by Patrick T. Hiller

Security, particularly national security, unfortunately is defined in relation to military power and its global projection. It is necessary to shift from an anarchic state system security paradigm to one that reflects human and planetary needs.

The traditional focus of security thinking has emphasized the nation state and competition for power in the international system (Kay, 2012). While it is widely recognized that the understanding of security needs to be broadened, immense fiscal resources still are put toward building stronger militaries.

The term "security dilemma" in an anarchic global system of states is described as follows:

"According to the security dilemma, actions taken by one state to enhance its security will necessarily decrease the security of other states. By acting to defend itself, a state may inadvertently provoke aggressive reactions from its rivals." (Levinger, 2012, p. 37)

The real security dilemma, however, lies at the intersection of an outdated "security through strength" paradigm and a new security paradigm emphasizing human and planetary needs.

THE OLD SECURITY PARADIGM

Paul Joseph (2007) states that security still stands for something that should be pursued primarily through military force. This perspective, according to Lester Brown is the legacy of two

world wars and the Cold War in the last century. We are still stuck to defining security almost exclusively through military force (Brown, 2011). The military security lens is not only visible in commonly "peace through strength" language, but also easily quantifiable in budgetary terms. According to the strongly grounded work of the War Resisters League, more than 50% of the federal budget outlays go into the military. Basic social services such as education or healthcare and even basic human survival needs such as food security fall short in this picture.

The dominant security discourse is maintained by the numerous collective subconscious elements legitimizing direct or structural violence (Galtung, 2007). Force and power are equated

The far-flung U.S. military establishment, including hundreds of military bases scattered around the world, will not save civilization. It belongs to another era (Lester Brown, Earth Policy Institute)

with imposing one's will. In a way the security discourse is the mainstream narrative in our society and the nonviolent conflict transformation/peace discourse is a counter-trend.

ALTERNATIVE SECURITY PARADIGMS

Lester Brown, President of the Earth Policy Institute recommends a conceptual and fiscal redefinition of security.

Climate change, population growth, water shortages, poverty, rising food prices, and failing states are the real security threats as opposed to military forces. While the conceptual change can be understood relatively easily, the vested interests of strong defense industries impede the

fiscal implementation. [Frida Berigan wrote](): "We have to dismantle the military industrial complex and take the profit out of security, catalyze a transformation of thinking so that security means more than bombs and borders and bloodletting, and begin to turn the whole work of the government around so that it serves the needs of people rather than sating the appetites of corporations."

Human Security

Human security is people centered and emphasizes physical safety, economic and social well-being, respect for their dignity and worth as human beings, protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Jody Williams, who received the 1997 Nobel Peace Prize for her work to ban landmines, advocates for a human security concept, where peace is defined by human and not national security and that is must be achieved through sustainable development, environmental justice and meeting people's basic needs ([2011 Ted Talk]()).

Authentic Security

Author and peace studies professor Jack Nelson-Pallmeyer calls for a rejection of American exceptionalism and pretenses to domination in order to unlock our imaginations for pathways to authentic security. Nelson-Pallmeyer goes on to distinguish between authentic security and protection of interests. The first one based on the idea that leaders "take steps to keep families, homes, neighborhoods, and nation safe and secure" (p. 92). The second one is based on the idea that leaders represent the interests of the wealthy, that our nation has special rights and responsibilities, and that there are many consumptive wants and needs. The second idea is supported by offensive militarism. "Militarism is not defense. Defending interests isn't the same thing as defending legitimate security needs" (p. 94).

Human Needs

John Burton contributed to the field of conflict resolution with his concept based on the human needs theory. His idea was that every person or group has/have basic needs, and if these needs are not met, the person or group is going to

debate. The five needs are security, participation, autonomy, recognition, and identity. When security is a shared need by all humans, pursuing security through force will not met everyone's basic human needs.

Planetary Loyalty

Historian Kent Shifferd (2011) considers the rise of planetary loyalty where people see themselves as citizens of the globe in common

Militarism is not defense. Defending interests isn't the same thing as defending legitimate security needs (Jack Nelson-Pallmeyer)

humanity with all people and with a common need to protect global ecosystems an element of the Global Peace System.

It is necessary to develop an understanding of security in peace and not a sense of security at the expense of others and the environment. Peace Systems thinking creates a counter-frame to this security dilemma.

Works cited:

Brown, Lester R. (2011). World on the edge: how to prevent environmental and economic collapse. New York: W. W. Norton & Company

Galtung, Johan. (2007). Introduction: peace by peaceful conflict transformation - the TRANSCEND approach. In C. Webel & J. Galtung (Eds.), Handbook of peace and conflict studies (pp. 14-32). London; New York: Routledge.

Joseph, Paul. (2007). Are Americans becoming more peaceful? Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.

Kay, Sean. (2012). Global security in the twenty-first century: the quest for power and the search for peace (2nd ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Levinger, Matthew Bernard. (2012). Conflict analysis: understanding causes, unlocking solutions. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace.

Nelson-Pallmeyer, Jack. (2012). Authentic hope: it's the end of the World as we know it, but soft landings are possible. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books.

Shifferd, Kent D. (2011). From war to peace: a guide to the next hundred years. Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland.