‘Security’ has been a contested term, concept, and issue in international politics and in their academic analysis as international relations. In the twentieth century the ‘security concept’ has been widely used since its inclusion in the Covenant of the League of Nations (1919) and in the Charter of the United Nations (1945) that described as its purpose in Article 1.1 “to maintain international peace and security” by taking collective measures “for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression or other breaches of the peace”.

In contrast, the ‘national security’ concept emerged during World War II in the United States “to explain America’s relationship to the rest of the world” (Yergin 1977: 193). It was widely used by the first US Defence Minister Forrestal to legitimize a strong military establishment and this is reflected in the National Security Act (1947) that created its legal and institutional basis (Czempiel 1966; Brauch 1977). It was criticized by Wolfers (1952, 1962) and Herz (1959: 236f).

The ‘security concept’ has gradually widened since the 1980s, as have the objects and means of security policy in the framework of three security systems in the UN Charter, and within the UN framework several sector-specific security concepts have emerged. For the constructivists, security is intersubjective (Wendt 1992, 1999). It depends on a normative core that cannot simply be taken for granted. Its political constructions have real-world effects by guiding action of policy makers and exerting constitutive effects on political order.

At least three major developments have triggered a major ‘reconceptualization of security’ (Brauch et al. 2008, 2009, 2011) in many parts of the world: (a) the end of the Cold War with its bipolar international order in 1989; (b) the process of globalization with the emergence of new non-state actors and processes as objective security dangers and subjective security concerns for both the world of ‘nation states’ and the ‘people’; and (c) a fundamental shift in the understanding of the Earth’s history since the industrial revolution from the Holocene to the ‘Anthropocene’ (Crutzen 2002).

These three major global contextual changes have resulted in three processes of a ‘widening’ of the prevailing narrow political and military national and international security concepts by adding at least three additional dimensions of economic, societal, and environmental or ecological security.
The second process of a ‘deepening’ of security by shifting the referent from the ‘state’ to the ‘people’, by moving from the notion of a ‘state-centred’ to a ‘people-centred world’ where the referent object are the individual, the family, the community, the tribe, the religious group and humankind as a species. This shift is reflected in the ‘human security’ concept that was introduced by Mabhuq ul Haq in the Human Development Report (UNDP 1994) and was developed further conceptually by the Commission on Human Security, co-chaired by Sadago Ogata and Amartya Sen (CHS 2003). The ‘human security concept’ and its three classical pillars of ‘freedom from want’ (referring to the human development agenda), ‘freedom from fear’ (pointing to the humanitarian law and disarmament agenda), and ‘freedom to live in dignity’ (stressing the human rights agenda, rule of law and good governance) were promoted further in the Report On Larger Freedom by UN Secretary General Kofi Annan (UN 2005). To this Bogardi and Brauch (2005) added a fourth pillar as ‘freedom from hazard impact’ by bringing issues of the environment and related to global environmental and climate change into the human security discourse. Based on a mandate by the Summit of September 2005 (UN 2005), the General Assembly has discussed the human security concept since May 2007 and UN Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon assessed the conceptual debate in two reports on Human Security in 2010 and 2012 (UN 2010; Brauch and Scheffran 2012).

A third process has emerged since the 1970s, the use of the security concept by several specialized organizations within the UN system, such as ‘food security’ by the UN FAO (Oswald Spring 2009) and ‘health security’ by WHO (Rodier and Kindhauser 2009). The concept of ‘energy security’ has been widely used by the IEA since its foundation in 1974 in response to the ‘oil shocks’, and later the ‘water security’ concept was adopted at the second ministerial meeting of the World Water Forum (in 2000, The Hague) and the concept of ‘soil security’ was suggested in a study for UNCCD (Oswald Spring and Brauch 2009; Brauch and Oswald Spring 2009).

This is the conceptual and political background of this study by Philip Jan Schäfer on Human and Water Security in Israel and Jordan that emerged from a diploma thesis in political science he submitted in February 2011 to the Otto-Suhr-Institute on Political Science of the Free University of Berlin of which this author was the thesis adviser and first evaluator. After obtaining his degree the diploma thesis was anonymously reviewed by a prominent hydrologist and political scientist from Israel and the Arab world. Their critical and constructive comments and useful recommendations resulted in a fundamental transformation from an academic thesis to this author’s first book.

From a constructivist perspective Schäfer analyses, assesses and compares the scientific and the political discourse on national, human, and water security in both Israel and Jordan. His study was influenced by the theory of ‘securitization’ of the Copenhagen School (Wæver 1995, 2007; Buzan and Wæver and de Wilde 1998) to which he added the categories of ‘violization’ and ‘opportunization’ (Neuman 1998; Warner 2000). With the tools of discourse analysis he compared the discourse on human security among scientists with that among high level policy makers in both Jordan and Israel. He also compared the ‘hegemonic’ national security
discourse in Israel with the ‘instrumental’ human security discourse of Jordanian government officials. He then focused on the securitization of water in Jordan and Israel prior and after the bilateral peace treaty of 1994. On the background of the bilateral tensions over the allocation of water in 1999 Schäfer observed a ‘de-securitization’ and ‘economization’ of water in both countries that downgraded ‘water’ as an issue of national security and of political conflict.

Thus, Schäfer’s careful analysis offers insights that are not only of pure theoretical and academic interest, they also matter politically. This study is a good illustration of Wæver’s ‘securitization theory’ that aims at a progressive de-securitization of political issues by taking them out of the realm of security policy, where issues of utmost importance for the survival of a state and its people require ‘extraordinary measures’.

It remains a challenge to achieve human and water security in the Middle East during the Anthropocene era of the Earth history, where the demand for blue (drinking) and green (soil water for agriculture) will increase, due to the projected trends of population growth, and the supply of water is projected to decline, due to the physical effects of climate change (increase in temperature and sea-level, precipitation change and more intensive extreme weather events, especially droughts). This requires cooperative strategies, policies, and measures by jointly addressing the new security dangers of water, soil, food, health, and livelihood insecurity.

Whether a process of de-securitization of soil, water, food, health, and livelihood issues will enhance the human security prospects for the people and will also contribute to a sustainable peace with sustainable development in the Middle East spring will remain a challenge in the aftermath of the political transformation triggered by the Arab for the years to come.

Mosbach, 1 May 2012

Hans Günter Brauch
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