



INTERNATIONAL SECURITY THROUGH FURTHER MODERNITY: A THEORETICAL APPROACH TO INLAND AND MARITIME SECURITY

L. Kirval¹

Received 19 January 2010; in revised form 29 January 2010; accepted 15 June 2010

ABSTRACT:

By taking into account, the rising international terrorism, piracy and terror acts in international seas; this paper focuses on the relationship of modernity and international security, utilising a political theory approach. Its main argument is that the international security can be strengthened by further developing the project of modernity. Therefore, it suggests a Habermasian liberal-social synthesis form for global governance, where the idealist International Relations theory is at the heart of the model. To this end, it first analyses the modern nation-state experience as its political institutions has been highly successful in providing security (and also attaining legitimacy) by means of such an understanding; albeit at the national level. Subsequently, it examines the feasibility of a global governance model for the lands and the seas of the world, which follows the footsteps of the nation-states.

Keywords: International and Maritime Security, Political Theory, International Relations, Modernity, Enlightenment.

INTRODUCTION

Historically, the nation-states have been the most successful political constructs that managed to get the masses' consent for the decisions of the central government

¹ Assistant Professor Doctor, Istanbul Technical University Maritime Faculty, lkirval@itu.edu.tr, Tel. +905322068995, Fax. +902163954500, ITU-Maritime Faculty Tuzla, 34940 Istanbul, Turkey.



structures. The nation-states made use of various tools for reaching this goal. Controlling of the education system and taxation, as well as their service providing character has been crucial in their quest for legitimacy. Elites and intelligentsia were also influential in pushing the societies towards convergence within the boundaries of national identities. Yet, besides being a product of modernity and industrialisation, the nation-state has also been an arena of democratisation. Liberty and equality ideas flourished with the French Revolution. Instead of being classified as 'subjects' who have obligations to the monarch, the individuals living within the borders of the nation-states were defined as citizens having basic political and social rights. On the whole, the rights have taken place of the obligations and this has also been crucial in getting the consent of the individuals for the newly developing political model.

Following the demise of the Empires, the newly flourishing model had to include the participation dimension to the decision making mechanisms. Furthermore, its service providing character and developing social policies helped it to attain higher levels of legitimacy. This increasing support of the masses has also been crucial for the development of the security providing character of the model, albeit functioning at the national level.

And today, modernity and the nation-state experiences can still be a guiding light for the policy makers trying to foster security (both inland and maritime security) at the international level. In this context, the following pages will analyse the nation-state experience and the philosophical discussions that accompanied it in the past. Subsequently, the feasibility of an international model which provides inland and maritime security, inspired by these historical experiences, will be commented upon.

MODERNITY AND THE NATION-STATE EXPERIENCE AS AN INSPIRATION FOR INTERNATIONAL INLAND AND MARITIME SECURITY

To fully understand the political experiences of the nation-states, one should focus on the history of the European continent; their geographical and philosophical birthplace.

For centuries the Monarchs have been the most powerful actors in Europe. Yet, the political authority of the monarchs started to be severely questioned with the development of the bourgeoisie. Bourgeoisie, as a financially powerful new class, was capable of fighting against the existing monarchies and especially with a view to create a freer market. To a great extent, an interconnected system started to flourish in Western Europe following the Peace of Westphalia. One can find the first signs of the institutionalisation of the state structures during those years. Institutionalisation of the taxation system, improvement of the transportation routes and infrastructure of the cities, advancements in maritime transportation and increasing levels of communication between the regions of Europe were the first signs of the upcoming centralised state model (Bendix, 1978).



Secularisation and Reformation were also crucial in the development of a critical understanding against the rigid and powerful institutions, most important one being the Church. At the political level, this same questioning started to develop against the kings and lords. As a result, a well institutionalised and participatory state structure started to become an alternative for the majority of the people (Anderson, 1991). Hereditary rulers, metaphysics and God started to be replaced by the secular institutions of state. However, it is difficult to argue that these institutions were considered as legitimate bodies at start. People still had a feeling of belongingness to their local communities and their kings/lords. The national identity would gradually flourish by the backing of the newly emerging state institutions and the service providing character of the model.

The contractual relationship between the King and peasant during the middle ages was not an even one. Peasant had generally a minimal say in his/her relationship with the ruler. Hence, in his/her actions, the ruler did not necessarily take into account whether he/she was regarded as legitimate by the masses. Obviously, the fear from revolts pushed the rulers to take into account the wishes of their subjects; however, this was only creating a minimal responsibility towards the society. On the contrary, the social contract tradition of the subsequent nation-states included democratic participation, and providing of services to the individuals, which were crucial for their legitimization (Hobsbawm, 1992).

One can easily say that, the era between 1600 and 1800 was a period of social, intellectual and cultural transformation for most of the European countries. Whereas the Medieval thinkers assumed that the past knowledge was the most reliable source of wisdom, the greatest thinkers from the seventeenth century onwards rejected the ancient authorities and resolved to rely on their own minds. Eventually, "Have courage to use your own reasoning!" (or Dare to know! - *Sapere aude!*) became the main motto of the thinkers of the time (Reiss, 1991: 58) who stressed the autonomy of science and the free play of the critical mind.

A new flourishing publishing industry on the other hand helped Europe to diffuse the newly acquired knowledge to all the segments of the society. For the first time reading was available to a wider audience. Books, newspapers and journals could be easily found in the coffee houses and lending libraries. Also, intellectual debates started to take place in the salons of the developing bourgeoisie. Increasing of the trade and the capital accumulation has been crucial in the growth of this class. This wealthy tradesman and merchant class demanded a share of the social and political power that was formally held only by the nobility. Bourgeoisie was also influential in mobilizing the lower segments of the society and would also ignite the following French Revolution.

In time, the debates of the salons have moved to the streets of the cities and this has been crucial in the development of a more demanding and open-society in Europe. Today's parliamentary democracies and civil society monitored political



structures have developed as a result of this historical background. The existing “social contract” tradition of Europe, coming from as early as the feudal times, also helped the development of new political models that brought the individual rights and freedoms to the centre, and reformulated the existing social contracts.

Besides these historical developments in Europe, the philosophical discussions in the continent have also been crucial in the advancement of modernity. Firstly, there have been discussions on the foundations of the individuals’ rights. Thinkers like Jean Jacques Rousseau believed that the individuals have basic rights from birth. However, in a society, they were sacrificing some of these in return for political rights. On the contrary, theorists like Durkheim argued that the individuals’ rights are solely a result of the society. Hence, Durkheim did not agree with the view that the individuals have basic rights from birth; for him, society was the main element that produced these rights (West, 1998). However, both of these two dimensions of liberalism still agreed on the importance of the basic individual rights for all the political regimes. Whether, coming from birth or flourishing in a society, these rights are considered as extremely important for further freedom of the individuals.

Moreover, the philosophers have also discussed the ways of attaining these rights. Here, a critical human mind was generally given as a main precondition. However, in reaching to this critical attitude which would take individuals to freedom, the philosophers had mainly two diverging opinions. The first camp of scholars that searched for freedom focused on the elimination of the boundaries on the ideas. On the other hand, the second camp of scholars underlined the existing exploitation in the material world as the main reason of the human imprisonment. These two philosophical dimensions have been crucial in the advancement of the political and social rights in the newly developing European political structures; the most important one being the nation-state.

Although the discussions on the freedom of thought is as old as the philosophical inquiry itself, Immanuel Kant can be taken as one of the most important names in this tradition. His underlining of the critical mind and the explanation of the political life as the free arena of conflicting views gives us a chance to reach freedom by discussion. Kant also underlined the importance of the political mechanisms and the legal framework for the healthy functioning of this dialogue model (Guyer, 1992: 1-26). Kant argued that the reason is the means by which the phenomena of experience are translated into understanding and this also marked the beginnings of idealism.

Instead of assuming that our ideas, to be true, must conform to an external reality independent of our knowing, Kant proposed that objective reality is known only insofar as it conforms to the essential structure of the knowing mind. He maintained that objects of experience—phenomena—may be known, but that things lying beyond the realm of possible experience—noumena, or things-in-themselves—are unknowable, although their existence is a necessary presupposition. For Kant, the individuals should have a critical attitude towards all the given truths in the phe-



nominal world. To this end, Kant suggests the creation of civil and just constitution that permits the different views to take part in the political sphere. However, for him, the human mind is incapable of analyzing the noumena and that's why he does not extend his critical attitude in this realm; instead he offers morals in this dimension, which he considers as crucial for the societal harmony (Keane, 48).

Following Kant's idealism, Hegel also tried to offer a freedom model based on freedom of thought. As another important name in this tradition Hegel suggested a dialectical method where the individual reaches a synthesis by the evaluation of the thesis and the anti-thesis (Miller, 1989). Therefore, Hegel claimed that "the real is the rational and the rational is real". For Hegel human history was the progression from bondage to freedom. Freedom is achieved as the desires of the individual are integrated into the unified system of the state, in which the will of one is replaced by the will of all. This theory is shown in his division of history into three stages, the first of which is in the ancient orient where only the ruler was free, the second in Greece and Rome where some were free, and modern world where all are considered free (Urmson, 1992).

In his 'Philosophy of Right', Hegel opposes the human logic which bases itself on principle of 'non-contradiction'. For Hegel, human mind is set to seek one sort of truth and when it finds that truth it opposes other alternatives. This intrinsic principle of non-contradiction is the main problem of human mind according to Hegel. Instead, he offers a new model in which the reality is regarded as the combination of the subject and its negation. Hence, the reality is the amalgamation of the contradictions and the synthesis of the thesis and the anti-thesis, which Hegel briefly calls as the 'dialectic method'. For Hegel, this whole dialectic process will be over when all the individuals can grasp this type of an understanding and demolish the principle of non-contradiction in their minds. Hegel argues that at this specific moment the 'Geist', an all encompassing spiritual body, will emerge and all the individuals will be a part of this final reality (which can also be taken as the God or the Absolute Idea).

In this whole process, Hegel underlines the importance of three core stages; the Family, the Civil Society and the State. The Family stage is characterised by relationships of love and affection existing among members of the family unit; this is an entity in which all members are freely associated under communal norms—it is a cohesive unit. The family unit generates its own negation in a component called Civil Society. This is characterised by a more intense individualism and competition than the family unit; brother begins to compete with brother, largely in economic realm. The cohesiveness and unity of the Family are lost and replaced by the particular wills of individuals in competition for self-development. These two stages are then mediated by the institution of the State, which takes the unity and general will aspect of the Family and combines it with the best of the Civil Society, that is, the individual appropriation of the environment. We thus have a society that united both particular and general will, the individual and the society, humans with their fellow humans. In concluding his model with the institutionalisation of the State,

Hegel argues that the State would be a neutral agent that would express only the general will of the entire state and hence would be the personification of the will of all the members of the community (Ingersoll, 2001:120).

Considering the state as the final synthesis stage before reaching the 'Geist', 'God' or 'Absolute Idea', Hegel justifies the state control on individuals. Hence, although the individuals are expected to have free minds, the state's authority on society is praised as it is considered as a neutral and mediating agent.

However, one main problem of the 'liberal' thinkers, whose ideas are summarised above, has been their belief in all encompassing morals and ethics, and their never-ending wish to achieve/offer universal explanations. Only a brave soul finally questioned this moral and universal dimension of modernity and this was Friedrich Nietzsche. Nietzsche refused any rational explanation that sought universalism. For Nietzsche, reason was nothing else than power, than will to power, which it so radiantly conceals (Habermas, 1984: 56).

Nietzsche argued that all the political and philosophical suggestions (no matter what their content is) would be limited by the physical desires of the one suggesting the model. Hence, for Nietzsche, the freedom discussions can in fact never be free because of the selfishness of the human mind. That's why; Nietzsche regarded all types of thinking as destined towards the empowerment of the self. As all the ideas were products of the self he also refused the existence of morals and even God. Ideas were always secondary, prior to them; there was always the survival instinct. For this reason, Nietzsche questioned the possibility of a neutral idea and the idealism of all the prior thinkers. He refused all the prior universalistic arguments and accepted the human mind as the cage of the individuals.

However, a problem also existed in Nietzsche's thinking; at the end of the day, his thinking was also limited with his own mind. Indeed, he was aware of this problem, and that's why he said; "All generalisations, including this one, are wrong." and "There are no facts, only interpretations." Yet, following the same logic, one can even say that even these last arguments are the products of a limited mind. Therefore, as the most liberating and emancipating philosopher Nietzsche had to develop the *Übermensch* (Superman) concept.

Superman, according to Nietzsche, is a person who reached to a state of being where he is no longer affected by the pity, suffering, tolerance of the weak, the power of the soul over the body, the belief in an afterlife, and the corruption of the modern values. Superman is constantly changing and in a state of rebirth and growth. He determines what is good and what is evil, and does not allow morals/religion/ethics or society to intervene. He uses a reason that is independent of the modern values of society or religion. He determines his own values. Creation of his own values gives him joy, and in order for the Superman to cope with a changing world, the Superman must constantly change. This constant state of change is a constant source of joy, leaving little or no room for suffering. The Superman does not believe in an afterlife or the power of the soul



over the body. Therefore, he makes the most out of this life, not depending on a reward in Heaven or a punishment in Hell for what he has done on Earth (Nietzsche, 1999).

Yet, as Jürgen Habermas argues, in criticising the existent rationalism of modernity, Nietzsche again used the rational model itself and this shows us the elasticity of the modernity in transforming itself. In fact, instead of demolishing the modernity as a project, what Nietzsche did was to try to enlarge its limits to possible extremes. Nietzsche's revolt against the limits of rationalism was surely crucial in extending the limits of the human freedom.

Historically, the nation-state has evolved as a neutral entity providing the rule of law for all the possible and even conflicting discussions of freedom, inclusive towards even the most radical forms of it. Theoretically, the nation-states (and related political institutions of modernity) have been considered as the protectors of freedom of thought, even capable of fulfilling the radical wishes of Friedrich Nietzsche.

Yet, as the nation-states are constructed by means of a clear national identity, they have also been limited in including the 'other'. However, this does not and should not mean that the project of the enlightenment should halt, and it's most important institution the nation-state should be replaced. Indeed today, a transformation can take place at the international level, only by making use of the nation-state experiences (Habermas, 1984). As Habermas argues, the individuals can develop feeling of belongingness to this supra-national political model (or *demos* as he calls it) due to its legal framework that is permitting all types of ideologies and identities existent in the political life.

Here, the citizenship is defined by the human rights, irrespective of the identities or the political views of the individuals. Surely, even this model will be a result of a limited thinking process, however, it will be able to transform in line with the ideas of its members towards more inclusiveness. As the development of such an understanding would decrease the othering effects of the national identities, it may also lead to internationalism. Besides leading to international inland security, such an understanding may also foster further cooperation between the navy men and merchant mariners sailing in the seven seas of the world. The 'others' of this new formulation will not be different ethnic, cultural or religious (or other) identities, but the political models that do not permit the inclusion of such differences to the political life. However, for the long-run success this model, it will have to be supported by strong social policies, and a welfare regime. Here, one should focus the second camp of philosophical freedom discussions.

GRADUAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE LIBERAL SOCIAL SYNTHESIS: THE 'GREAT TRANSFORMATION' OF THE NATION-STATE MODEL

The second camp of freedom seekers has shifted their focus on the problems of the material world and the clashes between the classes. Unquestionably, Karl Marx was the real revolutionary here as he took the freedom discussion from the world of ideas to the material world. With his well known sentence, "The philosophers have only

interpreted the world in different ways; the point is to change it" (Marx, 1854), Marx underlined the importance of making changes in the material world to reach freedom. For him, even Friedrich Nietzsche's acceptance of the mind as the absolute limit of the universe was not enough. For him, the real freedom could only be achieved with the transformation of the existent material world. Here, the material world was even defining the thinking dimension. Hence, without the solution of the problems at this level, no one could be really free, even though the mind was accepted as their sole guide. For him, there can be no real choice in a matter driven world.

The influence socialist theories on the European continent has been tremendous. At the outset, the struggle for welfare state policies has mostly taken place in the European continent due to the already existent strong trade unions. The middle and working classes were negatively affected by the industrialisation in the continent, and they grew both in numbers and social influence, as did the urban areas in which they worked and lived. The industrialisation was characterised by unique economic growth, the factory system of production and the use of new, artificially powered machines for transportation and mechanical operations. For the first time, human beings had the ability to produce far more than what was needed to sustain a large percentage of the population. However, it was the factory owners that were getting the most of this wealth. Working class bore the burdens of the industrialisation and urban social problems such as low wages, overcrowded cities, poor medical care, insufficient social services, and a host of related problems. Therefore, the working classes started to organise and get united for their rights. Karl Marx's ideas have been crucial in the development of this solidarity. Individuals started to understand the interdependence of men on each other and the negative effects of the uncontrolled capitalism.

However, the European social model has developed in a different way compared with the other parts of the world. In time, European socialists started to have a coalition with the supporters of the market and the democracy. For example, English Fabians' socialism during the 19th century has combined the market and socialism with a view to reach at higher economic development levels for all the society. Instead of following totally individual centric policies, they underlined the importance of society and tried to transform the market model in such a way that it functions for the benefit of all. Therefore, they did not foresee a doomsday for capitalism like the Orthodox Marxists. One can also see a similar trend in the development of the German social democratic alternative. Here, Eduard Bernstein was an important name. Instead of a capitalism that destructs itself due to its inherent inconsistencies, Bernstein suggested a capitalist model that aims to develop societal welfare by means of an organised public (Koray, 2002: 78). These revisionist socialists tried to develop a healthier market model instead of demolishing it. The term of the 'Revision' started to take place of the 'Revolution' for them (Lee and Raban, 1988: 12-33)

Following the Great Depression of 1929, the development of the Keynesian policies that underlined the importance of the state institutions for healthy functioning of



the market was also a result of these new arguments. The development of the social democratic policies in the 1970s (called as the Third Way), which tried to merge the market model and the welfare state policies, have also moved on this type of an understanding. Especially, the Labour Party in England and the German Social Democrats have been supportive of this model in the last decades. In time, the trade unions have also started to act parallel to these ideological transformations. Trade unions have been supportive of the revolution during the early years of tensions with the capital owners. Gradually, they started to fight for the improvement of their working conditions and reformation of the production cycles. Hence, instead of criticising the system, the trade unions started to fight for getting a better share from it (McCarthy, 1972: 128).

As a result of all these developments, the European continent started to experience a liberal-social synthesis. In this model, the capitalists' rights in the market have been guaranteed but in return they have accepted the role of the state to plan and govern for the societal welfare, which also included an intervention to the distribution model. On the other hand, the working classes had to accept the capital accumulation; however, they have been given some basic political/social citizenship rights to have a say in the distribution of the wealth (Przeworski, 1991: 11). In this model, the negative outcomes of the pure market forces are corrected by the governments and these corrections are decided upon by the democratic participation of the individuals (Dahl, 1992).

Therefore, the European experience showed that, besides a radical democratic outlook that is established by critical mind, all the political models also necessitate social and welfare policies for providing the basic mechanisms to the individuals in their freedom expedition. At the end of the day, the main questions and demands of the mankind did not change for centuries. Democratic participation and the solution of the problems arising from the material inequality have always been the major wishes of the masses and the policy goals of the modern political regimes. Similarly, for inland and maritime international security, any international political authority will have to take into account these two main wishes of the individuals. Policies that fulfil these wishes at the international level will be crucial for attaining international inland and maritime security. The increasing living standards and the social protection of the workers both on land and on seas will lead to the fostering of global security.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

This paper underlined modernity and the nation-state experience as a major inspiration for supranational/international level governance, having the greatest potential to provide inland and maritime international security. In doing so, it analysed the historical nation-state experience, which broadly institutionalised the liberal-social synthesis model, and provided security and attained legitimacy, albeit at the national level.

Similarly today, as a result of globalisation, a redefinition of politics by means of

a liberal-social synthesis is necessary, but this time this necessity arises at the international level. As Immanuel Wallerstein argued decades ago, if the global politics are left to the hands of the pure market forces today, it will gradually demolish the nationalised powers (whether democratic or not) and thus lead to the Hegemony of a certain group of countries.

Following the 'Great Depression' nation-states have been successful in this endeavour, which is tactfully analysed by Karl Polanyi in his 'Great Transformation'. In Zygmund Bauman's words; 'The project of freedom from fear pursued through the social state was perhaps the boldest endeavour ever consciously undertaken by humanity, along with the resolve it gathered to see it through' (Bauman, 2004: 33).

Today, 'there are valid reasons to suppose that on a globalised planet, where the plight of everyone everywhere determines and is determined by the plights of the others, one can no longer have freedom and democracy in one country, or only in a few select countries, or in international seas. The fate of freedom and democracy decided and settled on the global scale – and only at that stage it can be defended with a realistic chance of lasting success'. What is necessary is then, quoting Habermas again, 'the development of global 'politics' that can catch up with global 'markets'.

Therefore, welfare and social policies are of utmost importance for a secure world. Besides being successful in the democracy-inclusiveness dimension, an international governance model has to also provide social services to the individuals.

Therefore today, the individuals have to further strengthen the welfare state that they once managed to create, which Karl Polanyi once called as the 'Great Transformation'. What is necessary is then global economic governance that helps controlling the destructive forces of global capitalism.

Therefore, for international inland and maritime security, this paper suggests the grasping of the Enlightenment tradition of modernity and its perpetual peace at the international level, which was once tactfully depicted by Immanuel Kant. As Jurgen Habermas observed in one of his recent analyses;

"A nation-state is not going to regain its old strength by retreating into its shell... A politics of self-liquidation (letting the state simply merge into post-national networks) is just as unconvincing. And postmodern neo-liberalism cannot explain how the deficits in steering competences and legitimation that emerge at the national level can be compensated at the supranational level without new forms of political regulation... The artificial conditions in which national consciousness arose argue against the defeatist assumption that a form of civic solidarity among strangers can only be generated within the confines of the nation. If this form of collective identity was due to a highly abstractive leap from the local and dynastic to national and then to democratic consciousness, why shouldn't this learning process be able to continue?" (Habermas, 2001: 81).

Following Habermas, this paper argues that the continuation of this learning process will lead to the development of a global political model; functioning by



means of a political system that is based on communication, democracy, distributive justice and a welfare model; thus, also providing international security on the lands and the seas of the world.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, B. (1991) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London: Verso.
- Bauman, Z. (2004) *Europe: An Unfinished Adventure*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bendix, R. (1978) *Kings or People: Power and the Mandate to Rule*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Dahl, R. A. W (1992) 'Why Free Markets Are Not Enough', *Journal of Democracy*, Volume 3, No 3.
- Guyer, P. (Ed.) (1992) *The Cambridge Companion to Kant*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Habermas, J. (1984) *Theory of Communicative Action*, Boston: Beacon Press.
- Habermas, J. (1984) *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Habermas, J. (2001) *The Post-National Constellation: Political Essays*, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Hobsbawm, E. J. (1992) *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ingersoll, D. E., Matthews, R. K. and Davison, A. (Eds.) (2001) *The Philosophic Roots of Modern Ideology*, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Keane, J. (1998) *Civil Society and the State: New European Perspectives*, London: Verso.
- Koray, M. (2002) *European Social Model*, Istanbul: TUSES Publications.
- Lee, P. and Raban, C. (1988) *Welfare Theory and Social Policy*, London: Sage.
- Marx, K. (1854) *Thesis on Feuerbach*.
- McCarthy, W. E. J (1972) *Trade Unions*, London: Penguin Books.
- Miller, A. V. (1989) *Hegel's Science of Logic*, New York: Prometheus Books.
- Nietzsche, F. (1999) *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, London: Dover Publications.
- Przeworski, A. (1991) *Capitalism and Social Democracy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Reiss, H. S. (Ed.) (1991) *Kant: Political Writings*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Urmson, J.O. and Ree, J. (1992) *The Concise Encyclopaedia of Western Philosophy and Philosophers*, London: Routledge.
- West, D. (1998) *An Introduction to Continental Philosophy*, Cambridge: Polity Press.



SEGURIDAD INTERNACIONAL CON MODERNIDAD ADICIONAL: UN ACERCAMIENTO TEÓRICO A LA SEGURIDAD INTERIOR Y MARÍTIMA

Por considerar, los actos de levantamiento del terrorismo internacional, de la piratería y del terror en los mares internacionales; este artículo se centra en la relación de la modernidad y de la seguridad internacional, utilizando un acercamiento de la teoría política. Su discusión principal es que la seguridad internacional puede ser consolidada más lejos desarrollando el proyecto de la modernidad. Por lo tanto, sugiere una forma liberal-social de la síntesis de Habermasian para el gobierno global, donde está la teoría de relaciones internacionales idealista en el corazón del modelo. Con este fin, primero analiza la experiencia moderna de la nación estado como sus instituciones políticas han estado altamente - acertada en el abastecimiento de seguridad (y también lograr legitimidad) por medio de tal comprensión; no obstante en el nivel nacional. Posteriormente, examina la viabilidad de un modelo global del gobierno para las tierras y los mares del mundo, que sigue los pasos de las naciones Estado.