

by Catherine Boye

for 23rd APR 2009 in Kuala Lumpur

Security is a hard to maintain. States work hard to protect their people and land. This job has become more difficult as more issues settle under the umbrella of security. This view of “comprehensive security” presents many new challenges to states. This paper will outline the three greatest security challenges of tomorrow and detail generational differences in thinking about security.

Before identifying future challenges, I want to distinguish between a challenge and a threat. Identifying a threat is only the first step in a process of dealing with threats. Today’s threats are many and varied; there are the traditional issues such as territorial disputes, internal cohesion, and attacks from other states, as well as nontraditional security concerns such as climate change, pandemic diseases, cyber attacks, natural disasters, and economic insecurity. A challenge is the way to minimize or remove a threat. A challenge is not the threat itself but the way one deals with the threat.

The three greatest challenges of the future will be 1) the movement away from a concept of security based solely on national governments and militaries to a concept of security maintained by an assortment of actors; 2) movement from a reactive to proactive view of security; and 3) prevention of stalling or backward movement in trade liberalization.

Security maintained by an assortment of actors

The threats facing societies have changed. Traditional threats still exist but new, or in some cases, old threats viewed in a new way, require a new approach to security. One of the hardest shifts will be away from the belief that the national government and military are the

sole actors able to guarantee a society's security. It will become necessary for other groups to be incorporated into the structures that work to maintain the health and security of a society. While internal and external threats will at times require a response from the national government and military, and while both will have a role to play in dealing with new types of threats, the burden of providing security will fall on others too. These groups will include international organizations and large multinational coalitions, regional organizations and coalitions, local governments, and civil society.

Many of the threats that have caused this shift are transnational. Transnational threats, including climate change and pandemic diseases, can adversely affect every country and cannot be prevented by any single country alone. Solutions to these problems will need to be developed by most if not all nations. Any approach to these issues that is exclusive or discriminatory should be suspect. To organize such cooperation international organizations or large multilateral coalitions must be involved. Organizations such as the UN and WHO can play important roles due to their large and diverse membership. These organizations and others like them should be seen not as a drain on resources and energy but as an important piece of the larger security structure.

Regional organizations have critical roles to play. Regional organizations are often better suited to deal with local issues because they have a more personal stake in the problem, understand the concerns better, and have a greater understanding of the sensitivities inherent in the issue. The Asia Pacific is a diverse and dynamic region. It is home to regional international organizations with great potential. New threats, such as the resurgence of piracy off the East African coast must be watched carefully by those in the Asia Pacific. Many of the busiest shipping lanes in the world run through the Asia Pacific. Regional organizations can do much to prevent the same situations from arising in these busy shipping lanes. They can

do this by working together to diminish the risk of war in areas close to important sea lanes and developing a system of best practices for groups operating in the area.

There are also diseases that are endemic to much of Asia but not to the entire world. These diseases can cause instability and slow economic development in disease stricken areas. The sharing of information about diseases and additional problems with others in the region can lead to better, cheaper, and more effective solutions than a single government could provide. An example is the fight against counterfeit anti-malarial drugs. The fake drugs are often of high quality but contain no active medicine. The drugs are sold in every Asian country with endemic malaria. A regional coalition set up to complement the WHO run rapid alert system could greatly reduce the deaths caused by malaria and these fake drugs.

Local governments have an increasingly important role to play in maintaining security. Local governments have long dealt with internal security issues. Some development concerns as well as larger regional and transnational threats often have local effects that must be dealt with. Cities or counties located on a river could work with cities and counties in other countries upstream to deal with pollution, fishing issues and water use.

One group that can contribute to security but is often overlooked is civil society. In some countries a working civil society is considered a threat. This is a mistake on many levels, but I want to focus on the many benefits these groups can provide. Civil society can locate corruption, decrease crime, increase economic activity, identify areas of political or economic instability, and increase infrastructure security, among other things. Governments on both the state and local level should be finding ways to cooperate with civil society to protect internal security.

State governments and the military will still have a fundamental role in this new broad security scheme. There will continue to be the need to protect a country's territory and

interests against other countries and rogue internal elements. Nevertheless, while the role and importance of an organized armed force cannot be forgotten within this broader conception of security there should be the understanding that it alone is not sufficient. This transition will be one of the most important and difficult security challenges of the future.

This new view of security is not merely understanding that security threats are not necessarily external in nature or that state building is a security concern. Rather, it requires an understanding that any single government's efforts are unlikely to be enough to secure itself. This also means acknowledging the better your neighbor can deal with a drought or pandemic disease the more secure you are.

Most importantly, different groups should work together fluidly to provide security. Even small projects need cooperation from every group. A local monitoring station for emerging diseases might receive information from civil society, be run and staffed by the local government, funded by a national government, liaise with regional and international organizations, and rely on the military in the event of an outbreak. If any of those links is not maintained, security would be compromised.

Proactive view of security.

The new security paradigm should also attempt to change when and how a society deals with threats. For much of history security has been reactive: governments usually respond to an immediate threat. The idea of working to prevent future threats has been gaining traction. Being proactive requires recognizing a potential threat and then taking action to either remove the threat or decrease the possibility the threat will cause problems. One example is the recognition by governments that social unrest and armed insurrection are less likely in well-developed areas and therefore they use infrastructure and economic development as a

kind of threat prevention system. It is possible to be proactive about both traditional and nontraditional security threats.

Traditional security threats such as territorial disputes and internal security issues can be addressed by building trust and good relations with neighboring states. This helps to reduce tensions and make conflict between them less likely. Southeast Asia has understood for many years that internal security problems can often be prevented through state building activities. International, regional, and nongovernmental organizations can all work to identify areas of potential conflict and then act to prevent it through instruments such as track two dialogues, observer missions, targeted economic aid, confidence building measures, official good offices or mediation, and others.

There are territorial disputes throughout Asia. These potential flashpoints should be dealt with proactively. While solving these conflicts is often not possible in the short term much can be done to prevent these areas from becoming larger and more dangerous disputes. Creating codes of conduct, arranging coordinated patrols of the area, and keeping channels open to discuss the issue can all help minimize the tensions that surround these contentious issues. Land based disputes can be calmed through the use of international observers and agreements to limit military forces in the area. For maritime disputes the creation of special cooperative economic zones that jointly administer the exploration and development of natural resources, grant fishing rights and run patrols in the contested areas is another option.

Nontraditional security issues can also be dealt with proactively. Nature, unlike an enemy state or rogue-armed group, cannot be deterred. But it is possible to prepare for these eventualities without making them more likely. Natural disasters, pandemic diseases, and climate change are especially pressing threats in the Asia Pacific region. Its unique ecosystems are especially vulnerable to warming temperatures and population centers are

often located along coastlines that could be flooded if sea levels rise. The tropical region of Asia has been identified as the source of most new influenza strains and the most likely place for a new deadly strain to emerge. The geographic diversity that makes the Asia Pacific region so interesting also means its potential for natural disasters is greater: volcanic eruptions, cyclones, earthquakes, typhoons, floods, tsunamis, droughts, landslides, and in Northern Asia, blizzards are common.

While threats from the natural world cannot be prevented it is possible to develop systems to predict them and make their effects less severe. The development of early warning systems to detect earthquakes and the possible resulting tsunami, more advanced weather prediction capabilities and communication systems to provide information about natural disasters to far flung areas all provide extra time for governments and organizations to act and reduce casualties and destruction.

When a disaster does happen the international community often wishes to help and should be allowed to. Yet governments suffering from the effects of a disaster are often ill prepared to deal with help from these groups: problems range from incompatible radios to visas. The creation of a regional response group is one way to deal with these eventualities. Groups that specialize in a type of disaster relief or fields such as search and rescue could apply for visas and customs exemptions for special equipment before an incident and can become active when a government requests assistance. When a disaster happens it will be possible for these groups to respond much quicker and in a more organized fashion.

It is possible for actors on every level to be involved in preventing or dealing with potential threats. Members of these different levels will see and understand threats differently from a government. People living in the country will be best able to spot emerging crop and livestock diseases. A local government could be best able to identify gangs as an emerging

internal threat. These groups can be important in identifying new types of threats when they are small and more easily dealt with proactively.

Protecting against protectionism

Since the end of World War II, the idea of a free and open trading system has spread throughout the world and with it unprecedented prosperity. States have grown more interdependent and their interests have grown more entwined. Interdependence brought peace and security to many countries as development trumped historical differences and old enmities were replaced by shared success. These close ties proved to be a danger as well for when markets in one area of the world started to collapse it was not long before the markets elsewhere started to stumble.

The financial crisis and worldwide economic slump is affecting all governments but Asia has been especially hard hit. Asia had integrated itself more deeply into the economic system than most other regions and is now suffering the consequences. There is some hope: economic indicators have hinted at a recovery but damage has been done.

Groups made of scared, desperate people are pressuring leaders for policies to alleviate their current suffering. Many of the policies supported by these groups are protectionist in nature; they seek to improve the local economy to the detriment of their neighbors and trading partners.

Rising calls for protectionist measures and halting free trade must be countered. In the years between World War I and World War II when economic depression hit, many countries did all they could to protect themselves – even at the cost of the others. These actions created deep suspicion and distrust between the nations of Europe, nationalist sentiments flared, and were stoked by anxious politicians. World War II came as a direct result of the economic

hardships and the nationalist and protectionist policies implemented to stem it. The Asia Pacific region has great potential to help turn the economic tide. This potential could be hampered by the stalling or backward movement on free and open trade through nationalist and protectionist measures.

Several weeks ago, a Young Leaders meeting spent considerable time discussing what a leader is. What qualities does a leader possess? It was agreed that while countries and cultures disagree over how to choose a leader, all leaders share several characteristics. A leader is a far-thinking person who can convince people to do things that may not appear to be in their best interest but which in the end provide the greater benefit. Asia today requires leaders. Leaders who can understand the fears and problems of their people, calm the calls for protectionism, and convince their people that their prosperity and security is tied to that of their neighbor.

The current economic crisis does allow us the opportunity to ask serious questions about the stability and use of the current free trade. It seems excessive – all or nothing. Sometimes capitalism seems too destructive. Debating this is right. The next evolution of the economic system should come from the lessons learned from our current experience. What must be kept in mind is that beggar thy neighbor policies, such as most protectionist policies, can lead to a tragedy of the commons and sub-optimal outcomes for all involved.

Generational Differences

My generation has come of age after the end of the Cold War. The idea of the world being split into sides is seen as outdated and no longer applicable. Our worldview is shaped by globalization. We see a world that is much smaller where cultures and people intermingle and are no longer viewed as alien or strange. Most importantly, globalization is not merely the spread of McDonalds and Coca-Cola. It is a spread in ways of thinking; the younger

generation through the internet can communicate simultaneously with people from all corners of the world and thus be exposed to viewpoints and worldviews that are different from their own. This younger generation has a broader worldview and greater international experience; they have the potential to question prevailing assumptions perhaps allowing these young professionals to think of new and different ways of dealing with old problems. They are better able to understand what drives the decisions of other countries and peoples, perhaps allowing them to develop better policies toward these countries.

The Cold War was focused on the military and weapons. Counts were kept of the number of warheads, of delivery vehicles, and the total destructive power on each side. A zero sum mentality prevailed and cooperation between the sides was rare and often fraught with tension. Today's young professionals, while aware of historical differences, are less likely to see them as a constraint to cooperation. Old enemies have become potential allies; creating new arenas for cooperation.

The young professionals starting to enter the field have come of age in this globalized world. This generation has been exposed to differing views and cultures from a young age. They have a more cosmopolitan and international view. The problems of people around the world have becoming more real for them -- a reality rather than a story read in a newspaper. The younger generation is also more technologically adept; they understand new fields such as cyber security because they have grown up using tools that could be used as weapons. Being more familiar with new weapons, technologies and problems makes them more likely to see solutions to these problems. If someone does not know what a distributed denial of service (DDoS) attack is they are unlikely to be able to think of ways to counter one.

The younger generation views nontraditional security threats as at least of equal importance to traditional security issues. They have grown up hearing about environmental problems,

energy shortages, and global pandemics. These issues are real to them in a way that more seasoned professional cannot understand anymore than the younger generation can grasp the idea of a nuclear holocaust. As more young professionals enter the field there will likely be a greater call to deal with these issues and a resulting change in security priorities.