third world intellectuals (e.g. Abdel Malek, Samir Amin). From the 1960’s to the 1980’s, in Latin America, the school of ‘dependencia’ influenced the thinking on international relations and on development.

With the end of the Cold War the US intellectual dominance in the IR discipline has declined, and the Soviet influence disappeared with the implosion of the USSR. Since then an increasing theoretical and conceptual diversity has emerged and many new centres of conceptual innovation are blossoming in all parts of the world (Albrecht 1987, 1997, 1999; Crawford/Jarvis 2001). Despite the many schemes and approaches in IR, three scientific traditions are crucial.

38.2.1 Scientific Traditions and Schools of International Relations

Three intellectual traditions of thought, macro theories, or images of the world on IR have been distinguished by the English school (Wight 1971; Bull 1977; Buzan 2001, 2004, 2006):

- the Hobbesian or Machiavellian pessimist or realist with the primary focus on power politics and with a specific emphasis on military strategy (Malnes 1993);
- the Kantian optimist or idealist focusing on international law and human rights (Covell 1998);
- the Grotian pragmatic internationalist or rationalist pursuing opportunities for cooperation irrespective of the power difference and the democratic deficit (Bull/Kingsbury/Roberts 1992; Onuma 1993).

While in the early years of international relations during the inter-war period, legal perspectives in the Wilsonian tradition prevailed in the UK and US (Alger 1968; Meyers 1979, 1994a), since 1945 scholars working in the US have dominated and influenced the thinking and writing on international relations. Since then, at least five debates (Maghooir 1982; Baldwin 1993) between two opposite schools of thought occurred first in the US and later within the ‘OECD world’:

- 1st debate in the late 1940’s and 1950’s between supporters of realism (Carr 1939; Morgenthau 1948, 1969; Herz 1959; Niebuhr 1949) that called for power politics and the so-called idealists in the Wilsonian tradition who stressed international law and institutions (Claude 1962; Clark/Sohn 1966). Realist notions and concepts dominated the teaching of undergraduates, in graduate schools, and in