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INTRODUCTION

In the attempt to determine the essence of international life, we witness the reediting of the debate between those who believe in the international system as an anarchical environment where the aim is survival and those that sustain international life is possible with co-operation.

This paper tries to explore different positions and arguments favouring one or other perspective.

It posits the view that in the environment of the Post Cold War era “new” approaches based on co-operation will help to cope with the complexity of the resulting challenges.

The basic tenet of Conflict Theory is that human beings are sociable but conflict-prone animals. The "realists" maintain that international politics is a struggle for power in an anarchic environment, with political relationships governed by rules deeply rooted in human nature, thinking and acting in terms of interest defined as power. The pursuit of national interests, in this view, is the cause of conflict at international level.

On the other hand, both revolutionary and optimistic propositions include arguments such as interdependence and the need to use rationality to improve national conditions.

Obviously these are extreme positions reflecting opposing schools of thought. They are located at opposite ends of politico-philosophical postures as conflict and co-operation are located regarding human, state and international2 behaviour.

In the present conditions of global communications, increased participation of the individual in the decision making process, pursuit of shared goals of economic prosperity and growing respect for republican institutions, is it possible to accept "war" as the basic element needed to give motion to the international relations?

DISCUSSION

Firstly, it is important to define the basic elements of this discussion: Conflict, War and international life.

Conflict

"Conflict is a situation in which two or more human beings desire goals which they perceive as being obtainable by one or the other but not both."2

Kenneth Boulding has defined conflict as a situation of competition in which the parties are aware of the incompatibility of potential future positions and in which each party wishes to occupy a position which is incompatible with the wishes of the other.3

Conflict usually refers to a condition in which one identifiable group of human beings (whether tribal, ethnic, linguistic, cultural, religious, socio-economic, political or other) is engaged in conscious opposition to one or more identifiable human groups because these groups are pursuing what are to be incompatible goals.4

Conflict implies more than mere competition. The competition for scarce resources does not mean the intention to prevent the competitors the achievement of their objectives. Competition becomes conflict when parties try to enhance their own position by reducing that of the others, trying to thwart others from gaining their own ends, and putting their competitors "out of business" or even destroying them.

The causes of conflict are as old as human history. They are often based on territorial competition for resources, exacerbated by human behaviour and emotions, such as fear, greed, hatred, and ambition, coupled with political, economic, religious, ethnic, nationalistic, linguistic and environmental interests.

Conflict seems to be a universally ubiquitous and permanently recurring phenomenon within and between societies. Conflict need not lead to violent behaviour - it may be carried out by subtle political, economic, psychological, or social means.
War starts in the minds of men (UNESCO - Charter)

Armed conflict is a situation in which violence or military force is threatened or used. War is the most extreme manifestation of armed conflict and is characterised by intense, extensive and sustained combat, usually between states.5

A legal definition of the relation of war is:

When differences between states reach a point at which both parties resort to force, or one of them does act of violence, which the other chooses to look on as a breach of peace, the relation of war is set up, in which the combatants may use regulated violence against each other until one of the two has been brought to accept such terms as his enemy is willing to grant.6

In Clausewitz words "War is not merely an act of policy, but a true political instrument... the political object is the goal, war is the means of achieving it, and means can never be considered in isolation from their purpose... policy... will permeate all military operations and, insofar as their violent nature will admit, it will have a continuous influence on them" 7. Using Sun Tzu wisdom, Clausewitz suggested that the decisive battle need not always be fought.

In line with Clausewitz, Adam Watson said, in 1983, that

...war is a highly form of violence between states... But like other forms of planned and organised violence it is a means to an end. Political entities do not resort to force for pleasure, though some individuals may enjoy the thrill of excitement of violence and war. They resort to force in order to attain a political goal; for instance to correct what they consider an unjust or unfair situation, or to defend what they consider just ad right against violence by others.

This gives rise to the question, is injustice an intrinsic part of international life? We can attempt an answer by saying that pursuing national interests, political entities have their own perceptions of justice or fairness. This fact is an intrinsic part of international life.

According to Herbert C. Kelman8, war is a societal and intersocietal action conducted within a national and international political context. Of crucial importance in the study of international relations is the process by which nations develop their national policies and decide upon war.

From a different perspective we find Sir Norman Agnell, who published in the 1920s and 1930s and argued that “the factors which really do constitute prosperity have not the remotest connection with military or naval power, all our political jargon notwithstanding” clearly establishing the differences with those that believe in war as a basis for policy making.

International life

Is "Anarchy" the main characteristic of international life?

A Hobbesian answer would be one explaining that the existence of international anarchy, the very independence of states, best accounts for competition, the fear, and the temptation toward preventive war that characterises international relations. Politics among nations is not a continuous combat, but it is in this view a "state of war ... a tract of time, wherein the will to contend by battle is sufficiently known".9 In this vision, even when states share an interest in a common good that could be attained by co-operation, the absence of a source of global law and order 10 means that no one state can count upon the co-operative behaviour of others. Each state therefore has a rational incentive to defect from the co-operative enterprise even if only to pursue a good whose value is less than the share that would have been obtained from successful accomplishment of the co-operative enterprise.11 The concept is basically the same as used in Economic theory. Scarcity compels people to compete with each other for scarce resources. People may co-operate in certain areas, but all economic activity ultimately results in competition among individuals acting alone or in groups. Scarcity in international life may arise both over material goods (oil wells, water sources, etc.) and positional goods (roles, permanent membership of the UN Security Council, etc.)12.

In the promotion and protection of the population, according to Hegel, the civil society will be driven to "push" beyond its own limits and seek markets and so its necessary means of subsistence, in other lands.

War is not an external accident but a necessary feature of a world in which the individualities of states cannot be limited. War is not to be regarded as an absolute evil. War contributes towards the maintenance of the ethical health of peoples; "perpetual peace" is not simply unattainable; if attained, it would be positively undesirable. 13 2

Green, while accepting the Hegelian state role, argues against his position saying:

It is nothing then in the necessary organisation of the state, but rather some defect of that organisation in relation to its proper function of maintaining and reconciling rights, of giving scope to capacities, that leads to a conflict of apparent interests between one state and another. The wrong, therefore, which results to human society from conflicts between states cannot be condoned on the ground that is necessary incidence of the existence of the states.14
According to Waltz, the anarchy, that is international politics or "politics in absence of government", is a structure. And structure is the concept that makes it possible to say what the expected organisational effects are and how structures and units interact and affect each other. Recalling Waltz's three images, "Man, the State and War" we should understand that in this structure lays "the permissive cause" that gives a "final explanation of the origins of war among states". Therefore within the structure we can find the causes of war, but that does not mean that war is the result of the structure.

A liberal answer to the question, is anarchy the main characteristic of international life?, could be that the effects of international anarchy can be tamed in the relations among states of similarly liberal character. Some can add that in democratic states the citizens rule the polity and bear the costs of war with the effect of a peaceful attitude. Others may argue about the irrationality of war bringing Montesquieu claims that "commerce is the cure for most of the most destructive prejudices" and "Peace is the natural effect of trade".

Marx more than any other individual strengthened the idea that conflict arises inevitably out of the life-and-death struggle of socio-economic classes. Capitalism is the bondage from which people strive to be liberated, and this will be accomplished through knowledge of the inexorable dialectical laws of historical-social change. In this conception, class conflict has been the motor of social change. According to Marx, the coming clash between the capitalist, bourgeois class (thesis) and the proletariat (antithesis) would lead to a socialist order (synthesis). However, orthodox Marxists view all political phenomena, including imperialism and war, as projections of underlying economic forces.

Views regarding the international stage as anarchy (realists) or as an institutional site for competition between bureaucratic groups, societal forces and transnational actors (liberals) or the arena in which class interests compete for power and resources (Marxism) are challenged by globalisation and fragmentation that transform the nature of political community across the world.

Richard Deverak says:

The state and states system may have been forged on the ‘anvil of war’, but wider and deeper social forces contribute to the war imperative than neorealism's causal approach can illuminate... In order to understand the forces which condition and generate international relations, critical international theory eschews explanations based on a single, endogenous logic, preferring instead explanations based on the recognition of multiple logics... it is wrong to treat international outcomes as simply the product of systemic reproduction because there are other structures and processes that help to shape the state system, but lie outside it. It is crucial that it be located in relation to the social, economic, moral and cultural conditions which make it possible.

Bearing in mind the categories of war detailed above, it is not possible to give examples of international life wherein there has been no war. But it should be pointed out that "international life" is a broad concept and if the scope is focused on several regional organisations (OAS, MERCOSUR, CARICOM, ECOWAS, ASEAN, etc.), it is evident that they managed to reduce the threat of war in its various categories, through the development of confidence among partners.

The development of a new concept

The new environment requires new responses. This section intends to explain how a new concept is developed in accordance to the new "rules" that the globalised world imposes. These rules are a result of the two major trends, already depicted, globalisation and regionalisation. The threats that the new environment poses should follow these "rules".

Conflict and Co-operation

International co-operation and conflict are inextricably joined... International co-operation is embedded within a structure of competition, rivalry, and insecurity. In an anarchic and conflictual world, states develop and nurture co-operative relationships.

The behaviour of the states in the international stage reflect the pursuit of their own interest, in a very calculated way and within the framework of mutual interdependence. The high politics shows the way that the strategies should follow. The choices made at strategic level reflected in the state's behaviour are related to the payoffs that such state expect.

The useful Prisoner's Dilemma game is used by Axelrod to explain the emergence of co-operation between individuals that pursue their own self interest. The evolution of such co-operation is described in three stages:

3. The beginning of the story is that co-operation can get started even in a world of unconditional defection. The development cannot take place if it is tried only by scattered individuals who have virtually no chance to interact with each other. However, co-operation can evolve from small clusters of individuals who base their co-operation on reciprocity and have even small proportion of their interactions with each other.

2. The middle of the story is that a strategy based on reciprocity can thrive in a world where are many different kinds of strategies being tried.

3. The end of the story is that co-operation, once established on the basis of reciprocity, can protect itself from invasion by less co-operative strategies. Thus, the gear wheels of social evolution have ratchet.

Both Liberals and Realists explain from their point of view the reason for co-operation. While Realists understand it as only a transitory and rare stage in the permanent struggle for power, the Liberals underline that nations co-operate because it is in their own interest.

Arthur Stein says:

Since co-operation emerges when it is mutually advantageous, liberals must presume that states have common interests. As a result, self interested interaction leads to international co-operation. In contrast, realists see a world of conflicts of interest. But if international relations involve both common interests and conflicting ones, both liberals are both right and wrong.

States' behaviour may lead to conflict or co-operation they respond to an strategic choice. Strategies are affected by the existence of rules, norms and institutions that tame the exclusive pursuit of the national interest and the consequent struggle. Governments are no longer free arbiters of the policies of their states. Decisions and strategies are affected by International regimes.
International regimes

The "global village" and a world without borders were the nation state is being eclipsed by non territorial actors such as multinational corporations, transnational social movements, and international organisations reflect a modernist point of view that shows a trend in international politics. Kehoane and Nye wrote that we live in an era of interdependence 24 and "by creating or accepting procedures, rules, or institutions for certain kinds of activity, governments regulate and control transnational and interstate relations. We refer to these governing arrangements as international regimes".25

These regimes were explained by other scholars as well. Haas, for example, argues that a regime encompasses a mutually coherent set of procedures, rules and norms26. Hedley Bull refers to the importance of rules and institutions in international society where rules refer to "general imperative principles which require or authorise prescribed classes of persons or groups to behave in prescribed ways"27 . Finally, Krasner says that "regimes must be understood as something more than temporary arrangements that change with every shift in power interests"28. This is important to highlight the difference between regimes and agreements. Jervis, argues that the concept of regimes "implies not only norms and expectations that facilitate co-operation, but a form of co-operation that is more than the following of short run self-interest"29.

According to Vinod K. Aggarwal, "in a world of sovereign states the basic function of regimes is to co-ordinate state behaviour to achieve desired outcomes in particular issue areas"30.

The trend the world is following is clear, the erosion of national boundaries is a fact of growing importance, the participation of non state actors in the international stage is increasing, but still the nation state retains most of its attributes. Therefore nations states are the appropriate actors to build up the rules, and institutions necessary to foster co-operation in the present environment. This does not mean the exclusion of any other actor of this scenario. The co-operation should be wide in scope accepting inputs from different sources.

The other trend is regionalisation. In this regard the regional level offers unique grounds to design, test and develop international regimes with interests, cultural background, and possibly a future in common.

Confidence and trust in security issues may well be achieved through regimes established between countries and at both regional and global level. The difference here is that at a global level the degree of generalisation is such that the resulting rules and institutions show the trend that the international community as a whole dictates through them. At a regional level these rules and institution address particular problems and concerns.

The "international regime" that deals with security concerns fostering trust and confidence through co-operation is Co-operative Security.

The basic causal variables considered by Stephen Krasner to explain the development of regimes are 31:

* Egoistic self interest
* Political power
* Norms and principles
* Habit and custom
* Knowledge

These regimes, as described by Krasner, are based in egoistic self interest among other variables. However the existence of accepted norms of an ethical nature may lead us to assume a growing role of international institutions in ethical regime building.

Richmond, analysing peacemaking/conflict resolution points out that:

In the post Cold War ....is the view that there is developing -however fragile- ethical regimes and norms of democratic civil society both at the citizen level and at the global level.... In essence conflict resolution approaches must find a way of mediating between the three layers of the Post Cold War international system, harmonising the forces of globalisation an democratisation, in order to encourage the creation of ethical international regimes and ethical states.32

In the post-Cold War era where the shift from a military strategic oriented policy to an economic strategy oriented one is prevalent, the need to maximise one's own utility leads the nations' states to minimise risks in other fronts. The adherence to a co-operative security regime reflects more than a pure altruistic intention, it reflects the nation's self interest. The political power that arises from a stable, coherent polity with the ability to minimise, from the security point of view, the risk in the satisfaction of basic human needs, is obvious. The generation of agreed norms and principles among the members of a regime is reinforced by usage and custom. It is particularly important in security issues that the relationship are based on regular patterns of behaviour based on actual practice. Confidence is fostered with accurate knowledge of the situation and the capabilities of the participants of a system. These basic elements permit the achievement of prevention.

An Agenda for Peace

Prevention, according to the former UNSG, Boutros Boutros Ghali, is the key to face the new security environment successfully . In his "An Agenda for Peace" he emphasises the need for a preventive stage of diplomacy and actions that may help to reconstruct and strengthen peace avoiding the recurrence of a conflict.

This report defines:

- Preventive diplomacy is action to prevent disputes from arising between parties, to prevent existing disputes from escalating into conflicts and to limit the spread of the latter when they occur.

4
- Peacemaking is action to bring hostile parties to agreement, essentially through such peaceful means as those foreseen in Chapter VI of the Charter of the United Nations. Peace-keeping is the deployment of a United Nations presence in the field, hitherto with the consent of all the parties concerned, normally involving United Nations military and/or police personnel and frequently civilians as well. Peace-keeping is a technique that expands the possibilities for both the prevention of conflict and the making of peace.

It includes considerations about the usefulness of the involvement of regional organisations co-operating with the UN pointing out which Confidence Building Measures (CBM) are required and the monitoring of them. Concepts such as fact finding, Early warning, preventive deployment, and demilitarised zones, are developed as means to achieve peace and stability.

The concept that sytsetises the above mentioned elements is co-operative security.

Co-operative Security

Conflicts and tensions cannot be denied. Their emergence needs political decision and effective measures to prevent escalation.

"Co-operative security is the creation of a security environment (stable and predictable) through the mutual regulation of military capabilities and operational exercises that produce or can produce distrust and uncertainty." 33 This definition, useful in principle, is short in scope. This was the initial approach where the co-operation was envisaged almost exclusively in the military-security field. The new approach is broader in scope, being directed to any potential source of conflict.

Co-operative security is a broad approach to security which is multidimensional in scope and gradualist in temperament34; it emphasizes reassurance rather than deterrence; assumes that states are the principal actors in the security system, but accepts that non-state actors may have an important role to play.

Prevention is the basis of the concept of co-operative security. The security agreement, within this framework, avoids the successful development of appropriate means for aggression.

While "Collective Security" is designed to face the aggressive behaviour of any individual state against any member of an alliance and therefore deter aggression, "Co-operative Security" is designed to minimise the possibilities of such a situation.

A Collective Security System, in its traditional scope uses a reactive or confrontational strategy with the end to dissuade or counteract the threat. In this concept, NATO, SEATO, Warsaw Pact, and TIAR were created. "While alliances can bring the immediate rewards of greater security, they can also generate a loss of autonomy as the state now has an associate that might have distinct interests which must be included in future security decisions and actions." 35

A Co-operative Security System does not have a concrete threat or enemy. It is, in fact, a response to a new security environment where it is not possible to identify a sole risk. Within this concept there are no allies but partners.

The result of a Co-operative security system should be seen as the ability to resolve regional internal problems rather than the ability to face the threat of other regions.

Regional integration, minimises conflicts leading to co-operation under the umbrella of new political forms. In this scenario, "It is necessary to prevent situations in which the actors - if they perceive their concrete interest to be seriously at risk- respond in ways that involve a high probability of the use of force. In a crisis situation, options are scarce. As a result, uncertainty increases and decisions are taken in a highly subjective context. This reaffirms the need to build a new, comprehensive international security system in the western hemisphere"36.

On the other hand, economic goals and democratic processes gather countries into blocs. These integration processes that had original goals of economic growth are now complimented by political, security and defence goals, as well.

The key to this concept, according to Carter, Perry and Steinbruner37, lies in the fact that security planning is not directed at the preparation of threats, but instead is aimed at their prevention.

The concept of co-operation involves an heterogeneous but proportional participation of the correspondent actors. This participation includes the co-operative commitment that begins from the conviction of each actor on the benefits of the system.

The new concept of Co-operative Security synthesises the resulting environment in which confidence and co-operation is achieved. In this environment the preparation to face conflicts is replaced by applying the effort avoiding their occurrence.

Peace or stability in the international scenario is not the result of a single, well intentioned and fervently supported initiative. Not even when it comes from international organisations with the massive participation of international actors. Peace is the result of the sum of various initiatives, where the interests and commitment are embodied by actors decided to achieve it.

This is an approach with the emphasis on co-operation more than competition aiming at prevention rather than resolution of conflict. The focus, therefore, is far beyond exclusive military issues. The focus is on any potential source of conflict.
In Gareth Evans' words, Co-operative security involves Peace building strategies that fall into two groups that may be described respectively, as "international regimes" and "in-country peace building". This concept is wider than the one used by the Secretary-General in An Agenda for Peace, due to the fact that it is applied both to pre-conflict and post-conflict situations as well.

Focusing our attention on the international scenario, the first of the groups, "International regimes" global, regional and bilateral in scope are designed to minimize threats to security, promote confidence and trust, and create institutional frameworks for dialogue and co-operation. These are: "legal regimes and dispute resolution mechanisms", "arms control and disarmament regimes" and dialogue and co-operation arrangements".

One of the many mechanisms, co-operative security uses is the creation of confidence among the members of the system through the implementation of CBMs. In "An Agenda for Peace" they are addressed as follows; "Mutual confidence and good faith are essential to reducing the likelihood of conflict between States. Many such measures are available to Governments that have the will to employ them. Systematic exchange of military missions, formation of regional or subregional risk reduction centres, arrangements for the free flow of information, including the monitoring of regional arms agreements, are examples. I ask all regional organisations to consider what further confidence-building measures might be applied in their areas and to inform the United Nations of the results. I will undertake periodic consultations on confidence-building measures with parties to potential, current or past disputes and with regional organisations, offering such advisory assistance as the Secretariat can provide".

Mechanisms of Co-operative Security

The effectiveness of any prevention strategy is determined by the minimum gap between early warning, political decision and the corresponding early action.

Once political support is secured, at the operational level several mechanisms are activated to obtain rapid reaction.

As an example those used by the OSCE are greatly useful.

* Mechanism for human rights issues
This mechanism deals with issues concerning the respect for all human rights and fundamental freedoms, human contacts and other issues of a related humanitarian character. It includes procedures for the exchange of information and the assignation of experts to deal with the matters.

* Mechanism for consultation and co-operation as regards unusual military activities
This mechanism includes consultation and co-operation procedures between the members about any unusual and unscheduled activities of their military forces outside their normal peacetime locations which are militarily significant, within the zone of application for CBMs and about which a participating State expresses its security concern.

* Co-operation as regards hazardous incidents of a military character
The mechanism enforces the need to co-operate by reporting and clarifying hazardous incidents of a military nature within the zone of application for CBMs in order to prevent possible misunderstandings and mitigate the effects on another participating State.

* Provisions relating to early warning and preventive action
This mechanism establishes a right for a limited number of participating States to trigger an "action" by the Organisation.

* Mechanism for consultation and co-operation with regard to emergency situations
In accordance with the certain provisions, the member of the organisation, should consult and co-operate with each other concerning a serious emergency situation which may arise as the result of major disruptions endangering peace, security or stability.

* Mechanism for peaceful settlement of disputes
If a dispute arises between participating States, they will, without undue delay and in good faith, seek to settle the dispute through a process of direct consultation and negotiation, or seek to agree upon an appropriate alternative procedure of settling the dispute.

* Mechanism for conciliation and arbitration within the organisation
This mechanism includes procedures for: the establishment of a Court, the appointment of arbitrators, conciliation and determination of competence.

Peace and Co-operative Security
Interdependence is a fact in a globalised world. The necessity of rules to "play the game" in such an environment led the states and other international actors to draw some rules and design institutions to regulate and monitor the relationships.

The maintenance of Peace and Security needed a proper response after the end of the Cold War. This response changed the focus from a collective model based on reaction after aggression to a model based on prevention. Should we have to define in a line the difference between a Collective security system and a Co-operative one the answer would be: Co-operative security acts against the causes, while Collective security is designed to suppress effects.

Competition and conflict arises, most of the times, at a regional level. States are proximal competitors, they compete locally, with others similarly situated, whether geographically, geopolitically, militarily, economically, or in some other way. Co-operation, therefore, should arise at a regional level.
The implementation of a Co-operative Security System minimises the risk of the escalation of a conflict, providing appropriate grounds to conduct peace operations, if needed. These grounds are based on the mutual knowledge and confidence developed by the neighbour states and most of the times on the experience acquired through combined training and exercises. Therefore, a Co-operative System complements and facilitate the execution of Peace Operations. A co-operative system based on a regional criteria is not (obviously) a response to the global security by itself. However, the shape that the globalised world takes where the nations states gather in blocs to adapt themselves, may indicate to us that Peace and Security will be a result of regional initiatives monitored and blessed by the international community through United Nations.

CONCLUSION

Conflict is present in our daily life as it is in international life. Politics itself is a process for resolving conflicts. War is a mere instrument, a means to achieve a goal established by those who design the Grand Strategy. Being a means it can hardly become the “essence” of international life.

The pursuit in obtaining “basic needs” or safeguarding national interest, could be related with the need of security rather than war. This security is achieved through the preparation for an eventual war and through the development of new concepts preventing conflict through co-operation.

War could be the essence of Armed Forces, but in fact, we may say that the essence of them is Peace rather than war, because as Aristotle said “War must be regarded as only a means to peace...". And recalling Erasmus “War is delightful for those who have had no experience of it”, the military men are the ones with the chance to live close to the miseries of war learning from national experiences or operating abroad trying to achieve peace elsewhere.

Even the Marxist theorist for which life is the permanent struggle between classes, the essence of history is conflict and not war.

It is understood, that the post-Cold War environment is moved and shaped by “basic human needs”. The resort to war is still present but the present global environment is showing us the struggle of ideas, tendencies and concepts where the war is not absent but it plays a secondary role as a means rather than “essence”.
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