

CONFLICT, GLOBAL PEACE & SECURITY: THE ROLE OF CIVIL DEFENCE

B. Stephen Oladipo

Department of Sociology, University of Calabar, Abuja,
NIGERIA.

oladipo_stephen@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Debates, discussions and topical issues on security, conflict and need for global peace have been as old as the world itself. Conflict and the need for peaceful resolutions for purposes of sustainable cohabitation have been part and parcel of every human society and aeons of man development. From the very primitive epoch to the now capitalist era; conflict, disagreement, war, the need for improved security to counter the concurrent dynamism and multidimensional pattern of crime and crisis within and amidst nations of the world have been confrontational and as such, its discussions cannot be exhaustively explored. In all these however, Civil Defence as an emerging organization has played some vital roles in ameliorating the effect of war and conflict amidst the civil populace since its reckoning during the first and second world wars. The study therefore buttressed the position of dialogue and justice for all to build on this concept of civil pattern in Civil Defence civilian relation to forestall danger. This pattern has equally been largely regarded as the traditional approach to international security as well as the panacea to resolving deadlock crisis instead of opting for counter-force/mutual attacks.

Keywords: Civil Defence, Conflict, Dialogue, Internal/National Security, Peace and Resolution

INTRODUCTION

According to World Peace Organization newsletter (12 June, 2011): The greatest thing in life is internal peace, external peace and global peace! No doubt, the presence of conflict gives rise to the need for peace (Abolurin, 2010: 145). Security and peace therefore are two sides of a coin without which growth and development can never thrive in any given society Baldwin (1997). In fact, Peace is not merely the absence of war and hatred but also the presence of cooperation, compassion and worldwide justice. Hence it is imperative for us all to:

Learn Peace - Teach Peace!
Speak peace; Encourage Peace;
Exchange Peace; Build peace;
Trade Peace; Covet Peace and,

Ultimately, be the change you wish to see in the world because Peace starts from within!

It is not unknown in every issue of conflict however that the elusive need to consider the alternative option is usually the problem. Conflict, of course, breeds nothing but insecurity, chaos and destruction. Hence, where the parties involved lack the initiative and patience to look inward towards mutual resolutions, likely wars and mutual attacks become the option. Consequently, insecurity is informed and chaos becomes the order of the day. Appraising this

constantly elusive alternative consideration in situation of conflict therefore informs the need for this study while trying to capture the conceptual meanings of internal/national security; world/international security without losing sight on the varying types of insecurities in existence, such as, economic insecurity, job insecurity, food insecurity etc, which are all together sources of problems for most nations of the world at large towards the attainment of global peace; couple with the challenge of today's nuclear and terrorism threats. The study equally look into considering the roles of civil defence as national and international organization vis-a-vis its civil approach of dialogue through the process of educating the civil populace in period of war and conflict.

METHOD

The study adopted largely observation and empirical dimension with descriptive approach to communicate its findings. This of course brought to bear the cognitive attempt of analyzing the various forms of insecurity in existence to enhance understanding of the subject matter on natures and forms of insecurity around the world.

Concept of National Security

For effective discussion of international security, the knowledge of internal/national security is no doubt imperative. Although, variety of definitions exist providing an overview of the many usages of the concept of National Security. However, the concept still remains ambiguous, having originated from simpler definitions which initially emphasized the freedom from military threat and political coercion to later increase in sophistication and include other forms of non-military security as suited the circumstances of the time. Though, Abolurin (2011) views national security as national interest, which includes safety of life and property, economic, psychological, mental well-being and freedom to pursue the attainment of legitimate objectives without hindrance.

A typical dictionary definition, in this case from the Macmillan Dictionary (online version), defines the term as *"the protection or the safety of a country's secrets and its citizens"* emphasizing the overall security of a nation and a nation state Buzan and Hausen (2009). Walter Lippmann, in 1943, defined it in terms of war saying that *"a nation has security when it does not have to sacrifice its legitimate interests to avoid war, and is able, if challenged, to maintain them by war"*. A later definition by Harold Lasswell, a political scientist, in 1950, looks at national security from almost the same aspect, that of external coercion:

"The distinctive meaning of national security means freedom from foreign dictation."

Arnold Wolfers (1960), while recognising the need to segregate the subjectivity of the conceptual idea from the objectivity, talks of threats to *acquired values*:

"An ambiguous symbol meaning different things to different people. National security objectively means the absence of threats to acquired values and subjectively, the absence of fear that such values will be attacked."

The 1996 definition propagated by the National Defence College of India accretes the elements of national power:

"National security is an appropriate and aggressive blend of political resilience and maturity, human resources, economic structure and capacity, technological competence, industrial base and availability of natural resources and finally the military might."

Harold Brown, U.S. Secretary of Defense from 1977 to 1981 in the Carter administration, enlarged the definition of national security by including elements such as economic and environmental security:

"National security then is the ability to preserve the nation's physical integrity and territory; to maintain its economic relations with the rest of the world on reasonable terms; to preserve its nature, institution, and governance from disruption from outside; and to control its borders."

In Harvard history professor Charles Maier's definition of 1990, national security is defined through the lens of national power:

"National security... is best described as a capacity to control those domestic and foreign conditions that the public opinion of a given community believes necessary to enjoy its own self-determination or autonomy, prosperity and wellbeing."

Civil Defence and International Security

"Civil Defence has been defined as a range of measures taken by an organized body of civilian volunteers for the protection of life and property in the event of national disaster or enemy attack" (Abolurin, 2010:139).

It is equally collective measures, public-spirited call to serve, to safeguard, protect and provide non-combatant method against threat (The Defender, Vol. 2, n.d.)

International security however consists of the measures taken by nations and international organizations, such as the United Nations, to ensure mutual survival and safety. These measures include military action and diplomatic agreements such as treaties and conventions. For this purpose the establishment of Civil Defence Corps was necessitated, which dated back to the era of Emperor Nero of the Roman Empire. This was when the Roman Empire asserted her political powers in the world with colonies scattered all over the world. This historical development which brought about expansion of the Roman Empire coupled with acute shortage of citizens of military age to carry out essential services such as home defence, provided for civilians affected by wars, especially aged women and children, invariably demanded for additional manpower, hence, the creation of an organization charged with the safeguarding of the civil populace. During the first and second world wars equally, Civil Defence organization played various roles ranging from: 'home guard,' 'refuge-camp for civilian protection,' 'body of air, road and disaster protection' 'populace enlightenment and education on safety measures' among others (Abolurin, 2003). This consequently brought the relevance of Civil Defence to lime light at this period. The Organization (ICDO) however, is an inter-governmental organization which objective is to contribute to development of structures to ensure protection, to safeguard property and the environment from natural or man-made disasters. These structures are generally known as civil protection, civil defence, civil safety and emergency management as it exist today across the world in contribution to peace and security. These themes have equally reflected in ICDO's yearly Civil Defence Days titles such as: 'Civil Defence & the protection of the Environment (2005),' 'Civil Defence & Safety in the workplaces (2007),' 'Civil Defence & the basic first aid techniques (2008),' among others. Although varying countries of the world have eventually added and saddled Civil Defence organizations with numerous other functions based on the

emerging security-need within such individual nation. For instance, Civil Defence in Nigeria is saddled with functions such as:

1. Assist in the maintenance of peace and order and also in the protection and the rescuing of the civil populace during the period of emergency
2. To recommend to the minister of interior the registration of private guard companies
3. Inspect the premises of private guard companies, their training facilities and appliance designed for their use;
4. Supervise and monitor the activities of all private guard companies and keep a register for that purpose;
5. Maintain twenty-four hours surveillance over infrastructures, sites and projects for the federal state and local governments;
6. Have power to arrest, investigate and prosecute any person who is involved in any:
 - a. Criminal activities;
 - b. Chemical poisoning and oil spillage;
 - c. Industrial espionage or fraud;
 - d. Activity aimed at frustrating any government programme or policy;
 - e. Riot, civil disorder, revolt, strike or religious unrest, or
 - f. Power transmission lines and oil pipelines vandalism;
 - g. Monitor the activities of trade associations
 - h. Monitor and report any planned
 - i. Criminal activity aimed at depriving citizens of their properties or lives; or
 - j. Syndicate activity aimed at defrauding the federal, state or local government.
7. Provide necessary warning for the civilian population in times of danger
8. Evacuate the civilian populace from danger areas among other functions as contain in the 2003 act establishing it and 2007 as amended.

International and national securities are however invariably linked. International security is national security or state security in the global arena. This inter-linkage hinged on the fact that it was with the end of World War II, a new subject of study focusing on international security emerged. It began as an independent field of study, but was absorbed as a sub-field of international relations Elman (2008). Since it took hold in the 1950s, the study of international security has therefore been at the heart of international relations studies. Navari (2008). It covers labels like "security studies", "strategic studies", "peace studies", and others.

There is no universal definition of the concept of security though; but concepts in international security studies have been defined, such as sovereignty, war, anarchy, security dilemma, etc. The meaning of "security" is often treated as a common sense term that can be understood by "unacknowledged consensus" Al-Rodhan (2007). As there is no universal concept, the content of international security has expanded over the years. Today it covers a variety of interconnected issues in the world that have an impact on survival. It ranges from the traditional or conventional modes of military power, the causes and consequences of war between states, economic strength, to ethnic, religious and ideological conflicts, trade and economic conflicts, energy supplies, science and technology, food, as well as threats to human security and the stability of states from

environmental degradation, infectious diseases, climate change and the activities of non-state actors (Mc Donald, 2008).

While the wide perspective of international security regards everything as a security matter, the traditional approach focuses mainly or exclusively on military concerns. Paris, R. (2004). According to UNDP Human Development Report, 1994 however, various types of security have been recognized to include among others:

<i>Type of security</i>	<i>Definition</i>	<i>Threats</i>
Economic security	An assured basic income	Poverty, unemployment, indebtedness, lack of income
Food security	Physical and economic access to basic food	Hunger, famines and the lack of physical and economic access to basic food
Health security	Protection from diseases and unhealthy lifestyles	Inadequate health care, new and recurrent diseases including epidemics and pandemics, poor nutrition and unsafe environment, unsafe lifestyles
Environmental security	Healthy physical environment	Environmental degradation, natural disasters, pollution and resource depletion
Personal security	Security from physical violence	From the state (torture), other states (war), groups of people (ethnic tension), individuals or gangs (crime), industrial, workplace or traffic accidents
Community security	Safe membership in a group	From the group (oppressive practices), between groups (ethnic violence), from dominant groups (e.g. indigenous people vulnerability)
Political security	Living in a society that honors basic human rights	Political or state repression, including torture, disappearance, human rights violations, detention and imprisonment

Traditional Approaches to International Security and Concepts of Security in the International Arena

Traditional approaches to international security usually focus on state actors and their military capacities to protect national security. But the major turn and twist in today's traditional approach to international security and prospecting peace has been largely found in negotiation and dialogue. Though, Barry Buzan (2000) views the study of international security as more than a study of threats, but also a study of which threats that can be tolerated and which require immediate action (Morgan, 2007). He sees the concept of security in the international arena as not either power or peace, but something in between. However, over the last decades the definition of security has been extended to cope with the 21st century globalized international community, its rapid technological developments and global threats that emerged out of this process. One such comprehensive definition has been proposed by Nayef Al-Rodhan. What he calls the "*Multi-sum security principle*" is based on the assumption that "*in a globalized world, security can no longer be thought of as a zero-sum game involving states alone. Global security, instead, has five dimensions that include human, environmental, national, transnational, and transcultural security, and therefore, global security and the security of any state or culture cannot be achieved without good governance at all levels that guarantees security through justice for all individuals, states, and cultures.*" (Morgan, 2007).

Each of these five dimensions refers to a different set of substrates. The first dimension refers to human security, a concept that makes the principle referent object of security the individual, not the state. The second dimension is environmental security and includes issues like climate change, global warming, and access to resources. The third substrate refers to national security, defined as being linked to the state's monopoly over use of force in a given territory and as a substrate of security that emphasizes the military and policing components of security. The fourth component deals with transnational threats such as organized crime, terrorism, and human trafficking. Finally, the integrity of diverse cultures and civilisational forms tackles the issue of trans-cultural security. According to this multi-faceted security framework all five dimensions of security need to be addressed in order to provide *just* and *sustainable* global security. It therefore advocates cooperative interaction between states and peaceful existence between cultural groups and civilizations (Kolodziej, 2005).

Global Security

Global Security is a public policy organization focusing on the fields of defense, space exploration, intelligence, weapons of mass destruction and homeland security. The working definition is that the field involves the study of *transnational issues* with *global implications* that can only be solved by *collaborative effort*. Among the issues covered are conventional and critical security, national security and homeland security, international law, economic security, population movement, environmental security, energy security, gender and age, infectious disease threats, transnational crime, intra-state conflict, terrorism and insurgency, and American global power. It may therefore be useful to begin with a reminder about the U.S. Declaration of Independence which connects the security of the U.S. to global security in an explicit way, making certain value judgments that freedom and security are intrinsically good and compatible. Of course, other value judgments could be offered (e.g., a dictator might argue in favor of incompatibility between freedom and security), and the only proof the American founding fathers gave was that such truths were "self-evident." At base, this is wishful thinking because ideals do not connect us as globally as we would like. Things like commerce and communication connect us more immediately, and always have as a factor in development. Meanwhile, these connecting factors such as commerce and communication may never thrive within and around any nation without security proven peace and tranquility of such nation.

Regarding the kinds of issues that global security studies covers, it can be seen that some issues involve more "intractable" problems than others. It is customary for scholars to use terms such as "intractable" or "protracted" to describe conflicts which can never be solved or effectively managed except through mutual dialogue and resolutions (Azar, 1986). This is because Harm-producing intractable conflicts are essentially prolonged wars where the elites in the region are not hurting enough to change; political extremists exist on all sides, thwarting any attempt at nonviolent resolution; psychological wounds, grievances, and a sense of victimization run deep among the population; and there simply aren't enough of the right mechanisms in place, particularly security mechanisms, which build confidence in the expectation for anything other than failure. Ignoring such conflict zones (i.e., letting them burn) is the same as creating a breeding ground for a whole host of ills and bad things -- such as terrorism and disease -- which will be eventually exported around the world. The critical criteria for the selection of issues that the field of global security studies must face therefore should be the determination of the extent to which exportation of "global bads" (Crocker *et al.*, 2004: 5) may occur.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on issues raised in the course of this discourse, the following conclusions are engendered:

First, there is a clear difference between crisis (disagreement, misunderstanding, political or economic struggles as well as intra or international conflicts) and crimes such as armed robbery, terrorism, genocide etc that put question mark on the security of a nation or the world at large. Hence, where mutual dialogue approach could be employed to resolve issues of civil/political crisis, such approach cannot be adopted to resolve crime because no reasonable/proactive nation negotiates with terrorists and blood suckers.

Second, most countries have no post-conflict reconstruction program or security sector reform policy framework to underpin sustainable peace. This reflects the prominence of bilateral over multilateral security cooperation, as well as varying geopolitical interests, the exclusive alliance of countries with liberation struggle history, and sensitivities regarding possible hegemonic domination

Third, it comes to the fore of reckoning that capacity to enforce agreements relating to peace and security which varying countries may have brokered among themselves are often difficult to implement without rancor amidst concerned nations e.g. Nigeria-Cameroun Bakkasi crisis.

Fourth, complexities and challenges of dealing with unconstitutional changes in government in some countries is still a crisis looming hole especially within the African states. Crisis relating election rigging, post-election violence and inconsistency in electoral laws are all cumulating towards reoccurring crisis in Africa unlike most other European nations.

Fifth, cognizance should equally be taken of the fragmented approach to crisis in Africa as well as the absence of a common policy among nations with issues of shared borders. This situation hinders security cooperation. Hence rather than joint objectives, member nations within these category pursue detached objectives without a consistent set of principles and policies.

RECOMMENDATIONS

First, there should be both internal and international cooperation amongst security agencies towards engendering formidable synergy against issues of crimes and arm-conflicts that could put question marks on the peace of the people around the world.

Second, within the African societies where issues of crisis is reoccurring affair, dialogue and mutual negotiation in period of crisis should be introduced into the school curricula so that the populace could be well informed about the need for such alternative against the counter attack measures that consistently put both human and material resources needed for the development of the continent in danger.

Third, the need for the Government to further empower and enhance the capacity of Civil Defence and other relevance agencies which operate early warning system (EWS) as signals to oncoming disaster or crisis is strongly recommended.

Fourth, establishment of national centres where civil society, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), academia and stakeholders in national and international security need to converge periodically to brainstorm on way forward on the evolving dimensions of insecurity within and around the world is key.

Fifth, on issues of internal unrest especially as regard inter-tribal wars or conflict, government at all levels should be sensitive and, should operationalize mediation unit with a properly resourced panel of elders, reference group and support unit. This will ensure adequate participation of the people in the resolution of their own problems. Hence, the need for the people oriented solution to conflict is strongly recommended especially in Africa to avoid imposition of alienated solutions that may never resolved root causes.

Sixth, in resolving underlying grievances which are usually the root causes of conflict and state of anarchy within and around national borders, issues of justice to all parties concern must not be negotiated. Furthermore, reconciliation embedded in mutual understanding approach should be adopted rather than blame attributing and enforcement approach.

Seventh, effective foreign policy also requires that all settlement be shaped, or steered if we desire to, all ways, favor collective security interests. This is what makes any conflict resolution bodies/organizations to be regarded as being "strategically sensitive."

Finally, according to democratic peace theory (Maoz & Russett, 1993), states and nations should not only produce institutions and rules, but should generate collective understandings since "transnational policy networks" are the effects of deeply-held democratic norms (Checkel, 1998) whereby power asymmetries within and between nations would be downplayed and replaced by norms of more democratic-like decision-making in conflict resolution and quest for peace amongst all and sundry.

REFERENCES

- Abolurin, A. (2003). *Democratisation, Conflict Management and Amnesty Question in Nigeria*. Ibadan: John Archers (Publishers) Ltd.
- Abolurin, A. (2010). *Democratization and Conflict Management in Nigeria*. Ibadan: John Archers (Publishers) Ltd.
- Abolurin, A. (2011). *Issues and Challenges: Nigeria's National Security*. Ibadan: John Archers (Publishers) Ltd.
- Al-Rodhan, N.R.F. (2007). *The Five Dimensions of Global Security: Proposal for a Multi-sum Security Principle*, LIT.
- Baldwin, D. (1997). The concept of Security. *Review of International studies*, 23: 5-26
- Buzan, B. and Wæver, O. et al. (1998). *Security: A new frame work for Analysis*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Doty, P., A. Carnesale, et al. (1976). "Foreword." *International Security* 1.
- Buzan, B. (2000). Change and Insecurity' reconsidered. *Critical Reflection on Security and Change*. S. Croft and T. Terriff. Oxen, Frank Cass Publishers.
- Buzan, B. and Hansen, L. (2009). *The Evolution of International Security Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Elman, C. (2008). Realism. *Security Studies: An Introduction*. P. D. William. New York: Routledge.

- Gartzke, E. (2005). Economic Freedom and Peace in *Economic Freedom of the World, Annual Report*. pp. 29-44
- Baylis, J. (1997). International Security in the Post-Cold War Era, in John Baylis and Steve Smith (eds), *The Globalization of World Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kolodziej, E. (2005). *Security and International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. P.11
- Lippmann, W. (1944). *U.S. Foreign Policy*. London: Hamish Hamilton.
- McDonald, M. (2008). Constructivism. *Security Studies: an Introduction*. P. D. William. New York: Routledge.
- Morgan, P. (2007). Security in International Politics: Traditional Approaches. *Contemporary Security Studies*. A. Collins. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Navari, C. (2008). Liberalism. *Security Studies: An Introduction*. P. D. William. New York, Routledge.;Rousseau, D. L. (2010). Liberalism. *The Routledge Handbook of Security Studies*. M. D. Cavelty and V. Mauer. New York, Routledge.
- Owen, T. (2004). Challenges and opportunities for defining and measuring human security', *Human Rights, Human Security and Disarmament, Disarmament Forum*. 3, 15-24
- Paris, R. (2004). Still and Inscrutable Concept, *Security Dialogue*, 35: 370-372.
- Rothschild, E. (1995). What is Security. *Dædalusi*, 124(3): 53-98.
- Sheehan, M. (2005). *International Security: An Analytical Survey*. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Ullman, R. (1983). Redefining Security. *International Security*, 8(1), 129-153
- Wolfers, A. (1952). National Security" as an Ambiguous Symbol." *Political Science Quarterly* 67(4): 481-502.
- Wohlforth, W.C. (2010). Realism and Security Studies. *The Routledge Handbook of Security Studies*. M. D. Cavelty and V. Mauer. New York: Routledge.
- Tadjbakhsh, S. and A. Chenoy (2007). *Human Security: Concepts and Implications*. New York: Routledge.
- UNDP, (1994). *Human Development Report*, <http://hdr.undp.org/en/reports/global/hdr1994/chapters/>