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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. What makes Bull's ideas on security relevant for the post-Cold War international climate is the fact that he took seriously the moral and political complexities of strategy which were often ignored by other realists. In his early work, Bull used realism and pluralism to address the traditional international security agenda. He also used 'classical' solidarism to explore ideas about collective security and the ability of the United Nations to deal with common threats to international order and security. In his later work, Bull used cosmopolitan solidarism to explain the need for international society and world society to tackle poverty, human rights abuses and other forms of injustice in the world as part of efforts to deal with international order an security. The agenda which Bull addressed through 'classical' and cosmopolitan solidarism has remained at the centre of security debates in the post-Cold War era.

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. 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 (Wheeler and Dunne 1996). 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 theorists (Wheeler and Dunne 1996, p. 91; Watson 1987; Miller and

1 A little earlier, Robert Jackson (1995) had explained the relevance of Bull and Martin Wight's ideas for UN operations in Iraq-Kuwait, Somalia and Bosnia-Herzegovina; and Andrew Hurrell (1996) had analysed the future of the international society approach.
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Vincent 1990). 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’ (Hoffmann 1990, p. 15). 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.2

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’ (Wheeler & Dunne 1996, p. 106). 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 referent objects in analyses of security (Baylis 1997, pp. 204-205). 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

2 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.
military power as only one means of dealing with security problems. Non-military means are considered 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 (Makinda 1996, p. 154). 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 (1995), Barry Buzan (1991), Ken Booth (1991), Caroline Thomas (1987), Jessica Mathews (1989), Gareth Evans (1993), Edward Kolodziej (1992). In his writings on order and 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. Thus, Bull was a trans-paradigm theorist. 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 (See Vincent 1990; Griffiths 1992).

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’ (Bull 1995, p. 3). He defined international order as ‘a pattern of activity that sustains the elementary or primary goals of the society of states’, (Bull 1995, p. 8) and world order as ‘patterns or dispositions of human activity that sustain the elementary or primary

3 Wheeler and Dunne (1995, p. 92) have divided Bull’s ideas into realism, pluralism and solidarism, which are centred respectively on power, order and justice. 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.

4 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 state system.
goals of social life among mankind as a whole' (Bull 1995, p. 19). With regard to justice, Bull initially argued that it could be given only 'some kind of private or subjective definition' (Bull 1995, p. 75). 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 (Bull 1984, pp. 2-5).

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 (See Richardson 1990; Hurrell 1996).

The concept of pluralism, as conceived by international society proponents, stipulates that states observe common rules and institutions and ‘are limited in their conflicts with one another’ by these rules (Bull 1995, p. 25). 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’ (Bull 1995, p. 25). Bull used pluralism to underscore the view that states were expected to perform duties beyond their narrow national interests (See Bull 1973). Positing that there was ‘neither complete conflict of interest between states nor complete identity of interest’ (Bull 1995, p. 25), 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’ (Bull 1961, p. 78).

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 (Morgenthau 1967; Kegley 1995). 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 exclude the interests of any other' (Bull 1995, p. 23). 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' (Bull 1969, p. 638).

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' (Brown 1997, p. 52). 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 (Brown 1997, p. 52). 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 (Bull 1995, p. 13). 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' (Bull 1995, p. 13). 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' (Hurrell 1995, p. 63). 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 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 (Bull 1995, p. 17). 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' (Wheeler 1996, p. 125). 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’ (Barnett 1995, p. 81). 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’ (Bull 1995, p. 181). 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.

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 (Bull 1995, pp. 102-107). For instance, Bull argued 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 (Bull 1983, p. 127). 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’ (Bull 1995, p. 200). 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’ (Bull 1995, p. 201). 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’ (Bull 1983, p. 127). This was largely because the collapse of superpower detente had, in Bull’s words, ‘undermined the sense of security against nuclear warfare’ (Bull 1983, p. 127). 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 others’ (Wheeler & Dunne, p. 96). 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 (Bull 1980b). 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 responsible’ (Bull 1980b, 447). 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. 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’ (Bull 1961, p. ix). 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 (Bull 1980a). This non-military approach to international security not 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 US 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’ (Bull 1995, p. 231). 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 UN 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’ (Bull 1995, p. 230). The classical solidarist perspective seemed to place a premium on the use of force for the good of international society as a whole (Bull 1966, p. 52). 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 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.

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 (Bull 1966, p. 51). 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 (See Kingsbury & Roberts 1990).

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 (Bull 1995, p. 230). 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’ (Bull 1966, p. 52). This was consistent with the concept of collective security enshrined in the United Nations Charter. Under the Charter, one of the principal purposes of the UN is ‘to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace’ (UN Charter, 1.1). According Weiss, Forsythe and Coate, the central basis of collective security is that ‘all states would join forces to prevent one of their number from using coercion to gain advantage’ (Weiss et al. 1994, p. 249). Bull argued that collective security ‘implies that international order should rest not on a balance of power, but on a
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preponderance of power wielded by a combination of states acting as agents of international society' (Bull 1995, p. 231). 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 UN. Bull held onto this position despite the fact that the UN 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 UN 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' (Bull 1983, p. 130). He blamed Western leaders for by-passing the UN 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' (Bull 1983, p. 130). He suggested that instead of denouncing the Third World proposals and initiatives in the UN, 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 UN 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 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' (Bull 1983, p. 130). He therefore urged Western countries not to turn their backs on the UN, arguing, 'we have more to gain by joining in the debate in a positive and constructive way than by our present indifference' (Bull 1983, pp. 130-131). 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 20th century, it did not mean that 'the conditions will never obtain in which it could be made to work' (Bull 1995, p. 232). 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' (Bull 1995, p. 231). However, the 1990 Iraqi invasion of Kuwait and the international response, led by the US, 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 UN 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 'increasingly went beyond the state-centric framework' (Holbraad 1990, p. 190). 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' (Miller 1990, p. 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 (Bull 1983, p. 128). Bull also emphasised the rights and duties of individuals, and the responsibility of international society to uphold and enforce human rights everywhere (Bull 1984). 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 (Bull 1983, p. 129). 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 Jackson has described as 'humanitarian responsibility' (Jackson 1995, p. 117). However, in pursuing distributive justice, Bull went beyond the economic
domain. He, for instance, argued 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' (Bull 1983, p. 129). In 1983 he lamented that 'the well-springs of generosity of spirit, and even of enlightened self-interest' in Western countries were drying up (Bull 1983, p. 128). 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' (Bull 1983, pp. 128-129). 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' (Bull 1995, p. 25). 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 notoriously self-serving in their policies' (Bull 1984, p. 14). 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. 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. 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' (Bull 1984, p. 18). This perspective is very close to that held by critical security theorists. As Wheeler has argued, Bull believed that 'the

---

5 Robert Jackson (1995, p. 111) has described 'world society' as a client of international society which theoretically can be dismantled by the latter.
rules and norms of the society of states are only to be valued if they provide for the security of individuals’ (Wheeler 1996, p. 126).

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’ (Richardson 1990, p. 142). 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 proclaimed rights of states to the rights of individuals’ (Holbraad 1990, p. 190). Thus, in principle, Bull supported humanitarian intervention. His ideas at this level were consistent with what critical security theorists have described as human security (Evans 1994).

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 (Bull 1984, pp. 2-5). 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’ (Miller 1990, p. 65). He argued that ‘we disguise the essentially political nature of the process when we use “justice” to describe Third World demands (Miller 1990, p. 65). 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 (Falk 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 recognises that global security extends beyond the protection of borders, ruling elites, and exclusive state interests to include the protection of people’ (Commission on Global Governance 1995, p. 81). 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’ (Chipman 1992, p. 117).

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 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.6

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 UN 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 UN assumed more responsibilities 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 UN 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 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.
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