CHAPTER VI
CONCLUSION

The concept of security has been changing over a period. It has become more flexible in response to emerging new threats and challenges faced by the people. Generally, the traditional perception dominated security studies over the past many decades, since the persistent notion of conventional wars were considered the most threatening. Therefore, mainstream security studies were thus much focused on strategic and war studies. In the later period, vigorous debates emerged because of dissatisfaction with the traditional notion. A major initiative from different schools of thought put forward their interpretations of how security appears to be and should be. Interestingly, these approaches offered new insights and alternatives. Other than the realists, all the approaches are critical of the traditional concept. For them, there are other significant areas where security should focus than explicitly confining security to that of the state. All the approaches widen the scope and understanding of security. A major point of contestation was its overemphasis on state and its security while undermining other relevant areas. Not all the contestations however, contended that security of the state is dispensable, rather many argued for an equal importance to be paid to other areas as well. These gave great impetus in broadening the concept. This line of argument were strengthened by the fact that many non-military threats are increasing, while continuing focus on state security seemed narrow and undermined other threats. In addition, a conviction that the people in their everyday lives face these threats, therefore, it becomes imperative for the states to consider the issues that it had neglected in the past
within the realm of security. This endeavour to expand the concept gained greater salience in security studies especially, in the aftermath of the Cold War. In this framework, the idea of “human security” also came into being. Hence, the concept of security though contested provides much space for understanding security according to the changing times.

Over the past few decades, neoliberalism emerged as a powerful dominant contemporary ideology, laid the foundation of a market-based ideology. It coalesced around the idea that the market should be the organising principle for all political, social, and economic decisions. This ideology was promoted around the world as the proper approach to development favouring global economic integration and growth beneficial towards development of all the people. It was based on the assumption that economic growth will be most rapid when the movement of goods, services and capital is unimpeded by government regulation.

Within international relations theory, it holds the basic premises of international cooperation and peace through institutional frameworks and economic engagement as opposed to realist theory. As an ideology, it can be traced back to the work of Adam Smith, popularised by a series of scholars such as Friedrich von Hayek during the Second World War and Milton Friedman in the post-Second World War period. This policy was adopted in the state’s economic policies by popular political figures such as Margaret Thatcher, Ronald Reagan and Augusto Pinochet. Later on, Prime Minister Tony Blair and President Bill Clinton’s administrations endorsed a more modified version of this ideology known as the ‘Third Way’ approach. In addition, this idea has been repeatedly shared by multilateral institution such as IMF, World Bank and WTO,
which are reflected in policies such as Structural Adjustment Programme and Trade policies to the issues of development and governance. This ideology provided a strong legitimisation for the private sector such as TNCs, MNCs and elites within the state. As globalisation emerged, this ideology became stronger and swept across the world influencing almost all aspects of life. As for states, particularly neoliberalism has narrowed down its space and functions thereby, shaping and transforming its developmental roles, welfare provisions, legitimacy and its monopoly of collective violence.

Consequently, the market has come to play a dominant role especially with neoliberal economic globalisation. One major area of its impact could be seen on the state and its security functions. This ideology advances market-driven security such as outsourcing and role of the private sector in state security functions. This has been viewed by many scholars as states losing its monopoly in the area of security where, they are now shared. Unlike in the past, the increasing role of the private sector in the field of security reflecting in peace-keeping, pre and post-conflict reconstruction programmes, guarding important government as well as private installations, and even substituting state fighting forces is becoming more visible. Their service has been diverse and used extensively by state, private individuals, TNCs and INGOs. Their expertise in different fields has enormous advantages for them to be flexible and change their functions according to the demand of the market. Therefore, this phenomenon suggests a significant transformation in security studies also as a result in has the changing nature of warfare.
The increasing presence and role of private actors in contemporary conflicts has significantly transformed the way wars were imagined. Earlier, there was a strong perception that only the state could participate in wars but gradually this notion has been diminishing. Today, in many conflicts and wars, states rely on the privates to achieve their long-term as well as short-term objectives. These shifts are clearly reflected the different war activities—such as training of soldiers, logistic support, spying and intelligence roles, arms handling, disposal and manufacturing, handling and guarding of arms and ammunition – which is assigned to the private actors. There are however, some of the critical security sectors where the state is supposedly the sole responsible and has control over. As the market has become stronger with neoliberal ideas, there are great shifts and new realities. There is perhaps no space left where the private actors do not participate in public wars. For instance, many offensive and defensive offshore mission of a particular country has been achieved through using private security companies, which are clearly reflected in the US war on Iraq and its intervention in Afghanistan and Colombia. This clearly paved a way for the encroachment of the market in public wars.

The growing participation of the market in today’s conflict are clearly evident. However, there are many factors responsible, economic reason is one important factor, which cannot be denied. Wars create opportunities for the market. The soaring defence budget at times of war goes well into the contracts that they receive from the state. During warfare, all the contracts from supplying of food, cloths, vehicles, to arms and ammunition services can be performed by the private sector. After the war, all the reconstruction activities are done by the state with the help of private companies who
get big contracts. Various security service from guarding personnel to other important public and private installations are provided by market forces. Moreover, contemporary conflicts create a scenario where a need for new equipments and technology, arms and ammunition and gadgets of critical importance gives immense opportunity to the market to manufacture and supply to various clients. Along with state actors, various corporate MNCs compete to capture the local resource and establish their own companies in sectors like power, oil and other important sectors. Moreover, conflicts also create an illegal economy where, many private actors and mafia and even the states take this opportunity to make illegal profits from this. This clearly denotes that market plays a significant role in today’s conflict.

There are also associated risks of using market forces in public wars. Normally their operation, accountability, norms and their legitimacy are problematic. Increased privatisation of security clearly suggests this phenomenon is not only limited to few states, but in fact has become global. Evidence suggest that there was heavy involvement of PSCs in the past conflicts seen in Sierra Leone, Angola, Bosnia and recent conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan which labelled them as combatants. PSCs today are selling more services, some of which are core military capabilities and this market has turned itself into one the most profitable global business in the modern times. The ongoing privatisation of security and the role of contractors in warfare do challenge the traditional notion of the monopoly of the state on legitimate violence. The capabilities of private security companies are also comparable to military capabilities of a large number of Third World countries.
A number of governments have begun to develop policies dealing with security companies based in their countries but still there are more complexity and lack of effectiveness in their policies towards implementation. There is a greater dilemma that the systematic failure of state and international bodies to initiate effective framework to regulate the PSCs will push the industry to the highest degree to confer legitimacy on itself. This is not because there are no rules and regulations but the enforcement and implementation part whether at national and international are too weak to enforce or take action upon. While the clients who used these services are mostly the states therefore, enforcing strong rules or either banning them becomes difficult.

For neoliberals, development through the market symbolises rationality in terms of an efficient distribution of resources. While, all form of government intervention are considered undesirable. It is based on the premise that values, policies and their approach towards development of global growth will promote human security through economic welfare. But the Third World experiences suggest this ideology appeared to be a new form of domination. The neoliberals argued that poverty could be best alleviated by opening up the societies to market-based competition, since an unregulated free-market promotes economic growth and development. However, evidence suggests that by following the free-market prescription, many Third World states inserted themselves fully into the global economy in the expectation that freedom would ensue from such promises fantasised by the advocates of neoliberal globalisation. The real freedom infact under neoliberalism were mostly enjoyed by the private sector and markets while, large sections of society are denied basic needs. Under this process, local elites allied with transnational companies have grown stronger and has greater
determination to eliminate all remaining barriers to capital’s search for resources, cheap labour, and markets. As Jasmin Hristov states:

millions are born, live, and die in the wreckage left by neoliberalism plunder, the elite version of democracy counsels the hungry to patiently wait for wealth to trickle-down to them. Such democracy offers citizens the freedom to choose whether to spend their income on clean water, medicine, or food, to sell their dignity, or to become an internal enemy. The promise of democracy by those seeking to maintain their unchallenged privileges translates into increased repression and violence against those who stand up for social justice and the protection of life.¹

Poverty, hunger, diseases remain widespread globally and for majority of the world’s poorest people, neoliberalism has failed to address these issues. Moreover, these conditions are not only confined to the Third World but even developed countries. Particularly, since the 1980s and 1990s, the worldwide promotion of neoliberal economic policies by multilateral institutions (IMF, World Bank and WTO) increased inequalities within and between the states. According to Caroline Thomas:

During this period, millions of people previously taken care by the states have been thrown to poverty with the transition to market economies. Within the Third World countries, the adverse impact of neoliberalism has been felt acutely, as countries have been forced to adopt free-market policies as a condition of debt rescheduling and in the hope of attracting new investment to spur development.²

The proponents of neoliberal globalisation suggest an integration of global economy will relieve poverty and distribute the wealth. However, what one notices today is precisely the opposite that the poor are becoming poorer while wealthy are

become extremely wealthy. Today there is more widening gulf between rich and poor and inequality is huge and widespread because of neoliberal globalisation process. Neoliberal globalisation has push up a few segment of society where they have acquired enormous wealth that they are capable of buying everything. These wealth further creates power thereby they can easily influence any government decision-making body. For instance, some of the private corporation incomes exceed more than many of the Third World states annual GDP. The main problem here is global neoliberalism have created a system where there lacks an economic redistribution and the concentration of wealth in few hands at national and global level often led to high inequality and deepening poverty. Therefore, corruption, lack of resources and bad economic policies and managements usually pointed out by the governing international institutions alone cannot be a sufficient ground for such an outcome. Rather this can become more severe than before as the present existing systems shows, which become rather difficult to control the process.

The recurrent emphasis for a lesser role of the state in security and welfare service by the neoliberals has further the complicated of legitimacy for many weak states. When state decline its intervention in those basic needs of its citizen has further eroded the legitimacy of the states. Further, a legitimacy crisis arises in situation where states inability to perform its traditional security functions that a number of analysts have claimed to discern a growing legitimacy deficit. While leaving it to the market it has failed to address these functions.

No doubt, problems in the Third World vary from one another but the cases like Pakistan suggests there are many weak Third World states which show similar
symptoms. The weakness of the Third World states coupled with their inability and decline in their social sector spending such as education, which is an important channel for social mobility in modernising societies, creates a vacuum where non-state actors fill the gap. In Pakistan, the crises which is linked to the radicalisation of the youth and the spawning of a large number of militant groups is due to Pakistani state’s incapacity to create a balance between human and physical capital. The overall decline in social sector spending on public education has allowed the institution of the *Madrassa* schools to fill the gap and gain legitimacy within society.\(^3\) This has become a serious challenge to the legitimacy of the state.

Transnational criminal activity has intensified over the last two decades, which has acquired a greater global dimension. Many weak states offer convenient bases for criminal groups involved in the production, transit, or trafficking of drugs, weapons, people, and other illicit commodities, and in the laundering of the profits from such activities. In such weak states, criminal groups can easily corrupt leaders. Unstable and dysfunctional states that lack the capability or the determination to deliver fair justice and the rule of law, do not provide for the safety of their people, enforce private contracts, and regulate economic activity. In a global economy, realising high returns requires tapping a global market to trade illegal goods and launders the profits, consecutively depends on access to financial services and a contemporary telecommunications and transportation infrastructure which many of the weakest state lacks. Failed or weak states may thus be less attractive than apparently functional states,

which provides a baseline level of order and easy access to international trade while also affording prospects to corrupt political authorities and exploit various governance gaps.\cite{StewartPatrick}

**State-Market Relationship**

The state-market relationship is becoming more complex and interdependent in the contemporary world. One cannot possibly imagine the world without market but the question is what kind of market neoliberalism is stressing about and what kind of market do majority want — a market that is exploitative or a market that emancipates the marginalised community? Such questions have no straightforward answer. The argument here is not about the universal market that one sees everywhere such as small day-to-day businesses, where people earn, share their income and raise their livelihood. The problem with neoliberalism is, it is not an ideology that the majority wants but is empowering a small rich corporate class, MNCs, elites and countries where profit is the sole motive. It has created a system where the rich can become richer and powerful and be able to dominate all the socio-economic and political resources while leaving behind the majority in an abject condition. Though it talks about universal prosperity and freedom of individuals, where all will benefit through its policies, in reality, it has never cared about ending poverty, environmental damages, or issues and challenges faced by the Third World.

State-market relationship in the past two decades has become more intertwined, grown and transformed. Generally, state and market are dependent on each other and possibly cannot do in isolation of each other. But the more doubtful question is can

state-market relationship be defined in terms of human relation by ‘putting people first’ i.e., for the benefit and whose lives will be transformed through healthy interaction of both rather than acting on behalf of few groups, mostly rich and powerful states. Market indeed has a different logic, sphere of influence, role and activity but cannot force upon the state to act on behalf of the market forsaking the majority of its citizens whom it owes its very existence. Those policies of the market through which its action worsen the lives of the marginalised community especially, the common people should be monitored, controlled and regulated by the state rather than letting them to operate freely as neoliberalism would suggest. Though both roles are imperative in enhancing development, the idea of market pressurising state to narrow down and cut its welfare provisions is directly destroying the majority of the common people whose lives depend on those provisions. Such functions cannot in any circumstances be possibly performed by the market. However, market and private autonomy in certain areas is necessary but that does not mean it should be left free when it affects countless lives through its policies. Therefore, what neoliberals have frequently stressed on development, growth and prosperity cannot be perceived when it failed to transform the lives of the majority.

Conditions created by neoliberalism have promoted a deep sense of insecurity especially in the Third World states. The growing sense of marginalisation, high rate of poverty, discrimination and inequality has appeared, acquiring the form of multiple conflicts. These conflicts take the form of ethno-religious, ethno-political and ethno-cultural character where most of the sufferers are common people and among them,
women and children suffer the most.\textsuperscript{5} Thus, the impact of neoliberalism has brought far-reaching effect within the societies and between states. It has increased the states vulnerability from various aspects. It has failed to provide adequate livelihood in contrast to the ideals of human security and thus increased the insecurity as well. Neoliberalism, therefore, has caused more insecurity to people and greatly weakened the position of the states as well.\textsuperscript{6}

**International Institutions**

Today, multilateral institutions and its policies are determinant factors in changing millions of lives in the Third World. By following the neoliberal economic policies, these institutions have become central agent for powerful nations and corporates who control and run these institutions. For instance, the debt, which is commonly used as an instrument by the IMF and World Bank to get their policies implemented in many countries, had many negative consequences. The grave issue is those poor countries where half of their population are facing extreme poverty and lack of basic needs. Thus giving away, half of their national income as payment for debt to these institutions will further worsened their condition. Further, the austerity measures imposed upon these poor countries to cut their social spending creates enormous burden especially for poor to lead a decent life. In short, these institutions creates debt, debt creates unemployment, and creates different crises. Because of extensive privatisation of state enterprises, people have to pay more than they earned to have access for health, education and thus

\textsuperscript{5} B.C. Upreti (ed.), *Globalization and South Asia: Response and Alternatives*, (New Delhi: Summit Enterprises, 2008).

created human misery. Therefore, these poverty and misery are created as a result of the policy followed by these powerful countries and their agencies such as multilateral institutions, corporations and even the state regimes that supported these policies. The most debatable question is that despite huge natural resources, human resources and national wealth, many states continued to be undeveloped where the condition of the common people are worst and miserable.\(^7\)

Many are sceptical about the existing norms of these institutions and their apathy towards the Third World countries. Even though many wish for change in these system are met with limited success but gradually comes under the influence of these institutions and their policies. The denial of Third World’s voice suggests there is lack of room to address the problems and aspirations of people and their suffering. This suggests one does not have much faith in these institutions. The widespread global resistance against the policies of these institutions clearly reflect the needs for serious rethinking and reformations within these institutions.

**State Control over Security is Still Relevant**

Neoliberalism have been successful in theory of narrow down the state role in almost all the spare and it does not spared even in the role of security which was earlier a state domain subject. Market challenge the state that it can provide kind of any security function that the state does and is capable of as privatisation of security shows. However, there are some distinctions such as the basic motives, which make state and market quite distinctive. The security functions performed by state are because of

necessity and its responsibility towards its own citizens because the creation of very state is on that basis. For state, security is one of its primary goals. It is not for profit and the people have faith in the state for their security. Nevertheless, same logic is not applied to market. However, it can do but on what ground, and the main question is can market perform the role of security free of cost and for the interest of society? The answer is negative therefore, the basic motive are different. Only rich, wealth and money can buy security offered by the market.

No matter how state control over security is challenged, undermined and shares the monopoly of violence, state control over security and state’s central role in securing people’s security is still imperative. Privatisation of security no doubt shares the security role of the state but it cannot completely take over the central role of state authority in security affairs. Rather it acts on behalf of state as states look for these services, as it is not able to perform these functions according to the diverse security needs and challenges and demands of the present time. The growing debate for cutting defence budgets, growing demand for safety and security of different actors and institutions has ushered an intensified growth of private security companies in market model. However, the crucial point is that those private forces cannot entirely substitute the state’s security functions so long as the state exists since the state has legitimacy in the eyes of the people. Enforcing smart rules, accountability of those firms and control over them at national and international level could be a remedy to make these firms accountable. Their function, role and operations should be closely monitored, checked and punished in accordance with the law of the land.
No New Alternative at Hand

As of now there are only challenges in the form of criticism from different schools of thought and resistance movements from different segments in society against neoliberalism and economic globalisation. However, there is still no new theory or alternatives. While, its policy might not be destructive globally but because of such policies, few countries, class and groups are greatly benefited. Moreover, the condition of Third World states is not ripe for such ideas to flourish thereby reaping its benefits for all. These policies in fact become tools in the hand of the few rich class and groups in the state, rich industrialised countries trying to establish their position that prefer status quo rather than change. Therefore, we do not see much change rather we are likely to see its continuous adoption.

Uniqueness of the Third World and Challenges from Neoliberalism

Unlike the dominant Western discourse and perception, the Third World scholars used different theoretical frameworks in understanding their problems while dealing with Third World states. From their extensive studies, it is amply clear that the West and the Third World have a lot of difference in their state-making, problems, needs and wants and even threats perceptions. They cannot be compared in many ways in regard their problems and solutions. Using similar categories to address their problems will rather be difficult rather than providing solutions. Therefore, neoliberalism no matter how advantageous for the West cannot be the same when applied to the Third World whose economy, security, and society is different. At the international level, their voices are weak and their problems are ignored. While there is no alternative to the neoliberal ideology, the fact is it emerged in the West in accordance to the need of global capital.
However, as a policy framework, it is not in the interest of the Third World which has its unique socio-economic, political and security challenges. Neoliberal policies only weaken the Third World states. Thus, we can say that neoliberalism is more of a problem than solution for Third World states.

Neoliberalism as an ideology has originated from the West and has championed itself as an alternative in the wake of mounting problems faced by their state and governments. No doubt, though this ideology addresses many of their pertinent issues its implications cannot be the same for all the states globally. This is true for many of the Third World states. The difficulty becomes more apparent as the Third World has been perceived from the Western perspective without analysing the crux of their problems and the context of their nation-building process. Therefore, the impact of neoliberalism becomes different in the Western and Third World context. It also becomes more problematic when the West tries to apply this ideology forcefully in the Third World, the impacts prove negative.

If the Third World wishes to adopt their own trajectory of development, then governments should follow policies that improve condition of majority of its population. Economic redistribution, welfare functions, equity in power-sharing, corruption-free, transparency and accountability in its operations and conduct are important for their own development. Moreover, ethnic fragmentation, communalism and other divisions should be dealt with to enhance the unity of the state. The need of a strong state is imperative and if the state is strong, it can act positively in many ways. If it is weak, it has many disadvantages. Therefore, a strong state is desirable and can only tackle these negative elements.
One of the most uneasy questions is who will provide the safety and security of the people and for the state in the Third World? Can citizens depend on the market or the sectors private for these services? The state is required to defend people from internal and external threats whether they are military or non-military threats. The basic logic of market is profit-motive and it will less likely to do service where there is no profit or advantages to market while, states understanding over those issues are different. It is mostly non-profit and in the interest of all sections as the very logic of its own existence is based on safety and security of the people. State’s role becomes more important to protect people, change policies that effect lives of the people whether be it the market or any other threat. Therefore, no matter how powerful the private actors or the market are, their increasing roles, and undermining of the state and people, the faith of the people and their security lies with the state. For majority of the Third World states, their engagement with neoliberal policy substituting the role of the state has become more harmful rather than providing solutions. It is the state, which has to play the central role in the march towards development, welfare programmes and overall security of the people. The Western experience suggests, it was the state, which first emerged strong, firmly established itself, deeply connected with the people before it adopted new ideas and policies such as neoliberalism. Unlike the Third World, they do not face extreme contestation, conflict and negative consequences because of it. Thus, we can conclude that for the Third World, the central role of the state has become more important than ever, and it is only through the state that they can consolidate their process of nation-building, economic development and ensure security. This will be seriously undermined under neoliberalism.