

attempt to address the issues of changing perceptions of the threats to security and the evolution in how the term itself is being used, Krause and Williams examine the intellectual debate that has emerged particularly since the end of the Cold War over the nature and meaning of security, as well as over the future of the security studies discipline itself.<sup>42</sup> This debate has largely been between the adherents of neo-realism, on one side, and those advocating constructivist and expansionist approaches to security, on the other. Krause and Williams insert a welcomed critical orientation into this debate over the definition of security and the scope of security studies.<sup>43</sup>

Some neo-realists suggest that calls to expand the field of security could make security studies "intellectually incoherent and practically irrelevant."<sup>44</sup> In their attempt to demonstrate their adherence to canon of the scientific discipline, neo-realists claim that their approach to security is based on objectivity about what the nature of security is. For them, notions such as the centrality of the state, international anarchy, and the security dilemma are "facts" about the world. Such foundational claims are central to the debate about the broadening of the security studies agenda. Their problem solving approach to the issue has meant that neo-realists either accept the received views about security as givens or try to fit the evidence of new security threats into their existing conceptual frameworks.

Critical scholars are beginning to revise the very concept of security by asking the basic question of whose interest is being secured. Clearly if the object of security is the state, then security may be defined quite differently than is the object of security is the individual within the state or the globe. The expansion in the conception of security can be linked to new views on multilateralism.

### From Traditional to "New" Multilateralism

A useful definition of traditional multilateralism is offered by John Ruggie who explained that multilateralism (as opposed to bilateralism or imperialism) is a *generic* institutional form (a type of institution<sup>45</sup> that one can find in all places and times) that coordinates relations among three or more states on the basis of generalized principles of conduct.<sup>46</sup> Caporaso, drawing on Ruggie, argues that underlying the concept of multilateralism is the idea of an architectural form or a deep organizing principle of international life. For him, what distinguishes the institution of multilateralism from other forms are three distinct properties: indivisibility, generalized principles of conduct, and diffuse reciprocity.<sup>47</sup>

*Indivisibility* implies that the costs and benefits of cooperation will be shared among the members of the group, i.e. there will be equal access to the institutions and the services provided through multilateralism. An ideal multilateral institution is therefore not one that would discriminate among its members. It should prescribe appropriate conduct without regard to the particularistic interests of the parties or any special circumstances. *Generalized principles of conduct* refers to the norms created by multilateral institutions which govern the relationship of its members. The establishment of such general or universal standards ensures some degree of predictability of behaviour among members and should discourage, under ideal conditions, the differentiation of "relations case by case on the basis of individual preferences, situational exigencies, or a priori particularistic grounds."<sup>48</sup> Finally, *diffuse reciprocity* implies that members of the multilateral group should not expect strict and immediate reciprocity in their dealings with one another. They know that their collaboration will extend into the future and over many issues.