

Working Paper No.1997/3

**HEDLEY BULL AND
INTERNATIONAL SECURITY**

Samuel M. Makinda

Canberra
September 1997

National Library of Australia

Cataloguing-in-Publication Entry

Samuel Makinda,
Hedley Bull and International Security.

ISBN 0 7315 2863 8.

1. Bull, Hedley. 2. Security, International. I. Australian National University. Dept. of International Relations. II. Title
(Series : Working paper (Australian National University.
Dept. of International Relations); no. 1997/3).

327.116

© Samuel M. Makinda

DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

WORKING PAPERS

The Department's Working Paper series seeks to provide readers with access to current research on international relations. Reflecting the wide range of interest in the Department, it will include topics on global international politics and the international political economy, the Asian-Pacific region and issues of concern to Australian foreign policy.

Publication as a 'Working Paper' does not preclude subsequent publication in scholarly journals or books, indeed it may facilitate publication by providing feedback from readers to authors.

Unless otherwise stated, publications of the Department of International Relations are presented without endorsement as contributions to the public record and debate. Authors are responsible for their own analysis and conclusions.

Department of International Relations
Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies
Australian National University
Canberra ACT Australia

ABSTRACT

Hedley Bull made a significant contribution to international security studies, but his role as a security theorist remains largely unexplored. This paper argues that Bull's ideas went beyond the traditional international security agenda and helped establish the foundation for critical security theory. Although Bull did not describe himself as a critical security theorist, his work indirectly provided a basis on which the assumptions underpinning the traditional international security assumptions could be challenged. Bull was a trans-paradigm theorist who utilised realism, pluralism, classical solidarism and cosmopolitan solidarism not only to shed significant light on the traditional international security perspective, but also to lay the foundation for critical security theory. In his early work, Bull used realism and pluralism to address the traditional international security agenda, with its emphasis on threats to the states, power politics, and the use of military force. Classical solidarism provided a framework through which he explored ideas about collective security and the ability of the United Nations to deal with common threats to international order and security. Through cosmopolitan solidarism, Bull explained the need for international society and world society to deal with poverty and injustice in the world. It is through cosmopolitan solidarist ideas that Bull can be portrayed as a critical security theorist.

HEDLEY BULL AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

Samuel M. Makinda*

Introduction

The publication in 1995 of the second edition of Hedley Bull's *The Anarchical Society* appeared to confirm its continuing relevance in the post-Cold War era.¹ It was not surprising, therefore, that in January 1996, Nicholas Wheeler and Timothy Dunne published an analysis of Bull's ideas on pluralism and solidarism, and explained their limits and usefulness in understanding some of the 1990s humanitarian operations.² It is primarily because of Bull's particular way of explaining the nature of international society that he has been described, and rightly so, as one of the most influential international relations

* Murdoch University, Perth, Western Australia. This paper owes much to the criticisms and discussions I have had with several people in the past two years. I am indebted to Mary Bull, Adam Roberts and Andrew Hurrell who have helped me in the past two years to clarify my ideas about Bull's work. I am grateful also to Jim Richardson and Stephanie Copus Campbell who read the paper several times and provided very constructive criticisms. And finally, I would like to thank the students and staff of the Department of International Relations, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, The Australian National University, who critiqued an earlier version of this paper at a Departmental seminar on 7 August 1997. Needless to say, the responsibility for the paper's conclusions are mine alone.

¹ Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*, 2nd edn, Macmillan, London, 1995.

² Nicholas J. Wheeler and Timothy Dunne, 'Hedley Bull's Pluralism of the Intellect and Solidarism of the Will', *International Affairs*, vol. 72, no. 1, January 1996, pp. 91–107. A little earlier, Robert Jackson had explained the relevance of Bull and Martin Wight's ideas for UN operations in Iraq and Kuwait, Somalia and Bosnia-Herzegovina in 'The Political Theory of International Society', in Ken Booth and Steve Smith, eds, *International Relations Today* Polity Press, Cambridge, 1995, pp. 110–28; and Andrew Hurrell had analysed the future of the international society approach in 'Society and Anarchy in the 1990s' in B.A. Robertson, ed., *The Structure of International Society* Pinter, London, 1996.

theorists.³ However, a deeper examination of Bull's works reveals that he made an equally significant contribution to understanding international security. As Stanley Hoffmann has argued, 'Bull never separated his interest in strategic questions from his investigation of the nature, history and evolution of international society'.⁴ However, Bull's role as a security theorist remains largely unexplored. In this article I argue that Bull's ideas went beyond the traditional international security agenda and helped establish the foundation for critical security theory.⁵

Although Bull did not describe himself as a critical security theorist, I argue that his work indirectly contributed towards establishing the basis on which the traditional international security assumptions could be challenged. While asserting this, I am aware of the fact that there is often a difference between what a theorist claims and how the effect of his or her ideas are interpreted by other researchers. Bull's ideas on order and justice might have been intended to achieve a completely different outcome, but in my view they provided the ground on which other analysts can explain security in terms of individuals, human rights, culture, the economy and the environment, in addition to threats to the states. As Wheeler and Dunne have suggested, Bull's later work explored 'solidarism and its promise of a deeper consensus on substantive goals such as distributive justice, environmental protection and universal human rights'.⁶ It was through these ideas that Bull indirectly helped establish a foundation for critical security theory.

For purposes of this paper, I define critical security theory as a set of ideas, assumptions and propositions which claim that the state is only one of the

³ See, for instance, Wheeler and Dunne, 'Hedley Bull's Pluralism of the Intellect', p. 91; Adam Watson, 'Hedley Bull, States Systems and International Societies', *Review of International Studies*, vol. 13, no. 2, April 1987, pp. 147–53; and J.D.B. Miller and R.J. Vincent, eds, *Order and Violence: Hedley Bull and International Relations* Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1990.

⁴ Stanley Hoffmann, 'International Society', in Miller and Vincent, eds, *Order and Violence*, p. 15.

⁵ It is possible to argue that the 'young Bull' of the 1960s was perhaps closer to realism than the 'mature Bull' of the 1980s, who was drifting towards critical theory. However, in the 1960s and 1970s Bull raised questions which could not be addressed effectively within the realist framework.

⁶ Wheeler and Dunne, 'Hedley Bull's Pluralism of the Intellect', p. 106.

referent objects in analyses of security.⁷ I argue that Bull's analyses of order and justice raised broad questions and thereby played a crucial role in creating the fertile ground on which critical security theory emerged.

The traditional security approach takes as the main referent object threats to the political independence and territorial integrity of the state, and it prescribes military action to deal with such problems. In the traditional security discourse, security is conceptualised primarily in military terms. However, the critical security approach is more flexible and claims that referent objects may range from individuals, the economy, culture, the environment and the state, to international society as whole. In critical security theory, the state or those who act in its name, may sometimes be considered security threats. While critical security theorists may prescribe military means to deal with particular threats, they see military power as only one means of dealing with security problems. Non-military means are considered to be equally significant.

In critical theory, security may be defined as the preservation of society's values, norms, rules and institutions. This definition includes the states system and the principles, values and norms which are associated with it. It also includes the protection of people and their institutions from military and non-military threats and the guarantee of basic needs and fundamental freedoms.⁸ In a sense, critical security theory is like a 'broad church' whose perspectives and referent objects differ widely, and which includes such writers as Mohammed Ayoob, Barry Buzan, Ken Booth, Caroline Thomas, Jessica Mathews, Gareth Evans and Edward Kolodziej.⁹ In his writings on order and

⁷ For a brief account of some of the assumptions of critical security theory, see, for instance, John Baylis, 'International Security in the post-Cold War Era', in John Baylis and Steve Smith, eds, *The Globalization of World Politics*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1997, chapter 10.

⁸ This is borrowed from Samuel M. Makinda, 'Sovereignty and International Security: Challenges for the United Nations', *Global Governance*, vol. 2, no. 2, 1996, p. 154.

⁹ See, respectively, Mohammed Ayoob, *The Third World Security Predicament*, Lynne Rienner, Boulder, CO, 1995; Barry Buzan, 'Is International Security Possible?' in Ken Booth, ed., *New Thinking About Strategy and International Security*, Harper Collins, London, 1991; Ken Booth, 'Security in Anarchy: Utopian Realism in Theory and Practice', *International Affairs*, vol. 67, no. 3, 1991, pp. 527–45; Caroline Thomas, *In Search of Security: The Third World in International Relations*, Wheatsheaf, Brighton, 1987; Jessica Tuchman Mathews, 'Redefining Security', *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 68, no. 2, Spring 1989, pp. 162–77; Gareth Evans, *Cooperating for Peace*, Allen and Unwin, Sydney, 1993; and Edward A.

justice, Bull addressed the moral and political complexities of strategy and adopted an approach which was similar to that of critical security theorists. It could, therefore, be argued that one of his contributions to scholarship was in the area of critical security theory.

Bull's ideas revolved around order and justice, which he examined through various theories including realism, pluralism, classical solidarism and cosmopolitan solidarism.¹⁰ Thus, Bull was a trans-paradigm theorist.¹¹ Through realism and pluralism, he addressed the traditional international security agenda, with its emphasis on threats to the states, power politics, and the use of military force. Classical solidarism provided a framework through which he explored ideas about collective security and the ability of the United Nations to deal with common threats to international order and security. Through cosmopolitan solidarism, Bull explained the need for international society and world society to deal with poverty and injustice in the world, and this is consistent with some aspects of critical security theory. These four theoretical strands in Bull's writings represent different approaches to international order and security.¹²

According to Bull, order is a condition in which things 'are related to one another according to some pattern, [and] their relationship is not purely haphazard but contains some discernible principle'.¹³ He defined international order as 'a pattern of activity that sustains the elementary or primary goals of

Kolodziej, 'Renaissance in Security Studies? Caveat Lector!', *International Studies Quarterly*, vol. 36, no. 4, December 1992, pp. 421–38.

¹⁰ Wheeler and Dunne have divided Bull's ideas into realism, pluralism and solidarism, which are centred respectively on power, order and justice. See Wheeler and Dunne, 'Hedley Bull's Pluralism of the Intellect', p. 92. However, Bull's ideas on collective security and the protection of human rights are so far apart that they need to be examined under different theoretical frameworks, hence the need to divide solidarism into classical and cosmopolitan.

¹¹ Jim Richardson makes a very important point in relation to the final section of *The Anarchical Society*, namely that Bull explored and reached alternatives, took them seriously, but in the end returned to the states system.

¹² For some useful critiques of Bull's concept of order, see, for instance, R.J. Vincent, 'Order in International Politics', in Miller and Vincent, eds, *Order and Violence*; and Martin Griffiths, 'Order and International Society: The Real Realism?', *Review of International Studies*, vol. 18, no. 3, July 1992, pp. 217–40.

¹³ Bull, *The Anarchical Society*, p. 3.

the society of states',¹⁴ and world order as 'patterns or dispositions of human activity that sustain the elementary or primary goals of social life among mankind as a whole'.¹⁵ With regard to justice, Bull initially argued that it could be given only 'some kind of private or subjective definition'.¹⁶ However, in the early 1980s, he endorsed Third World perspectives which defined justice broadly in terms of political independence, self-determination, economic equity, racial equality and cultural liberation.¹⁷

This paper has been divided into four parts. The first examines Bull's realism and pluralism, and their relevance for the traditional security agenda. The second analyses his ideas on classical solidarism and their relevance for the collective security agenda. The third analyses Bull's ideas on justice and points out how they helped establish a foundation for critical security theory. The conclusion examines the relevance of Bull's ideas for the next millennium.

Realism, pluralism and duties beyond the state

While Bull played a prominent role in the traditional strategic studies debates from the 1960s to the 1980s, his scepticism and concern for ethical, moral and political complexities took him beyond the dominant international security paradigm. It was Bull's interest in these non-military factors that allowed him to lay the groundwork for critical security theory. Bull's ability to operate both within, and beyond, the realist security framework ensured that his ideas were considered significant during his time and thereafter. To elaborate on these issues, I will examine briefly Bull's stances on realism and pluralism.¹⁸

The concept of pluralism, as conceived by international society proponents, stipulates that states observe common rules and institutions and 'are

¹⁴ *ibid.* p. 8.

¹⁵ *ibid.* p. 19.

¹⁶ *ibid.* p. 75.

¹⁷ Hedley Bull, *Justice in International Relations*, 1983–84 Hagey Lectures, University of Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, 1984, pp. 2–5.

¹⁸ One of the most comprehensive analyses of Bull's perspectives on international relations theory is James L. Richardson, 'The Academic Study of International Relations', in Miller and Vincent, eds, *Order and Violence*. See also Hurrell, 'Society and Anarchy in the 1990s'.

limited in their conflicts with one another' by these rules.¹⁹ It postulates that the states which comprise international society 'are bound not only by rules of prudence or expediency but also by imperatives of morality and law'.²⁰ Bull used pluralism to underscore the view that states were expected to perform duties beyond their narrow national interests.²¹ Positing that there was 'neither complete conflict of interest between states nor complete identity of interest',²² the pluralist conception underlined the assumption that states with different national interests could still work together for the maintenance of international order and security. Indeed, Bull's ideas on international order and security should be understood within the pluralist paradigm. It was within this framework that Bull explored options for arms control. He asserted, for instance, that 'no policy, unilateral disarmament or other, should be entertained, which is not based on serious moral, political and strategic analysis'.²³

Some of Bull's ideas fall within the theory of realism, but he did not embrace the realism which emphasises that the primary goal of the state is the pursuit of national power.²⁴ Bull rejected the Hobbesian view of international politics because he felt that it portrayed international relations as 'pure conflict between states' and as a zero-sum game in which 'the interests of each state

¹⁹ Bull, *The Anarchical Society*, p. 25.

²⁰ *ibid.* p. 25.

²¹ In a paper on Australian foreign policy in the early 1970s, Bull used the phrase 'duties beyond ourselves' in reference to the Australian government's responsibilities towards Southeast Asia and the Southwest Pacific. See Hedley Bull, 'Options for Australia' in Gordon McCarthy, ed., *Foreign Policy for Australia: Choices for the Seventies*, Angus and Robertson, Sydney, 1973.

²² Bull, *The Anarchical Society*, p. 25.

²³ Hedley Bull, *The Control of the Arms Race: Disarmament and Arms Control in the Nuclear Age*, Weidenfeld and Nicholson, London, 1961, p. 78.

²⁴ For an earlier definition of realism, see, for instance, Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, 4th edn, Knopf, New York, 1967, chapter 1. For more recent definitions, see, for example, Charles W. Kegley Jr., *Controversies in International Relations Theory: Realism and the Neoliberal Challenge*, St Martin's, New York, 1995, chapter 1. In a recent paper, Tim Dunne suggested that there were three elements in realism: statism, survival and self-help. See his 'Realism', in Baylis and Smith, eds, *The Globalization of World Politics*, pp. 109–24.

exclude the interests of any other'.²⁵ His discomfort with realism came out through his criticism of E.H. Carr's *Twenty Years' Crisis*, which, he felt, jettisoned 'the idea of international society'.²⁶

According to Chris Brown, the concept of international society is linked to realism through the common claim that 'the focus of study should be primarily on the world of states'.²⁷ While international society, like realism, posits that international relations take place in conditions of anarchy, its proponents argue that states act within a system of rules, values and common interests.²⁸ Bull's analyses of war, arms control, the balance of power and the role of the great powers, brought him very close to most realists, and were consistent with the traditional concept of international security which is predicated on the use of military power and deterrence. However, his emphasis was on how war, arms control, the balance of power and the great powers contributed to the maintenance or construction of international order.

Bull explained the existence of international society in terms of common interests, values, rules and institutions.²⁹ He argued that international society exists 'when a group of states, conscious of certain common interests and common values, form a society in the sense that they conceive themselves to be bound by a common set of rules in their relations with one another'.³⁰ It is for this reason that Andrew Hurrell has argued that 'the subjective sense of being bound by a community was the cornerstone' of Bull's 'definition of international society'.³¹ Of international society's institutions, the most important were the system of states, order, international law, state sovereignty and the principle of non-intervention. He also examined the rights and responsibilities

²⁵ Bull, *The Anarchical Society*, p. 23.

²⁶ Hedley Bull, 'The Twenty Years Crisis Thirty Years On', *International Journal*, vol. 42, no. 4, Autumn 1969, p. 638.

²⁷ Chris Brown, *Understanding International Relations*, Macmillan, London, 1997, p. 52.

²⁸ *ibid.* p. 52.

²⁹ Bull, *The Anarchical Society*, p. 13.

³⁰ *ibid.* p. 13.

³¹ Andrew Hurrell, 'International Society and the Study of Regimes: A Reflective Approach', in Volker Rittberger, ed., *Regime Theory and International Relations*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1995, p. 63.

of states, and the significance of war, diplomacy, balance of power, international law and the great powers for international order.

Bull believed that the reciprocal recognition of the sovereignty of states is a crucial element of international society.³² State sovereignty implies independence from outside authority, equality of status in international law, and non-intervention in domestic matters. As Wheeler has argued, Bull believed that in such a system 'the common procedural values of sovereignty and non-intervention enable states to provide for order'.³³ It is respect for these principles that constitutes stability, certainty and order in international society. And given the anarchical nature of international society, the preservation or protection of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the state has been a primary security concern for the realists.

While positing that states acknowledged the existence of a common set of norms, values, principles, understandings and institutions which bound them, Bull, like other international society theorists, recognised the recurrence of war and conflict. Indeed, as Michael Barnett has argued: 'Conflicts persist, wars occasionally occur, and states will balance the power of others, but by and large states have found it mutually advantageous to establish institutions and norms to further their collective interest in security and survival'.³⁴ Bull considered war to be a central feature of international society and argued that it was war, and the threat of war, that determined the shape and rules of international society. He recognised that war was not the only determinant of the nature of the international system, but argued that it was so basic that even terms like great powers, alliances, spheres of influence, balances of power and hegemony 'are scarcely intelligible except in relation to war and the threat of war'.³⁵ While some realists see war as an instrument for pursuing national power, Bull saw it as a phenomenon which would help bring about international order and security.

³² Bull, *The Anarchical Society*, p. 17.

³³ Nicholas J. Wheeler, 'Guardian Angel or Global Gangster: A Review of the Ethical Claims of International Society', *Political Studies*, vol. 44, no. 1, March 1996, p. 125.

³⁴ Michael Barnett, 'The New United Nations Politics of Peace: From Juridical Sovereignty to Empirical Sovereignty', *Global Governance*, vol. 1, no. 1, Winter 1995, p. 81.

³⁵ Bull, *The Anarchical Society*, p. 181.

Central to Bull's concept of international order was the survival of the society of states as a whole. In such a society, the balance of power had specific functions, the most important of which was the maintenance of order and security. Bull made distinctions among five different categories of balances of power, all of which were said to be about stability, equilibrium and order.³⁶ Bull argued, for instance, that the 'maintenance of the global balance of power is a basic condition of order, without which there would be no prospect of security for' either superpower or its allies or neutral third parties.³⁷ Bull explained the balances of power largely, but not exclusively, in terms of their benefit to international society as a whole.

It was within the pluralist conception of international society that Bull argued that the two superpowers had a responsibility to negotiate arms control treaties and to guarantee the security of the whole international society, not just themselves. He believed that the United States and the Soviet Union had a mutual interest in the maintenance of international order and security. In his own words: 'Great powers contribute to international order in two main ways: by managing their own relations with one another; and by exploiting their preponderance in such a way as to impart a degree of central direction to the affairs of international society as a whole'.³⁸ However, he also argued that the great powers could be irresponsible at certain times, and 'frequently behave in such a way as to promote disorder rather than order'.³⁹ For instance, he argued in 1983 that the idea that 'firm and durable understandings between' the superpowers would lead to 'a degree of order in the international system' had 'become difficult to sustain'.⁴⁰ This was largely because the collapse of superpower detente had, in Bull's words, 'undermined the sense of security against nuclear warfare'.⁴¹ According to Wheeler and Dunne, Bull was making a statement that 'the legitimacy of the institution of the great powers depends upon how far they can make their special privileges acceptable to

³⁶ *ibid.* pp. 102–7.

³⁷ Hedley Bull, 'The International Anarchy in the 1980s', *Australian Outlook*, vol. 37, no. 3, December 1983, p. 127.

³⁸ Bull, *The Anarchical Society*, p. 200.

³⁹ *ibid.* p. 201.

⁴⁰ Bull, 'The International Anarchy in the 1980s', p. 127.

⁴¹ *ibid.* p. 127.

others'.⁴² This again illustrates Bull's non-traditional conception of international security—he believed that it entailed duties beyond the immediate national interests.

Indeed, it was not long before Bull was arguing that the superpowers were behaving irresponsibly.⁴³ Suggesting that the superpowers had lost the legitimacy of the international society, Bull argued: 'The United States and the Soviet Union have little claim to be regarded as nuclear trustees for mankind...it is difficult to find evidence in any part of the world that they are still viewed as the great responsables'.⁴⁴ The assumption that the superpowers were expected to serve as nuclear trustees of humankind is central to Bull's conception of international security, namely that states, despite their differing national agendas, had moral and ethical responsibilities to international society as a whole. It is this type of reasoning that set him apart from many realists and made him contribute indirectly to the emergence of ideas that sought to challenge the assumptions of traditional international security.

Even when tackling issues of significance to the central strategic balance such as nuclear deterrence and arms control, Bull often raised moral and ethical questions.⁴⁵ For instance, in his seminal work on arms control in 1961, Bull argued 'for the recognition of complexity in the moral, military and political issues raised by modern war'.⁴⁶ Unlike many realist strategists, Bull approached nuclear deterrence and arms control from the wider political and societal contexts. For example, in 1979 he criticised nuclear deterrence policies because he believed they focused on means rather than ends, and were concerned mainly with military issues rather than the management and control of political crises.⁴⁷ This non-military approach to international security not

⁴² Wheeler and Dunne, 'Hedley Bull's Pluralism of the Intellect', p. 96.

⁴³ Hedley Bull, 'The Great Irresponsibles? The United States, the Soviet Union and World Order', *International Journal*, vol. 35, no. 3, Summer 1980, pp. 437–47.

⁴⁴ *ibid.* p. 447.

⁴⁵ For a critical review of Bull's ideas on strategic issues, see, for example, T.B. Millar, 'Strategic Studies and Arms Control', in Miller and Vincent, eds, *Order and Violence*.

⁴⁶ Bull, *The Control of the Arms Race*, p. ix.

⁴⁷ See Hedley Bull, 'Future Conditions of Strategic Deterrence', in *The Future of Strategic Deterrence*, Part 1, Adelphi Paper No. 160, International Institute for Strategic Studies, London, 1980, pp. 13–23.

only made his ideas different from those of his realist contemporaries, but it also ensured that his work would have significance outside the traditional international security framework.

It was within this broad security framework that Bull blamed the heightened antagonism between the United States and the Soviet Union in the late 1970s and early 1980s on ideological differences. This increased tension not only undermined the potential of the superpowers to perform duties which went beyond their narrow national interests, but it also clearly underlined the uncertainty of managing international order and security in a pluralist society. If a pluralist order presented such problems, what prospects did Bull think a solidarist one would have?

Classical solidarism and collective security

Unlike many realist scholars of his time, Bull had developed a strong interest in international law, international institutions and collective security. He was fascinated by solidarism (which I call classical solidarism to distinguish it from cosmopolitan solidarism) because he considered it 'a superior form of maintaining order because it seeks to make force solely or chiefly the instrument of international society as a whole'.⁴⁸ He believed that classical solidarism would limit the unilateral use of military force, legitimise collective security, and provide a framework for coping with diversity and managing order in an expanding international society. His classical solidarist ideas appeared to be at odds with the prevailing strategic views because many strategists paid no attention to the role of the United Nations or international law. However, Bull's views became increasingly popular in the post-Cold War climate.

Bull believed that the unilateral use of military force was not conducive to order in international society. Indeed, his exploration of classical solidarism stemmed partly from the perception that in a solidarist society states would not resort to the use of military force or war for selfish political ends, because of an acknowledgment 'that force can legitimately be used only to promote the purposes of the international community'.⁴⁹ The classical solidarist perspective seemed to place a premium on the use of force for the good of international

⁴⁸ Bull, *The Anarchical Society*, p. 231.

⁴⁹ *ibid.* p. 230.

society as a whole.⁵⁰ It underpinned the Paris Pact of 1928, according to which the states comprising international society would not resort to war as an instrument of national policy. It was also consistent with the UN Charter which prohibits both the use of force against the political independence of other states or in any manner inconsistent with UN objectives, and intervention in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of other states.⁵¹

In the 1960s, when Bull first articulated the concept of solidarism, he argued that this Grotian conception of international society was reflected in efforts that went into the creation of the League of Nations in 1919, the Paris Pact, the UN in 1945, and the Nuremberg Tribunal.⁵² He, therefore, believed that the classical solidarist ideas which he was articulating had played a role in post-war reconstruction and security arrangements. Moreover, as an admirer of Hugo Grotius's ideas, Bull believed that international institutions had the potential to enhance international order.⁵³

Bull also explained the virtues of the collective security system, and in the 1970s he argued that a solidarist doctrine pointed to a situation in which states would cooperate to deal with security threats without necessarily setting up a world government.⁵⁴ He explained classical solidarism in terms of the ability and willingness of 'the states comprising international society' to cooperate and work together 'with respect to the enforcement of [international] law'.⁵⁵ This was consistent with the concept of collective security enshrined in the UN Charter. Under the Charter, one of the principal purposes of the United Nations is 'to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace'.⁵⁶ According to Weiss, Forsythe and Coate, the central

⁵⁰ Hedley Bull, 'The Grotian Conception of International Society', in Herbert Butterfield and Martin Wight, eds, *Diplomatic Investigations*, Allen and Unwin, London, 1966, p. 52.

⁵¹ See, the UN Charter, Articles 2(4) and 2(7), respectively.

⁵² Bull, 'The Grotian Conception of International Society', p. 51.

⁵³ For an excellent analysis of the Grotian perspective, see Benedict Kingsbury and Adam Roberts, 'Introduction: Grotian Thought in International Relations', in Hedley Bull, Benedict Kingsbury and Adam Roberts, eds, *Hugo Grotius and International Relations*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1990.

⁵⁴ Bull, *The Anarchical Society*, p. 230.

⁵⁵ Bull, 'The Grotian Conception of International Society', p. 52.

⁵⁶ The UN Charter, Article 1(1).

basis of collective security is that 'all states would join forces to prevent one of their number from using coercion to gain advantage'.⁵⁷ Bull argued that collective security 'implies that international order should rest not on a balance of power, but on a preponderance of power wielded by a combination of states acting as agents of international society'.⁵⁸ It would appear from this that Bull believed that, in principle, international society would be better managed if the use of military force was left to the discretion of the United Nations. Bull held onto this position despite the fact that the United Nations was effectively excluded from the main issues of peace and security until the Cold War ended.

In the early 1980s, Bull lamented that the Western powers, which had been the principal authors of the UN Charter, and had previously used the United Nations as an 'instrument of their policies' from the 1940s to the 1960s, had now chosen to treat it with 'scepticism mixed with resentment and sometimes downright hostility'.⁵⁹ He blamed Western leaders for by-passing the United Nations in matters of peace and security, rather than making use of it. Bull argued that Western countries were inclined 'to obstruct the involvement of the UN in national liberation activities, rather than to seek to influence it; to complain about the so-called politicisation of the UN specialised agencies rather than to seek to understand what has brought it about'.⁶⁰ He suggested that instead of denouncing the Third World proposals and initiatives in the United Nations, the West should be more constructive and less cynical, and should take more seriously the issues which Third World states had raised. He argued that it was in the long-term interest of the West and international society as a whole, for Western countries to play their full part in shaping the UN system.

Bull believed that the participation of Third World states in the United Nations was evidence of the expansion of international society, and he saw classical solidarism as a framework which would help lessen the problem of anarchy. Cognisant of the fact that the Third World states had achieved

⁵⁷ Thomas G. Weiss, David P. Forsythe and Roger Coate, *The United Nations and Changing World Politics*, Westview, Boulder, CO, 1994, p. 21. See also Inis L. Claude Jr., *Swords Into Plowshares: The Problems and Progress of International Organization*, Random House, New York, 1964, p. 249.

⁵⁸ Bull, *The Anarchical Society*, p. 231.

⁵⁹ Bull, 'The International Anarchy in the 1980s', p. 130.

⁶⁰ *ibid.* p. 130.

numerical preponderance and that the West could no longer dominate the UN General Assembly proceedings as it had done in the late 1940s and 1950s, Bull argued that international order and security would be greatly enhanced by the Western powers seeking 'common ground with others' to render the UN more effective. In his own words: 'We can hardly expect to arrest the gathering anarchy in international relations without seeking to maintain and indeed to extend the role that the UN plays'.⁶¹ He therefore urged Western countries not to turn their backs on the United Nations, arguing, 'we have more to gain by joining in the debate in a positive and constructive way than by our present indifference'.⁶² Thus Bull felt that the West, which had most to gain through solidarism, was acting in a manner that appeared to threaten the vitality of the only international organisation with universal membership.

Bull acknowledged that although 'the attempt to apply the solidarist formula [had] proved premature' in the twentieth century, it did not mean that 'the conditions will never obtain in which it could be made to work'.⁶³ He believed that the UN General Assembly's endorsement of the US-led coalition in the Korean war in 1950 was not a good demonstration of solidarism because it 'served to weaken rather than enhance the role of the [UN] in world politics'.⁶⁴ However, the 1990 Iraqi invasion of Kuwait and the international response, led by the United States, which took place several years after Bull's demise, was a clearer demonstration of classical solidarism. Indeed, many of Bull's solidarist ideas would be very supportive of the role of the United Nations in international order and security in the immediate post-Cold War era.

Bull's solidarist ideas in the 1980s went beyond the old-style collective security system and took more serious account of the needs, rights and duties of individuals. Whereas classical solidarism was statist in orientation in the sense that it focused mainly on the rights and duties of states, his 1980s ideas on cosmopolitan solidarism appeared to encourage more intrusive diplomacy and to condone a reinterpretation of state sovereignty. Bull's emphasis shifted as he explored justice and cosmopolitan solidarism in his later work. As Carsten Holbraad has argued, in his discussions of international justice, Bull 'increas-

⁶¹ *ibid.*

⁶² *ibid.* pp. 130–1.

⁶³ Bull, *The Anarchical Society*, p. 232.

⁶⁴ *ibid.* p. 231.

ingly went beyond the state-centric framework'.⁶⁵ J.D.B. Miller argues that Bull's 'radicalism was selective, and [was] buttressed by a concern for established institutions and a dislike of left-wing nostrums'.⁶⁶ Bull's concept of cosmopolitan solidarism was underpinned by this radicalism.

It was these cosmopolitan solidarist ideas, combined with a strong commitment to ethical and moral considerations, that helped Bull lay the foundation for critical security theory.

Cosmopolitan solidarism and critical security

Bull's cosmopolitan solidarist ideas were expressed more clearly in his later years and reflected his concerns about both inequalities in wealth and power between the industrialised states of the North and the underdeveloped states of the South, on the one hand, and the state of human rights in some countries, on the other. He subsequently called for a greater transfer of power and economic resources from the North to the South with a view to reconstructing a more equitable international order.⁶⁷ Bull also emphasised the rights and duties of individuals, and the responsibility of international society to uphold and enforce human rights everywhere.⁶⁸ It was with human rights and the redistribution of wealth in mind that Bull explained the concept of justice in international relations, which, in turn, helped prepare the ground for critical security theory.

Bull recognised that the poverty of Third World states was partly due to the corruption and mismanagement in these states, but he also argued that 'one of the chief threats to international order in the 1980s' derived from the Western countries' failure to manage the international economy effectively.⁶⁹ Bull was keen to see a redistribution of resources not for commercial gain, but in the name of international justice. He saw justice in terms of what Robert

⁶⁵ Carsten Holbraad, 'Conclusion: Hedley Bull and International Relations', in Miller and Vincent, eds, *Order and Violence*, p. 190.

⁶⁶ J.D.B. Miller, 'The Third World', in Miller and Vincent, eds, *Order and Violence*, p. 66.

⁶⁷ Bull, 'The International Anarchy in the 1980s', p. 128.

⁶⁸ Bull, *Justice in International Relations*.

⁶⁹ Bull, 'The International Anarchy in the 1980s', p. 129.

Jackson has described as 'humanitarian responsibility'.⁷⁰ However, in pursuing distributive justice, Bull went beyond the economic domain. He argued, for instance, that 'the West should be ready to accommodate the demands of Third World countries for a redistribution of wealth and power in the international system'.⁷¹ In 1983 he lamented that 'the well-springs of generosity of spirit, and even of enlightened self-interest' in Western countries were drying up.⁷² He felt it was time that the West did something to help the Third World peoples who were in need of assistance.

Bull believed that by helping Third World states economically, the Western countries were strengthening their own security and that of international society as a whole. He argued that an international order could not endure unless Third World states and peoples believed that they had a stake in it. For example, at a conference in Canberra in 1983 Bull argued: 'We must take the Third World seriously primarily because of the vital interest we have in constructing an international order in which we ourselves will have a prospect of living in peace and security into the next century and beyond'.⁷³ In other words, Bull saw a fairer distribution of power and economic resources between the North and the South not only as a form of charity to the disadvantaged sections of international society, but also as part of the efforts to reconstruct international order and manage the emerging security problems.

The closing of the economic gap between the North and the South represented a form of justice which was quite different from that constituted by the protection of human rights, because the latter called for a balance between the imperatives of international order and requirements for world order. For example, in defending the pluralist conception of international society, Bull had rejected the Kantian view of universal society and emphasised that 'states are the principal reality of international politics'.⁷⁴ It was states that took action to enforce international law, establish diplomatic relations and build international institutions. However, later in life when he was focusing on justice, he appeared to be disturbed by the fact that the states' national interests could hinder the realisation of the common good, and he noted that 'states are

⁷⁰ Jackson, 'The Political Theory of International Society', p. 117.

⁷¹ Bull, 'The International Anarchy in the 1980s', p. 129.

⁷² *ibid.* p. 128.

⁷³ *ibid.* pp. 128–9.

⁷⁴ Bull, *The Anarchical Society*, p. 25.

notoriously self-serving in their policies'.⁷⁵ While his prescriptions fell short of authorising non-state actors to take over the responsibility of human rights protection, he realised that a pluralist international society could not provide order in the world society, that is, among individuals.⁷⁶ It is for this reason that he came to emphasise cosmopolitan solidarism. He argued that a consensus was emerging in the West that the international community should have a responsibility to protect human rights even within state borders.⁷⁷ Indeed, as Bull argued in 1984, 'the question of justice concerns what is due not only to states and nations, but to all individual persons in an imagined community of mankind'.⁷⁸ This perspective is very close to that held by critical security theorists. As Wheeler has argued, Bull believed that 'the rules and norms of the society of states are only to be valued if they provide for the security of individuals'.⁷⁹

Bull's emphasis on human rights as a part of the international order raised questions about state sovereignty. Although Bull believed that state sovereignty and non-intervention in domestic affairs were important institutions of international society, in his call for international justice, he emphasised the rights of individuals against those of the state. As James Richardson has explained, Bull 'suggested that normative issues relating to justice could not be adequately addressed in terms of the sovereign state, but required discussion of the individual, on the one hand, and the potential global community, on the other'.⁸⁰ Bull conceded that the demands for justice could result in undermining the principle of non-intervention. It required international society to take up measures to protect individuals even in their own countries, in the name of international order. As Holbraad has explained, Bull 'broadened the focus in the direction of world politics by shifting attention from the pro-

⁷⁵ Bull, *Justice in International Relations*, p. 14.

⁷⁶ Robert Jackson has described 'world society' as a client of international society which theoretically can be dismantled by the latter. See Jackson 'The Political Theory of International Society', p. 111.

⁷⁷ Wheeler and Dunne refer to cosmopolitan solidarism as a 'thicker' solidarist community. See, Wheeler and Dunne, 'Hedley Bull's Pluralism of the Intellect', p. 98.

⁷⁸ Bull, *Justice in International Relations*, p. 18.

⁷⁹ Wheeler, 'Guardian Angel or Global Gangster', p. 126.

⁸⁰ Richardson, 'The Academic Study of International Relations', p. 142.

claimed rights of states to the rights of individuals'.⁸¹ Thus, in principle, Bull supported humanitarian intervention. His ideas at this level were consistent with what critical security theorists have described as human security.⁸²

From the above discussion, it can be argued that Bull's conception of international society could enable one to explain security in terms of political, economic, humanitarian and societal factors. This would be similar to the views of critical security theorists who argue that human rights and good governance have become international security issues. As already noted, Bull did not use the term critical security, but some of his ideas about justice provided a foundation on which critical security theory is based. For example, in the 1983–84 Hagey lectures, Bull outlined five conceptions of justice underpinning the North–South relations. These included equal sovereignty, self-determination, racial equality, cultural liberation and economic equity.⁸³ By this time Bull had firmly placed the poor Third World states and their peoples at the centre of his theory of justice. To Bull, the realisation of justice was not merely a matter of helping the poor; it was vital for dealing with the problems of anarchy and for the construction of international order. These same issues are not only considered significant security factors by developing countries, but they also form a part of the critical security agenda.

As expected, Bull's exploration of cosmopolitan solidarist ideas had a mixed reception in realist circles. One of the most balanced criticisms of Bull's views came from J.D.B. Miller who argued that justice in international relations was 'more of a political than a legal or ethical concept'.⁸⁴ He argued that 'we disguise the essentially political nature of the process when we use "justice"' to describe Third World demands.⁸⁵ Richard Falk agreed with Bull but argued that 'it would be desirable, but it seems virtually impossible to achieve the sort of solution' Bull proposed.⁸⁶

⁸¹ Holbraad, 'Conclusion: Hedley Bull and International Relations', p. 190.

⁸² See, for instance, Gareth Evans, 'Cooperative Security and Intrastate Conflict', *Foreign Policy*, no. 96, Fall 1994, pp. 3–20.

⁸³ Bull, *Justice in International Relations*, pp. 2–5.

⁸⁴ Miller, 'The Third World', p. 65.

⁸⁵ *ibid.* p. 92.

⁸⁶ Richard Falk, *The Promise of World Order: Essays in Normative International Relations*, Wheatsheaf, Brighton, 1987, p. 267.

However, Bull's ideas would find favour with critical security theorists who argue that the concept of security ought to address the rights and responsibilities of both states and individuals. As the Commission on Global Governance has explained, security may include the protection of people from their own states. In a 1995 report it stated: 'The security of people recognizes that global security extends beyond the protection of borders, ruling elites, and exclusive state interests to include the protection of people'.⁸⁷ John Chipman also has argued that it is 'precisely the rise in international concern about human rights and the emphasis on attaching sovereignty to people rather than territory that has begun to loosen the constraints on interference in the domestic affairs of states'.⁸⁸

Conclusion

Bull's conceptions of pluralism, classical solidarism and cosmopolitan solidarism contributed significantly to an understanding of the traditional international security perspective, and also helped lay the foundation for critical security theory. His concern for international order placed emphasis on the role of arms control, the balance of power, war, diplomacy and the great powers. It was his deep knowledge of these issues that made Bull a very influential participant in the strategic studies debates of the 1960s and 1970s. However, the difference between him and most realists was that he raised broader moral and political complexities which were often ignored by the others. For example, while many realists saw war as an instrument of national policy, Bull regarded it as an important element in constructing international order. While many realists assumed that the great powers exploited their positions to pursue their own selfish interests, Bull argued that in going after their goals the great powers contributed to international order and security. Even when addressing issues that were central to the traditional security agenda, Bull stressed the moral, ethical and political dimensions and, therefore, helped undermine some of the assumptions on which traditional security was predicated. Indeed, by raising some of the issues which had been neglected

⁸⁷ Commission on Global Governance, *Our Global Neighbourhood*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1995, p. 81.

⁸⁸ John Chipman, 'The Future of Strategic Studies: Beyond Even Grand Strategy', *Survival*, vol. 34, no. 1, 1992, p. 117.

by most strategists, Bull provided both rationales for orthodox views and critiques of them.

One factor which is likely to enable Bull's conception of international security to continue to have an impact in the next millennium is the fact that he adopted a broad and trans-paradigm approach. His emphasis on moral values, norms, institutions and rules of international society, which made his contribution to international security distinctly different from that of many of his contemporaries, will continue to have a wide appeal. Moreover, the fact that some of Bull's pluralist assumptions have been embraced by policy makers is an indication of the continuing salience of his ideas.⁸⁹

Bull's notion of classical solidarism, and his emphasis on the significance of international law, also put him at odds with some of his contemporaries, who thought that international law was of no consequence in power politics. Bull's ideas would have been appropriate for collective security, but during the Cold War, the United Nations was nearly paralysed by the US–Soviet rivalry. However, some of his classical solidarist ideas became more relevant in the post-Cold War era, especially as the United Nations assumed more responsibility for international order and security in the early 1990s. It is generally agreed that the US-led coalition, which expelled Iraqi troops from Kuwait in 1991, was a clear demonstration of the classical solidarist ideas which Bull had associated with collective security. Iraq had violated international law by invading Kuwait in August 1990, and the United Nations had sanctioned the use of military force to remove Iraqi troops from Kuwait. While the operation against Iraq was not necessarily a prototype of international responses to violations of international law, it is reasonable to assume that similar actions may be undertaken in the future. Indeed, Bull's classical solidarist ideas will remain relevant in the next millennium.

Finally, one very important feature of Bull's work is that he was dissatisfied with the predominant international security paradigm, and for this reason he expounded ideas which indirectly helped establish a foundation for critical security theory. Bull believed that international order and security required the effective management and control of political and economic crises rather than emphasising military issues; and this has been the line of critical

⁸⁹ The concept of 'good international citizenship' in Australian foreign policy, for example, has been attributed to Hedley Bull. See Gareth Evans and Bruce Grant, *Australia's Foreign Relations: In the World of the 1990s*, 2nd edn, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1995, p. 34.

security theorists. Bull questioned the legitimacy of an international order which was based on respect for state sovereignty without a corresponding respect for human rights everywhere, and this continues to be an issue of great significance to critical security theorists in the late 1990s. Bull believed that distributive justice and human rights were important for international order and security, and many critical security theorists subscribe to this view. Bull's contribution to the emergence of critical security theory, however indirect, is a clear indication that he was a theorist of the future. His ideas on cosmopolitan solidarism are likely to continue to influence security debates well into the next millennium.