

„*Ante Portas – Studia nad Bezpieczeństwem*”
2018, No 1(10)
DOI: 10.33674/1201811

Aleksandra Cieslar
United Kingdom

**MARY KALDOR, *GLOBAL SECURITY CULTURES*, POLITY PRESS,
CAMBRIDGE 2018, SS. 224**

Mary Kaldor's recent book titled *Global Security Cultures* is an important contribution to the field of human security. The author of the book is a professor of Global Governance and director of the Conflict and Civil Society Research Unit in the Department of International Development at London School of Economics and Political Science. Professor Kaldor is an established and highly regarded scholar, best known for her work on concepts of new war, global security and democratisation. In 2003 she has received a Commander of the British Empire (CBE) for 'services to democracy and global governance'.

In her new book Professor Kaldor intends to make sense of the different and often competing approaches to the security in the post-Cold War reality. In the recent decades we have observed evolution of different security pathways. New phenomena closely tied with technological advancements often blur rather than increase general understanding on how the nations become more defensive and secure. The book provides essential analysis on the current state of international security describing patterns of behaviour within the global security paradigm. At the same time, the book presents a slightly different approach to security by looking at the issue across a variety of different factors and actors instead of the tradition military forces *versus* enemy. The changing nature of international relations after the dissolution of the bipolar world exposed the lack of appropriate theoretical framework for our understanding of global security.

The book is a result of a long-term research project entitled *Security in Transition: An Interdisciplinary Investigation into the Security Gap*. The research was concerned with the transition between the Cold War security paradigm and the different security models that emerged after 1989. The security gap refers to the profound global lack of security that has been affecting millions of people worldwide. Influenced by the research outcomes, the author developed the concept of security cultures as an analytical tool in order to make sense of the contemporary approaches of security. The book explores the complex layers and complicated nets of connections between security cultures in modern post-Cold War conflicts, particularly in Bosnia, Afghanistan and Syria as prime examples. Identifying security cultures is about

finding similarities in doing security worldwide in terms of its objectives (safety) and recipients (whose security?). Security in this context does not necessarily mean military defence, as the use of military force has changed as a consequence of information technology advancements.

The first chapter, after the introduction, focuses on explaining what security cultures are. Using the term 'culture' suggest social rather than spatial relations. In addition, by definition culture is something that is repetitive, reproduced and specific to a certain groups. Indeed, Mary Kaldor emphasise that security cultures are reproduced continually and socially constructed. Four main types of security cultures have been distinguished in the book, geopolitics, liberal peace, new war and war on terror, and described in the subsequent four chapters. Security cultures, as described by Mary Kaldor, constantly influence each other and cannot exist in isolation. They consist of different sets of actors and have different characteristics but interact and penetrate each other.

Geopolitics, the first security culture, is also the oldest and most dominant one. The chapter examines the history and evolution of geopolitics to what it is today. Indeed, we have witnessed a recent come back of geopolitics in the annexation of Crimea. However, the traditional practice of geopolitics is changing from territorial to communicative in a sense that the military power is used against people and not to seize territory. The geopolitical tactics have adapted to the contemporary nature of the conflict and the ever advancing technology. The role of the military forces has been changing profoundly. Wars are no longer declared and carried out as they were decades ago. The increasing number of private military and security companies also plays an important role in the rise of this security culture. In addition, geopolitics security culture encompasses hybrid war, a state where local conflicts are manipulated for the purpose of political gain. All these factors combined seem to suggest that geopolitics revival is long lasting. However, the author proposes that it might be soon taken over by the competing alternatives.

Next chapter deals with the new wars security culture. Professor Kaldor begins by presenting the evolution of new wars after the end of Cold War and explaining what is new in new wars. The most prominent characteristic of this security culture is that the conceptual framework of wars, and of conflicts for that matter, has irreversibly changed. It must be understood as much more than a mere expansion of political conflict between two irreconcilable positions. Rather, the new wars security culture is a form of long lasting social state where violence is used to allocate resources. The actors are, according to Mary Kaldor, creating a security culture by being programmed to repeat a certain sets of behaviour. New wars are not the same as guerrilla wars or 'low intensity wars'. They involve a large number of non state actors, whose focus is on controlling population and resources - the main source of money. The sad point is that the new wars are often more profitable than peace to internal and external actors. Therefore, it is within their interest to increase the violence,

chaos and attacks on the civilians. Deep structural changes on local and global level are needed in order to stop the spread of new wars.

Third chapter describes the liberal peace security culture as the one that offers the most opportunities to improve the general global security. Liberal peace, as Professor Kaldor argues, is a product of humanitarian assistance and growth of international institutions, such as the United Nations. Therefore, the theory is rooted in the old wars. Although the objective of liberal peace, namely to end conflict, is promising, the culture of liberal peace is adjusting too slowly to the changing nature of contemporary conflicts. Peace agreements are often drafted between warring parties that make financial and political gains from the conflict. Negotiations ought to be more inclusive and supported by deep understanding of the parties involved and their power relations. Any peace agreement that fails to recognize the power relations inside and outside the conflict zone has little chance to be successful and long-lasting. Liberal peace needs serious adjustment and evaluation. Recognizing the flaws of liberal peace culture helps to identify areas where change is possible as new ways of ending conflicts are needed.

Final security culture described by Mary Kaldor is the war on terror that specifically aims at humans instead of territories and states. The culture was born out of response to the 9/11 attack, that had been treated as a classic attack of a foreign state rather than a non-state actor. Professor Kaldor argues that the events after the terrorist attack on US led to the creation of a separate security culture that uses spy technology, surveillance, cyber-attacks, drones and intelligence to deliberately target individuals. This security cultures is also characterized by the decline of norms regarding torture, detention, privacy and confidentiality. The society is able to accept practices that were considered impermissible before. There is no more inside or outside. The enemy can hide anywhere, home or abroad. Unfortunately, as we have learned in the last 15 years or so, the war on terror has undoubtedly failed to stop terrorism.

Mary Kaldor ends the book by providing a number of examples where her distinction between different security cultures is shown in practice. The book is focused on analysis of the current state of global security, but not without trying to give possible solutions to the problems. We are left with conclusions and final recommendation that a new peace culture, born out of a restructured and readjusted liberal peace, is needed to counter both new wars and war on terror. Liberal peace that was created to contain 'old wars' in new security paradigm is creating an unstable situation called 'hybrid peace', that often allows for the further exploitation of populations. Justice and adequate economic policy is needed in order to stop those who make profit from wars.

The main recommendation suggested in that book is that a new humanitarian approach is necessary to accurately respond to the contemporary security demands. But how can we adjust liberal peace? Do humanitarian principles even apply to the current conflicts? Is it possible for the states to implement the 'principles of humanity', as Mary Kaldor calls them?

Unfortunately, the answer to these questions remains unclear. Security cultures and responses to the threats change slower than the nature of the threat itself. Therefore, the reactions and solutions come after a threat is recognised. International consensus and approach change even slower. That is perhaps the reason why it takes time to agree on appropriate approach to the security problems and take action. Perhaps, as the civilization continues to evolve our humanitarian attitude will evolve as well.

Although the book makes a number of highly compelling and engaging arguments, there are a few that deserve a special attention. Firstly, Professor Kaldor makes a very interesting and important point regarding the contemporary conflicts around the world. The days of territorial disputes are gone. The new wars and terrorism lost their geopolitical focus. The conflicts of the 21st century have become bio-political. Rather than controlling territories the objective of the insurgency is the control of population. All four security cultures, including geopolitics supported by the technological revolution, are predominantly focused on controlling groups of people. Indeed, bio-politics can be observed all over the world. This is precisely why the approach to peacemaking and peacekeeping has to change.

Secondly, as Professor Kaldor argues, there is an increasing blurring between the seemingly opposite notions of global and local as well as inside and outside. In times of deep globalisation no place can stay isolated. The world of interconnectedness brings global to the local and *vice versa*. In addition, the number of international actors is growing. The enemy is rarely as simple as another state. Many scholars seem to be stuck on the local/global division without realising that this division is often no longer valid.

Lastly, Mary Kaldor highlights the role and importance of the civil society in local and global conflict resolution. Without an independent civil society there can be no meaningful negotiations or peace agreements. In new wars and war on terror the sides of the conflict are much more concerned with making profits and controlling the resources than with ceasefire and peace. The objective is to keep the conflict going as it generates financial gains and power. Civil society has a crucial role in establishing the legitimacy of the government at all levels. However, what is missing from the book is the explanation of what exactly is meant by civil society. Is civil society always unified and in agreement? Who and on what level (local, state or international) can give legitimacy to political authority?

Although the general statements in the book are supported by convincing evidence regarding the emerging security cultures, it is surprising that cyber attacks or cyber security have received so little attention in *Global Security Cultures*. Examining the current state of international affairs, it is justify wondering if cyber security is becoming one of the cultures that professor Kaldor defines in her book. Perhaps at the moment the exact pattern, characteristics or even possibilities of cyber warfare are not fully recognised as it is still blurred into other security cultures. As the information technology

revolution gains speed all aspects of our lives become more and more digitised and also more vulnerable. Nations, communities, businesses and individuals will require increasing levels of cyber security. Cyber security is a fast growing global business that is predicted to reach billions of dollars in spending costs in the next few years.

The cyber threat is very specific as it does not cross any country borders. It does not operate within any physical frontiers but rather lingers in digital space, which is virtually a no man's land. In addition, it is fully bio-political. The objective of cyber warfare is predominantly to control the population. Although cyber attack is not considered a breach of sovereignty, its consequences can be devastating, including chaos, misinformation, spread of fake news, influenced public opinion, even interference in elections. We can only expect for the cyber attacks to become more sophisticated. If that is the scenario for the future and cyber attack will develop its own security culture, how can we adjust the concept of liberal peace and the principle of humanity to it?