

ГЛАВА 2

ТЕОРЕТИЧЕСКИЕ ВОПРОСЫ МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫХ ОТНОШЕНИЙ

NEW FIVE DIMENSIONS OF GLOBAL SECURITY (AMERICAN EXPERTS VIEW)

N. Zharylgasova, F.T. Kukeyeva

Al-Farabi Kazakh national university, Almaty, Kazakhstan

E-mail: fturar@mail.ru

Abstract. Authors analyses the new dimensions to global security. Analyses are based on the American experts' research works. *According to the American experts, in a globalized world, security can no longer be regarded as a zero sum game, with the state participation. Global security and the security of any country or culture cannot be achieved without good governance at all levels, ensuring security through justice for all people, nations and cultures*

The realist thinking traditionally is a basis for analyzing International Relations (IR). In the field of Security Studies, the realist security paradigm – the old state-centered and militaristic view of security – was the main approach for many years. According to the realist approach, states are the primary source of both security and insecurity.

As the Cold War came to an end, the interstate conflicts gave way to a number of other security issues, which led to number of other issues also recognized as security concerns, including illegal immigration, environmental degradation, organized criminality, and terrorism. As a result, a greater departure from the traditional approach to security was thought to be required.

According to the proponents of the realistic approach, states will inevitably suffer from insecurity as long as there is no overarching authority structure in the international system. In the absence of a higher political authority that can guarantee security, states, which are assumed to be rational entities, will make similar strategic calculations. Each will seek to acquire military power in order to prevent an attack. Since no supranational authority exists, states have only themselves to rely on for security, making the international security system a self-help system characterized by the security dilemma.

The security dilemma is analyzed by liberal or idealistic principles, who contend that the negative implications of international anarchy can be modified through the creation of rules and norms that govern state behavior, such as that informing the practice of collective security, for example. Yet, despite the tremendous contribution of the United Nations (UN) to global security and stability, the concept of collective security does not depart significantly from the traditional security paradigm's military-and state-centrism.

The different approaches led to debates between experts seeking to broaden the scope of Security Studies and those who sought to preserve a narrower focus. Scholars who want to widen the agenda argued that issues traditionally associated with domestic policy, such as health, the environment, immigration, and rights, ought to be viewed as global security issues. Given this altered focus, the means of achieving security necessarily extended beyond the use of force and prevention. An increasing number of IR scholars, including some neo-realists, called for a widening of the security agenda. For example, the Copenhagen School sought to set out a framework for security capable of incorporating a wider security agenda [1]. It aimed to establish a more radical view of Security Studies by including both military and nonmilitary