

## DISRUPTIONS TO GLOBAL SECURITY<sup>1</sup>

### Definitions:

1. *Security* - “1. freedom from danger, risk, etc.; safety. 2. freedom from care, apprehension, or doubt; well-founded confidence. 3. something that secures or makes safe; protection; offense.”<sup>2</sup>
2. *Global* - “1. pertaining to the whole world; world-wide; universal.”<sup>3</sup>
3. *Global security* is the assurance of true “belongingness” achieved by the peaceful, harmonious, and mutually beneficial co-existence of all the world’s diverse peoples in a common spatial environment—the earth.

### Disruptions to Global Security:

1. Old geopolitical boundaries, which separate rival powers and major military blocks.  
Characteristics: *economic, political*.  
  
—Central Powers vs. Allies (World War I)  
—Axis vs. Allies (World War II)  
—Communism vs. Democracy (Cold War)  
—NATO vs. Warsaw Pact (Europe)  
—East vs. West (Iron Curtain)  
—North vs. South (Korea, Vietnam)  
—Other bellicose political conflicts, i.e., in Latin America

---

<sup>1</sup>Review of Michael T. Klare, “Redefining Security: The New Global Schisms,” *Global Issues* 99/00, edited by Robert M. Jackson (15<sup>th</sup> ed.; Guilford, CT: Dushkin/McGraw-Hill, 1999), 27-31.

<sup>2</sup>*Webster’s Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary of the English Language* (New York: Gramercy Books, 1989), 1290.

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*, 601.

2. Old ethnic / religious boundaries, which separate rival cultures and major religious forces. Characteristics: *ideological, religious*.

- Christianity vs. Islam (Balkans)
- Judaism vs. Islam (Middle East)
- Hinduism vs. Islam (India)
- Roman Catholicism vs. Eastern Orthodoxy (Eastern Europe?)
- Roman Catholicism vs. Protestantism (Ireland)
- Native / tribal religions vs. Christianity / Islam (Africa)
- Other ethnic / nationalist conflicts (Africa, southern Russia)

3. Old, not new (a la Huntington<sup>4</sup>) linguistic / religious [civilization] boundaries, that identify and differentiate major civilizations. Characteristics: *cultural identity*.

- The “loose frontiers” between Western, Slavic-Orthodox, Japanese, Islamic, Confucian, Hindu, Latin American, and African civilizations.<sup>5</sup>

- Are Huntington’s categorizations cohesive? Inclusive? Meaningful? Pragmatic?

- Challenges: What about Christian influence in India? What about conflict in Ireland? What about aboriginals in Australia, or Eskimos in North America?

- Can Huntington’s assumptions or definitions withstand the test of empirical data?

“The central elements of any civilization are language and religion.”<sup>6</sup>

“In the post-Cold War world, the most important distinctions among people are not ideological, political, or economic. They are cultural.”<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>See Samuel P. Huntington, “The Many Faces of the Future,” *Global Issues* 99/00, 15<sup>th</sup> ed., 15-18.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., 17.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., 16.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., 17-18.

—A better analysis might be a Venn diagram of interlocking religious and linguistic circles. The major religions would include: Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, Others (Chinese folk religion, Confucianism, Jainism, New Religion, Parsiism, Shintoism, Sikhism), and Atheism and the Nonreligious.<sup>8</sup> The major languages would include: Chinese, English, Hindi, Spanish, Arabic, Portuguese, Russian, Japanese, Bengali, German, French, and Malay.<sup>9</sup>

4. Old, not new (a la Lake<sup>10</sup>) economic / democratic boundaries, which separate market-oriented societies from “pariah” states. Characteristics: *economic, political*.

—“Outlaw” states, such as Cuba, North Korea, Iran, Iraq, Libya, Sudan, and Syria versus those who participate in international trade organizations.

—But in many ways, these countries are both “westernized” and “market-oriented.”

—These countries are aligned in other ways with many other nations. In other words, they are “players” in regional and global economics.

—But these states eschew involvement with the United States and with certain European nations.

—The perspective of Lake seems to be a good example of western paternalism. He defines a shift in particulars, i.e., a change in individual “rebel” or “outlaw” nations, but it is not a change in substance.

---

<sup>8</sup>*The New York Times 2000 Almanac*, edited by John W. Wright (New York: Penguin Putnam, 1999), 495-500.

<sup>9</sup>*Ibid.*, 502-503.

<sup>10</sup>Klare, “Redefining Security: The New Global Schisms,” *Global Issues 99/00*, 15<sup>th</sup> ed., 28.

5. Old, not new (a la Klare<sup>11</sup>) “internal” boundaries, that divide people(s) economically, demographically, sociologically, environmentally, etc. Characteristics: *economic, ideological, social / cultural, political*.

—**Rich versus poor**

Extravagant income versus little or no income  
Clean water versus unfit water  
Literate versus illiterate  
Abundant food versus food shortages and starvation  
Mansions versus shanty-town / homelessness  
Long life versus early preventable death

—**Ethnic uniformity versus ethnic diversity**

Rural versus urban  
Suburbs versus inner city  
Forced ethnic cleansing versus tolerance  
Designated tribal lands versus openness

—**Controlled population growth versus phenomenal population growth**

Rich countries versus poor countries  
Developed, industrial centers versus undeveloped, agricultural centers  
Environmental control versus environmental impoverishment  
Overeducated versus undereducated

—**Environmental preservation versus environmental degradation**

Means to maintain and renew versus little or no means  
Power to effect change versus little or no power  
Ability to “manipulate” population and resources versus little or no ability  
Takers (from other environments) versus givers (to enrich others and themselves?)

Conclusion:

While variations exist in every area or country of the world, striking and historic regional variations are readily discernable. These are not necessarily new schisms, as Klare postulates, but are as old as humanity and are growing and perhaps intensifying.

---

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., 28ff.

David W Fletcher, January 2000

All Rights Reserved / Unauthorized Electronic Publishing Prohibited / [www.davidwfletcher.com](http://www.davidwfletcher.com)

Questions:

\*According to Samuel Huntington, the central elements of any civilization are:

- A. Location and resources
- B. Communication and ideology
- C. Language and religion
- D. Economics and politics

\*What improvements have made it cheaper to move money, goods, knowledge, ideas, and images around the world?

- A. Low inflation and low interest
- B. Improvements in transportation and communication technology
- C. New discoveries by the military
- D. Acceptance of English as a universal *lingua franca*

\*Which is not a source of human insecurity?

- A. Literacy
- B. Malnutrition
- C. Poverty
- D. Unemployment

\*Which important event in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century marked a shift away from the old geopolitical boundaries?

- A. The establishment of a demilitarized zone between North and South Korea
- B. The collapse of the former Soviet Union
- C. The NATO bombing of Serbia
- D. Richard Nixon's visit to China

\*Which of the following represents a new delineation of global fissures?

- A. The world's great civilizations
- B. "Holdout" or "pariah" countries
- C. "Internal" discord within countries
- D. None of the above