CHAPTER II
CHANGING CONNOTATION OF SECURITY

Security, traditionally, has been understood in terms of security of the state. This notion of national security emanated predominantly from the field of strategic studies and was dominated by the realists focusing on power and the institutions of power, especially the military.\(^1\) However, the debate around the concept views ‘security’ as ambiguous and a weakly developed concept. Thus, constructing security in terms of national security appears to be problematic given that, the problem of national security lies at the root of war.\(^2\) Therefore, it is pertinent to discuss the various debates on security to gain a better understanding of the problem of security.

Historically, the notion of insecurity has lead to the search for security and this developed over the past many centuries. For instance, the origin of the states as one reads in Western political thought finds the state of nature assumed a primal anarchy in which the conditions for the individuals involved are marked by unacceptably high levels of social threat. This unacceptable chaos becomes the motive for sacrificing some freedom in order to improve levels of security and in this process, the government and the states were born. Thus, to John Locke, the chief end of man’s placing themselves under a government is the preservation of their property meaning their lives, liberties and estates which in the state of nature was very unsafe and insecure. Similarly, for Thomas Hobbes, people found states in order to defend themselves from the invasion of foreigners and the


injuries of one another and thereby to secure themselves. In this way, the state becomes the means by which people seek to achieve adequate levels of security against social threats. This illustrates the notion of insecurity and how the state plays a vital role in defending and providing for people’s security.

In international relations, security has been conceived as external threats to a state. This has been established on account of a particular trajectory of historical development tracing back to the peace of Westphalia. Emergence of the modern states system (1648) and development of the European system of states (1945) and its relations with the domestic political processes of national consolidation within the major European states have led to the legitimisation of both the system and the individual participants. These two trends of interaction among sovereign states and greater identification of individuals with their respective states had reinforced each other thereby, firmly established the foundations of international relations. Thus security develops synonymous with the protection from external threats of a state’s vital interests and core values. This tradition in international relations, which depicts states as sole actors responding to external threats or posing such threats to other states, eventually became strong in the field of security studies.

Later on, developments since 1945 have further strengthened the traditional Western notions concerning security which was clearly sparked by the Cold War years where, the concept of alliance security was superimposed on the concept of state security.
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Furthermore, by making the security of NATO, the Warsaw Pact, and the major developed states of Europe and North America the central focus of the security of the international system overall, the dominant strand in Western strategic thinking increasingly eliminated the distinction between the realist (state-centric) and idealist (system-centric) approaches to the study of International security. The conceived meaning of security came into being in different historical periods.

1. Meaning of Security

The word ‘Security’ is derived from the Latin word ‘Securitas’. It is understood as, free from danger, anxiety and fear. The traditional concept of security is almost exclusively around the state and its survival as a political community. Indeed, the ultimate goal of state behaviour and its core value assumed to be the securing of the state itself against anything that may threaten its existence or integrity. Security is therefore linked to military defence of the state and its sovereignty against external threats. For this reason, a significant part of security studies has been concerned with strategic studies or the studies of war.

The concept of security has been dominated largely by the idea of national security. Based on this definition, many policyframers and analysts tend to take a one-dimensional approach to security i.e., state and military security. This was based on two assumptions. Firstly, that most threats to a state’s security arise from outside its borders. Secondly, that these threats are primarily, if not exclusively, military in nature and

---

5 Ibid.
generally require a military response if the security of the target state is to be preserved. The assumptions were summed up in Walter Lippmann’s celebrated statement that “a nation is secure to the extent to which it is not in danger of having to sacrifice core values, if it wishes to avoid war, and is able, if challenged, to maintain them by victory in such a war.”

Lippmann’s definition, according to Arnold Wolfers implies that security rises and falls with the ability of a nation to deter an attack, or to defeat it. This is in accordance with the common usage of the term. Thus, the concept of security was confined to the state, its sovereignty, integrity and boundary.

Security seems to be, as agreed by most authors as ‘something good’ but there is much less agreement on what clear meaning to attach to security. In order to gain a better understanding about the meaning of security, it is pertinent to explore the referent object and subject by raising two questions - security for whom and security for what? One can place the individual and state or national as two levels of analysing security, then one can point out that an individual is insecure to the degree that he or she is subjected to, or endangered by death or physical attack or similar victimisation; but also insecure to the extent that they risk deprivation of basic human needs by unemployment, accident, sickness or other predicaments. On the other hand, national security as a term lacks any simple and straight forward connection to individual security.

In analysing the nature of state and national security, Barry Buzan had employed a model representing three components of the state: the idea of the state, institutional
expression of the state and the physical base of the state. Quite often, these three components are interlinked with each other in myriad ways. These three components are also easily distinguishable from each other which can be best described as an object of security. Unlike individual’s description, state shows its characteristics which is necessary attributes of statehood such as physical base of territory and population; the governing institutions which control the physical base; and the idea of the state which establishes its authority in the minds of its people. The other features which make states a distinctive group of entities are an agriculture commune, a factory, a family household, and numerous other social units along with its size and sovereignty.11

These three elements of the model are important in identifying the vulnerability to threats which makes them objects of national security. While it was found that states are exceptionally different as objects of security, each of the components offers large number of choices and, when combined, these result in unlimited array of combinations around which a state might be structured. As a result of this diversity, the nature of security problem essentially differs from state to state. All states to some degree are vulnerable to military and economic threats, and many also suffer from basic political insecurity. The diverse components of the state appears susceptible to different kinds of threats, which makes national security a dilemma in many dimensions rather than just a matter of military defence. The multifaceted character of the state opens it to threats on many levels, particular vulnerabilities depending on the unique structure and circumstances of the state concerned. Thus, the notion of security could be mapped in a common sense, but it could only be given specific matter in relation to certain cases.12
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According to Buzan, “while we can identify individuals with ease and fairly certain about the meaning of threats and injuries to them, the same exercise cannot as easily be applied to collective units like nations and state.” Under this framework, the nation is seen above the total number of its citizens, recognised as survival of its own, and seen endangered in this respect. This leads to the object of security as the values that constitute national security, in the logic that threats to these principles constitute threats to national security (the idea, physical base and its institutional expression). Traditionally, a nation has had very strong military and territory connotations. On the ‘rational’ level, the argument is straightforward, since the worst threat to a nation is occupation and subjugation by another through war, military means will have to be engaged in these circumstances and while control over one’s own territory prevents occupation, national security should be exceedingly concerned with military and territorial dimension.

As a result of the above debate, the ‘state’ develops into the object of security as viewed by the realists but for others it is problematic to view security exclusively in terms of the state and its security. The critical theorists and the advocates of human security wish to accentuate on the ‘individual’ as the referent object of security.

2. Traditional Understanding of Security

There was a time when security was viewed explicitly as external threats where most of the threats were military in nature and in order to protect or defend the state it had to be dealt by the military. This notion of ‘security’ is the traditional perception of security. Before we proceed further, it is pertinent to raise some queries regarding the traditional
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understanding. First, why has security been constructed in this framework? Second, how it has effectively dominated security studies over a long period of time? And third, why were there no other contending conceptions to challenge it?

While dealing with these queries, one cannot ignore the importance of analysing the traditional notion of security and its threat perception. As in the past, the most threatening issues were external military threats to the state. In order to understand this notion, one has to take into account the two World Wars and the Cold War period where most nations faced an external threat of war and a majority of the world had participated in these wars. Under such circumstances, the traditional notion of security was framed in a way where the threat perception was dominantly from wars. This period was also considered as the supremacy of the traditional notion of security, not because it favours the military or glorified war but in the sense that there was no other contending theory to challenge this notion. Secondly, war was also unpredictable due to the very nature of human beings as stated by Hobbes and Machiavelli.

Explaining war and human nature, Kenneth Waltz observed that in wars, there is no victory but only varying degrees of defeat is a proposition that has gained growing acceptance in the twentieth century. He makes the analogy that wars can be similar to an earthquake which being a natural occurrence its control or elimination is beyond the control of man.15 Disease and pestilence, bigotry and rape, theft and murder, pillage and war, appear as constants in world history. Observing the nature of man, he observed, miseries are ineluctably the product of our natures. Therefore, he concluded that the root
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of all evil is man, and thus man is himself the root of the specific evil which is war. J. David Singer and Daniel S. Geller also pointed out that war is a rare event in world politics, but it is always with us. They further argued that the paradox is that most societies are in continuous preparation for a very rare event but if the event occurs, the stakes can be enormous. Not only does war usually bring extraordinary destruction to combatants and civilians, but all too often the loser may find their land occupied or annexed, and their wealth confiscated by the victors. They also put forward a conventional saying that “if you want peace, prepare for war.”

The fear of war and threat emanating from militaries has always been there in human history. In the history of states, each state has been made insecure by the existence of others, and the actions of each in search of its own national security have frequently joint with others to make war. With the improvement of military technology, the fear of war is most prominent and arguably, the most likely threat for human survival. Thus war associated with military threats occupies the traditional core of understanding national security. Military threats normally threaten all the components of the state. It subjects the physical base to strain, damage and dismemberment. It can destroy institutions, undermine, suppress or demolish the idea of the state. Military actions not only threaten damage within the layers of social and individual interest but also strike at the very essence of the state’s basic protective functions. As the state is more a social entity, an idea, than it is a physical being, the use of force threatens to overthrow a self-created rule by consent, and replace it with an imposed rule by coercion. Military action

16 Ibid., p. 3.
can wreck the work of centuries in the political, economic and social sectors, and as such motivates not only a dominant concern to defend achievements in these sectors, but also a sense of outrage at unfair play.\(^{19}\) Since the use of force can wreck major undesired changes rapidly, military threats have been normally accorded the highest priority in national security concerns.

It is often complex to explain why there is war and different threat perceptions faced by the state in the international system. Many analysts have put different arguments to explain the threat perception among states which is a major contributing factor for war. One popular exposition is the existence of anarchy and security dilemma in international relations.\(^{20}\) Therefore, understanding the problem of anarchy that leads to the security dilemma of states in the international system becomes rather significant.

There has been a historical understanding of the operation of the concept of “anarchy” in the international system which can be traced back to the works of Thucydides, Carl von Clausewitz and Hobbes. Edward A. Kolodziej has expressed that the three theorists greatly contributed to the development of the field of security studies. He examined the three great theorists who devoted much of their time to explain and understand security. But studying the philosophy of these theorists won’t tell us what we wish to know, but it will help us to learn how to think about security and relatively a bit about what to think about security and why? These thinkers were able to go well beyond their eras. They were able to standardise the behaviour of all actors - humans and their

\(^{19}\) Ibid., p. 75.
\(^{20}\) The idea of “security dilemma” was introduced by John Hertz in the early 1950s which explains that a structural notion in which the self-help attempts of state to look after their security needs tend automatically (i.e. regardless of intention) to lead to rising insecurity for others as each interprets its own measures as defensive and the measures of others as potentially threatening. Ibid., p. 3.
agents - with respect to security without reference to time, space, or social circumstances. He stated that Thucydides, Clausewitz and Hobbes still speak to us across time and space and historical circumstances. They understood that what was “real” or true about humans and their societies was the embedded presence of force as the ultimate instrument. These writers assumed that conflicts would erupt into violence when non-violent means get exhausted to resolve differences.\footnote{Edward A. Kolodziej, *Security and International Relation* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 48-75.} These historical accounts greatly influenced the traditional notion of security.

In the international system, existence of the problem of anarchy not only allows war to happen, but also makes it difficult for states that are contented with the status quo to arrive at goals that they recognise as being in their common interest. According to Robert Jervis, since there is no institutions that can create and enforce international laws, the policies of cooperation will bring mutual rewards if others co-operate or might bring disaster if they do not. Since, states are aware of this, anarchy encourages behaviour that leaves all concerned worse off than they could, even in the extreme case in which all states would like to freeze the status quo.\footnote{Robert Jervis, “Cooperation under the Security Dilemma,” *World Politics*, vol. 30, no. 2, January 1978, p. 167.} Therefore, cooperation among the states becomes difficult under such security dilemma.

In similar vein, John J. Mearsheimer argues that great powers are constantly seek for opportunities to increase power over their rivals with domination as their final objective. Thus anarchy in the international system ultimately leads to great powers struggle for power. This perception does not permit for status quo powers, except for the unusual state that achieves predominance. Instead, the system is occupied with great
powers that have revisionist intentions at their centre. In explaining why states pursue power and the logic behind why great powers seek to maximise their share of world power, Mearsheimer says that it is the system in particular, that promotes states to search for opportunities to exploit their power in relation to other states.\textsuperscript{23}

In addition, great powers fear each other and regard each other with suspicion, and worry that war might happen. They anticipate danger as there is little room for trust among states. Though the level of fear varies across time and space, but it cannot be reduced to an insignificant level. From the perspective of any one great power, all other great powers are potential enemies. To support his argument, Mearsheimer illustrates with the example of the response of United Kingdom and France to German reunification at the demise of the Cold War. Despite the fact that these three states had been close allies for almost forty-five years, both the UK and France instantly began to worry about the possible dangers of a united Germany. The basis of this fear was that in a world where great powers have the capability to attack each other and might have the motive to do so, any state bent on survival must be at least suspicious of other states and reluctant to trust them. In addition, the problem of “911” the absence of a central authority to which a threatened state can turn for help and states have even greater incentive to fear each other. Furthermore, there were no mechanisms, other than the possible self-interest of third parties, for punishing an aggressor. At times, it is difficult to prevent potential aggressors, states have ample reason not to trust other states and to be prepared for war with them.\textsuperscript{24} Therefore, it is the structure of the international system, not in particular

\textsuperscript{24} Ibid., p. 32.
characteristics of individual great powers that cause them to think and act offensively and to seek hegemony. In contrast to Hans J. Morghanthau’s argument of states invariably behave aggressively because they have a will to power, Mearsheimer rather assumes that the principal motive behind great-power behaviour is survival. However, in anarchy, the desire to survive encourages states to behave aggressively.25

This notion of traditional security with its focus on national security raised severe criticism from various angles and some even went to the extent of criticising it for being excessively narrow, hollow, and a militarised interpretation.26 Wolfer’s article “National Security as an Ambiguous Symbol” was one amongst them. He incisively points out that statesmen, publicists and scholars who wish to be considered realists, are inclined to insist that the foreign policy they advocate is dictated by the national interest, and more specifically by the national security interest. He further went on to say that when political formulas such as “national interest” or “national security” gain popularity, they need to be securitised with particular care. They may not mean the same thing to different people and may not have any precise meaning at all.27

Hanson W. Baldwin makes a critical observation that there is a basic paradox in coupling the word ‘defence’ with modern military means and methods. The atomic bomb, the long-range plane, the giant missile have demolished so many “security” concepts that defence, measured by any military yardstick, has chiefly been a reflex retaliation. He went on to say that in search for defence, man has broken the boundaries of space and solved many of the mysteries of nature. But ironically, they have made themselves less

25 Ibid., pp. 53-4.
secure than before. Michael Sheehan has also argued that during the long domination of academic international relations by realism, the working definition of security was a firmly limited, which saw its nature as being concerned with military power, and the subject of these concerns as being the state, so that the concept was consistently referred to as ‘national security.’ It is therefore strikingly important that the term security received so little serious scrutiny in the post-World War II period. In the immediate aftermath of World War II, the expression ‘national security’ was perceived on the area of public policy with the preservation of state independence and autonomy.

In the absence of any agreement on a definition of security, it is a highly contested concept. Such a concept involves fierce disputes about the proper application on the part of its users. A classic attempt to define the term provides some insight into its controversial nature. For Buzan, the concept of security is rarely addressed in terms other than the policy interests of particular actors or groups. The debate also has a heavy military emphasis and endless disputes range about the particularities of security policy both within and between states. The debates were generally set within limited temporal and conceptual frameworks and general notions like ‘dominance’ and ‘stability’ mark the limits of attempts to give stable meaning to the idea of security. Thus, there exists a problem when security is seen primarily in national terms by both policy-makers and strategist. James T. Shotwell on the other hand envisages that international peace rests upon national security and there can be no sound progress towards international peace so
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long as nations live under fear of aggression from their neighbours. Under those conditions there is only one thing which responsible statesmen can do and that is prepared for defence. But he also cautioned that it is just this legitimacy of defence which has created the chief problem in the field of security.33

From the above arguments, one can without any doubt derive that security in the past was concerned primarily with the state, military and its external threats. The kind of uncertainty and the account of the two horrible World Wars greatly influenced the traditionalists, where they perceived security in terms of external military threat to a state as it was inevitable because of uncertainty of human nature to pursue peace and wars. Thus, the traditional perception of security has dominated the field of security studies for a long period of time in international relations, especially the West, until lately with the emergence of new threats and new approaches. The traditional understanding of security is changing with the emergence of different schools of thought on security.

3. Approaches to the Study of Security

Much has changed in the study of security in the post-Cold War period. Alternative ways of seeing and understanding the world had emerged in the 1980s and influences the approaches to security. The traditional realist conceptualisation has come under sustained attack where it was increasingly seen as unsatisfactory in its own terms and was ignoring important aspects of an emerging international policy agenda.

Interestingly in security studies, different schools of thought had presented multiple interpretations of how they think and understand the concept of security. For

instance, liberalism traditionally included peace research approaches and has for long provided an important critique of the traditional realist security paradigm. A further useful critique has been developed within the constructivist branch of international relations, while more dissident views are provided by the feminists, post-modernists and critical theory. In this regard, Steve Smith states that:

Strategic studies began to look like one story about the world, not the only, let alone the true story. Twenty years on, the changes in the field are enormous. Of course, many may still study the military aspects of security (and they must remain a central part of the field), but the entire area is far more ‘essentially contested’. At the level of the actors involved, the most fundamental points is that the Janus-faced nature of the state has become much more accepted, as both a source of insecurity for populations.34

Smith contends that while military concerns are still central to debates about security, there are numbers of other features of human activity that are now considered as security issues. Moreover, the notion of security has been expanded and deepened. However for Smith, the major change has been that the security discourse is no longer solely a debate about a world ‘out there,’ a world that are presented with and which is essentially unchanging over the centuries. Instead, the debate about what counts as a security issue, and security, itself becomes a central point for contention between diverse power/knowledge interests.35

Consequently, over a period of time, security has become a much more flexible concept accommodating diverse views rather than confining itself to a limited area. Significant changes have occurred in the international system. What was assumed and

written about in the past appears to be contested and difficult to apply in analysing new issues and challenges today. The traditional understanding of security was a realist understanding, but the liberals, feminists, constructivists, post-modernists and critical theory have evolved their own interpretation and understanding of security. All of them have a contribution to the evolution of security studies. It is these various approaches that have contributed to the changing conception of security.

The realist approach is the most dominant approach to the study of security. It has influenced greatly the policy-makers and scholars and has had a great impact on security studies. It identifies the state as the key rational actor in the international system. It also maintains that universal moral principles cannot be applied to the action of states where politics is governed by objective laws and in order to improve the society, it is first necessary to understand the laws by which society lives.36

The realists are also sceptical that permanent international peace is possible because human nature is deemed to be driven by a lust for power. War and violent conflict were seen as perennial features of an anarchic international system. Moreover, in the absence of any higher authority, sovereign states have no alternative but to assume responsibility for their security. During the Cold War period, security thinking centred on the idea of national security, which was largely defined in military terms. However, realists insists that militarisation of the state system is not necessarily a recipe for unending war. Instead, the pursuit of national security compels states to form alliances which, when weighed against one another in a balance of power configuration may ensure prolonged periods of international stability. Thus, according to the realists, the

creation of a bi-polar world order based on a balance of comparable US bloc and Soviet power let to an affective system of deterrence and helped to maintain general peace during the Cold War.\(^{37}\)

Realism draws its intellectual inspiration chiefly from the great theorists whose influences in the understanding about security, whether the anarchy of the state of nature and security dilemma as Hobbes, Clausewitz and Thucydides hold.\(^{38}\) First, it assumes that the state has evolved over several centuries to become the principle unit of political organisation of the world’s populations. It has triumphed over all other forms of political organisation like city-states, feudal principalities and empires. Second, closely related to Hobbesian thinking, the state enjoys a monopoly of legitimate violence. The world’s peoples, however split they may be according to nationality, ethnic origin, language, religion and culture, have chosen the state or have had the state forced on them to resolve their difference. They also rely on the state to defend their interests against the devastations of the other states and international actors. Third, there has arisen a body of international law over a century that recognises the legal and moral authority of the state to perform its internal and external security functions.

In discussing the realist approach to security it is necessary to understand the distinction between classical realism and neorealism (also known as “structural” realism). One fundamental difference lies in the determining factors of the security dilemma. Classical realist such as Morgenthau saw this as originating in a flawed human nature, which was power-seeking and prone to violence. For Morgenthau there were biological and psychological compulsions, to live, to propagate and to dominate that are common to
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all men. The problem of this assumption is that, if human nature is a constant, then how does one explain variations in international political behaviour. The same unchanging human nature is presumably responsible not only for the international reality marked by competition, arms race, and war, but also for those areas of the world and the periods of history characterised by cooperation and peace. The classical realist view as an explanation of human political behaviour is probably flawed, leading a later generation of realists to seek an alternative grounding for their explanation.\textsuperscript{39}

Dissatisfaction with the flaws in the “human nature” explanation, structural realist, beginning with Kenneth Waltz in 1979, argued that the explanation for the security dilemma lay instead with the structure of the international system and the patterns of behaviour it compelled states to fall into. This explained the striking similarities in defence and foreign policy behaviour displayed by states with very different political systems and ideologies, such as the United States and the Soviet Union during Cold War. Waltz, in surveying the long history of international relations, felt that it was characterised by recurring patterns and repetitive events. He explained this in terms of the systemic constraints operating on all states. These constraints were seen as being so powerful that they overrode the intentions of individual state actors. Structural realists believe that states and statesmen are virtually powerless to alter the system in which they find themselves.\textsuperscript{40}

The Second point of difference between the realist and neorealist is the balance of power explanation as it is seen quite differently in the two approaches. In the classical account, balance occur because of the consciously directed policies of the governments of

\textsuperscript{39} Sheehan, Op.cit, p. 17.
\textsuperscript{40} Ibid.
the states that make up the system, which do not wish the system to be dominated by a single state or alliance that would be in a position to dictate to them. For Waltz, however, it is an error to suppose that if a balance of power is to come into existence, the states must act so as to create one. In the neo-realist conception, balance of power from despite the efforts of the component states, which are in fact seeking to maximise their power and can even achieve hegemony over the system, but their simultaneous efforts to do so effectively cancel each other out. In neo-realist logic, if a state is to succeed, it has little choice but to make the acquisition of power its central, immediate aim.41

For a long period, the concept of security was shaped and influenced by realist thinking and there were no competing theories that could challenge its intellectual position in security studies. It is true that the impact of the Second World War and the Cold War helped to consolidate its intellectual framework in world politics. However, increasingly over a period of time the realist approach came under challenge from the liberals.

The liberals were the first to challenge the realist approach and its variant neorealism. Neorealism is a belief that the international institutions do not have a very important part to play in the prevention of war and the institutions are seen as the product of state interests and the constraints which are imposed by the international system itself where, it is the interest and constraints which shape the decisions on whether to cooperate or compete than the institutions to which they belong. As against the neorealist approach, some liberals strongly argued that institutions played and continued to play a crucial role in enhancing security. They went on to say that the developing pattern of institutionalised

41 Ibid., p. 29.
cooperation between states opens up unprecedented opportunities to achieve greater international security in the years ahead.\textsuperscript{42}

Liberalism is a tradition of political thought composed of a set of practical goals and ideals. The liberal approach upholds different methods in dealing and understanding international issues. It has championed limited government and scientific rationality, believing individuals should be free from arbitrary state power, persecution and superstition. It advocates political freedom, democracy and constitutionally guaranteed rights, and privileges the liberty of the individual, competition in civil society and claims that market capitalism best promotes the welfare of all by most efficiently allocating scare resources within society. To the extent that its ideas have been realized in recent democratic transitions and manifested in the globalisation of the world economy, liberalism has emerged as a powerful and influential doctrine.\textsuperscript{43} Liberals also hold that the growing corpus on international law would contribute to peace settlement of disputes. It argues that the Western civilisation had suffered enough from war and that their leaders and citizens have learned how costly it was to wage war.\textsuperscript{44}

For the liberals, the state needs to play a minimal role in a liberal society, predominantly acting as arbiter in disputes between individuals and ensuring the maintenance of conditions under which individuals could enjoy their rights to the fullest.

There are significant disparities amongst liberal theorist, but all concur on the primacy of
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the individual in political life and on the role of the state as being limited to maintaining a stable social, political and economic background within which individuals can interact and pursue their chosen ends. Liberals considers the minimal state indispensable since there is an underlying harmony of interest among individuals. Just as the competition of the market place would produce the best goods, so too would the market place of ideas produce sound political sense. The liberals emphasised the positive role played by public policy including foreign policy. Consequently, the state is not unitary, lone actor pursuing its own course independently of the public. Conversely, it is composed of numerous persons representing mass interests. Nor, were decisions the sole prerogative of those individuals acting in the name of the state. Decisions were supposed to be informed by public opinion and political consensus arising out of the clash of ideas and interests. This view of domestic politics was carried over into the international realm. Liberals, however like the realists, recognise that war was a defining feature of international politics. They agreed with the realists that the state of anarchy that characterises the world (as opposed to domestic) politics contributes to lack of trust among states, posing an obstacle to cooperation and peace. As it was understood that there could be a harmony of interest among individuals within a given state, thus for liberals, establishing such kind of harmony among states was possible.\textsuperscript{45}

The liberals made an important assertion that the development of the international economy made it more costly for states to go to war. Through the spread of democratic political systems, the issues of war and peace are no longer restricted to a small group of political and military leaders as in the past. Thus, the liberals were the first to put the traditional realist approach to security on the defensive.

\textsuperscript{45} Ibid., p. 194.
A critique of the traditional concept of security also came from feminism. Within feminist international relations, there is much consideration surrounding the importance of women presence in international security. Feminist scholarship on security employs a different ontology and understanding from traditional security studies. Feminists were reluctant to be connected with either side of the realist/idealist debate and generally sceptical of rationalist, scientific claims to universality and objectivity. Most feminist scholarship on security is compatible with the critical side of the third debate. Questioning the role of the state as security provider, many feminists have adopted a multi-dimensional, multi-level approach. Feminist’s commitment to the emancipator goal of ending women’s subordination is consistent with the broad social structures, as its starting point. Feminists seek to understand how the security of individuals and groups is compromised at all levels by violence through physical and structural.

Feminist approach to security views security as conceived by mainstream international relations theorists as biased, as it places much faith in the traditional understanding of security. Security, as traditionally defined, amounts to a situation of stability provided by militaristic states whose nuclear proliferation, paradoxically, is seen to prevent total war if not the many limited wars fought on proxy territory. Security is therefore, examined only in the context of the presence and absence of war, since the threat of war is considered endemic to the sovereign state-system. Feminists suggest security must be redefined, especially national security as it is deeply endangering human survival and sustainable communities. State military apparatuses create their own security
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dilemma by asserting a game in order to achieve the absolute and relative gains of state security.48

Following on the wave of the world-wide feminist uprising, some feminists strongly advocate that the personal which is political is also quite like, international. They exposed how international politics often involves intimate relationship, personal identities and private lives. The informal politics are in general less transparent than the domain of official politics and they are normally ignored by international relations scholars. Taking the view from below, feminists have sought to show that gender relations are integral to international relations. For instance, diplomatic wives smooth over the workings of power among states and statesmen. Global symbols such as multi-national corporations conquer foreign cultures and prepare them for the onslaught of Western capitalism. They suggest how women are and have always been part of international relations if choose to see them there. Besides, it is in part because women’s lives and experiences have not been empirically researched in the context of global politics.49

It is argued that women’s understanding of security and violent conflict is different from men. Therefore, cutting across cultures, class and caste, women’s conception of security and power is different. Women are more pacific than men in their approach to inter-state and domestic conflict and are more accepting for compromise to resolve disputes and are less likely than men to engage in armed forces.50 It is also viewed that the relationship between masculinity and war has been central to feminist
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investigation. For instance, Cynthia Cockburn on analysing the aggression/force/violence which occurs in military preparation and war argues that “masculinity shape war and war shapes masculinity.”

Feminist scholars also challenge the exclusive and marginalisation of women’s experiences and perspectives on security. Challenging the centrality of men’s experiences and theories and paying attention to women’s experience, it argued that they shed light not only on the gendered aspects of social and political life but provide acute insights into other forms of structural inequalities at the heart of the conflict the idea being that women’s experience represents an alternative reading of history, the possibility of non-violent ways of negotiating conflict and agency in reconciliation and peace. It is often argued that women make up a disproportionate share of the economically disadvantaged and therefore they might view huge military expenditures and drain on resources available for domestic social programmes, particularly essential to women.

Indeed, feminist international relations illustrates how women are ignored yet centrally occupied in international relations, while work on gender points out the kinds of gendered identities for both men and women constituted by the processes of world politics. It is argued that while security has always been considered a masculine issue, women have rarely been recognised by security literature however, women have been writing about security to a certain extent since, the inception of the century. Some have observed that there is an overlap between feminist and other critics of traditional security

54 Ibid., p. 1956.
studies but they also acknowledge that what feminists add is a concern with what is lost from our understanding of security when gender is overlooked. For them, gender alters our thinking about security not by adding new issues and different perspective, but more by forcing us to reconceptualise security.55

For feminist, the key concept of security and sovereignty and units of analysis like state and international system are indistinguishable from the patriarchal divisions of the public/private. The provisions of national security continue to be an almost exclusively male domain. Some liberal feminists have reacted to this by advocating the enlistment of far more women in military, and allowing them to serve in all the roles. Feminists also argue that the military is an integral part of the institutions of the state and therefore violence should not be seen as an unusual and limited act, but as an inevitable reflection of the way in which society is organised and the masculinist intuitions that underpin it. Feminism’s approach to the state and to patriarchy brings into question the view that the state is the mainstay of security and that security for the individual is adequately understood in terms of membership of a particular community. The conception of security promoted by feminist is constructed in terms of a commitment to social justice, which is seen as essential for the development of enduring peace.56

Furthermore, by concentrating on the gender variable in international theory, feminism shows the inadequacies of the realist security agenda in its failure to recognize the systematic social relations of dominations that have made women vulnerable to security threats domestically and internationally. Feminists have taken the security of people, not state, as their point of departure, as well as a broader formulation of security that

incorporates non-military dimensions. Thus, the feminist approach in this way has promoted an alternate understanding about security.

Constructivism also challenged the traditional notion of security by contending that it primarily focused on power and politics. Constructivists’ hold that state behaviour cannot be understood without analysing issues of identity and the social relations in which identities and behaviours are embedded. Constructivism rejects the notion that there is a body of objective knowledge about the world that exists independently of subjective understanding. Some argue that while agreeing that there are certain empirical facts about the world, the interpretation of these facts the way in which they are invested with meaning is scarcely an objective exercise. The reality of the world, which includes the world of international relations, has been socially constructed via a complex of inter-subjective understandings. This means that the condition of anarchy as argued by Alexander Wendt is quite simply what states make it. This also means that the security dilemma, for example, does not exist before any interaction between states but is in fact a product of social interactions of states.

Constructivists are seriously concerned with the impact of norms on international security. Norms as such are inter-subjective beliefs about the social and natural world that defines actors, their situations, and the possibility of action rooted in and reproduced through social practice. The practice of diplomacy enacts and thereby reproduces accepted international beliefs about state capacity. Norms constitute actors

and meaningful action by situating both in social roles (e.g., modern state, military organization) and social environment (e.g., the modern world system). Besides, norms regulate action by defining what is appropriate (given social rules) and what is effective (given the laws of science). This concern with norms leads constructivists to view actors and structure much differently than the rationalist approaches to international relations according to Theo Farrell. As he says, realism and neo-liberalism depict a world occupied by undifferentiated rational actor (self-interested states), whose relations are structured by the balance of material power. In contrast, constructivism locates actors in social structures that both constitutes those actors and is constituted by their interaction. Constructivists held that ideas are not only rules or road maps for action, but rather ideas function ‘all the way down’ to actually shape actors and action in international politics. Particularly, when ideas become norms, they not only constrain actors, but also constitute actors and enable action. For instance, international law not only defines legitimate state practice, it also legitimates states and allows them to behave in ways that have meaning for other international actors. Thus, the relation between identity and interest is particularly important.

Ted Hopf, for instance, points out that in telling you who you are, identities strongly imply a particular set of interests or preferences with respect to choices of action in particular domains, and with respect to particular actors. This realisation leads constructivists to problematise that which realists and neoliberals take for granted, like identities and interests. As Paul Kowert also notes that rationalist theories explain how
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state should choose or how they should bargain. They offer answers to some important questions about when states should cooperate and when they might be expected to fight. Yet they say nothing about who the actors are or how their interests were constituted. In essence, the constructivist critique of neorealist and neoliberals concerns not what these scholars do and say but what they ignore is the content and source of state interests and social fabric of world politics. Thus, constructivism has a view of the role of norms, of actors and structures as mutually constituted, and of the relationship between identities and interests.  

The constructivists also brought the assumptions of social constructivism into security studies. Their idea of ‘security communities’ suggests that shared understanding, norms and values could be developed among the states. A basic premise of contemporary constructivist theory holds global politics as an important social character, in contrast with the firmly asocial world depicted by neo-realist scholars. This bring into prominence, the need to consider the importance of state identities and the source of state interests suggesting that the purposes for which power is deployed and is regarded as socially legitimate may be changing and positing that the cultural similarities among states may be shaped by institutional agents. Thus, constructivists believe that it is an approach, which recognises the importance of knowledge for transforming international structures and security politics, is best suited to taking seriously how international
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62 A Security Community is a region in which large-scale use of violence (such as war) has become very unlikely or even unthinkable. The term was coined by the prominent political scientist Karl W. Deutsch in 1957. In their seminal work Political Community and the North Atlantic Area: International Organisation in the Light of Historical Experience, Deutsch and his collaborators defined a security community as “a group of people” believing “that they have come to agreement on at least this one point: that common social problems must and can be resolved by process of peaceful change.” See Croft and Terry, Op.cit., p. 86.
community can shape security politics and create the conditions for stable peace. Security, therefore, is something that can be constructed where insecurity is not simply the ‘given’ condition of the international system.

Further challenge to the realists has emanated from the post-modernists who criticised the traditional approaches to security and made some valuable reflections about the nature of security and international relations. Post-modernists dispute the epistemological, methodological and ontological assumption of traditional security studies in the most basic way. Post-modernism does not seek to explain international relations by focusing on the state, nor does it take the state as given or primary. The central theme of the post-modernist approach is that there is no such thing as truth, there are only ‘regimes of truth’. What this means is that statements about the social world are only “true” within a specific discourse. Society decides what is acceptable to believe and what is unacceptable, the latter of which is to be suppressed or merely ridiculed. Therefore, post-modernism is concerned with how some discourses and therefore some truths dominate others. This is where power comes in. Power and knowledge depend on one another.

The work of Bradley Klein looks at strategic studies as a discourse closely associated to the processes of state-formation and protection. Klein demonstrates how the literature of strategic studies, far from being neutral evaluations of the inevitable condition of international anarchy, is instead a specific political move aimed at the defence of the state. At the same time, he asserts that what else is a strategic study about but the political-military defence of the state. Strategic violence is less a function of the
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state than an instance of its own assertion and ongoing process of defining state boundaries, excluding that which differs from its domain, and punishing those who would challenge it. In other words, strategic studies empower the displacement of difference. This has informed the post-modern writers as they persuade a sceptical position whenever certain key organising principles are invoked. These principles, such as ‘the state-system,’ ‘the West,’ are for Klein, cultural constructs ‘made intelligible to social agents through the medium of language.’

Instead of presuming their existence and meaning, it should be historicise and qualified them as set of practices with distinct genealogical trajectories. In short, the issue is not whether they are factual or fake but how they have acquired their meaning. For Klein, the strategic studies itself is part of the process of defending the state and the question of how does states competent of organising violence emerge in the first place should be posed. Strategic studies rely uncritically on what generally needs explanation.

While observing the practice of US foreign policy construction, some post-modernist held that how the domains of self/other, inside/outside and domestic—foreign shapes the identity of the US in writing a threat. The anarchy problematic is an interesting contribution from Richard Ashley for what he believes is the defining moment of most inquires in international relations. The anarchy problematic asserts that nations dwell in perpetual anarchy, for no central authority imposes limit on the pursuit of sovereign interest, or that the “essential structural quality of the (international) system is
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anarchy the absence of a central monopoly of legitimate force.”  

Most importantly, the anarchy problematic deduces from the absence of central, global authority, not just an empty concept of anarchy, but a description of international relations as power politics, characterised by self interest, raison d’être (reason of the state), the routine resort to force, territoriality, so on.  

In theorising the state of violence, post-modernists had to argue that state’s sovereignty and violence are standard and long-standing themes which draw on established tradition of international relations thinking. They are also central themes in post-modern approaches to the study of international relations. Rather than adopt them uncritically from traditional approaches, post-modernism revises them in view of insights gained from ‘genealogy and deconstruction’. For instance, sovereignty as opposed to anarchy where deconstruction attempts to show that such oppositions are indefensible, as each term always depends on such oppositions are indefensible, as each term always depends on the other.  

Post-modernism as a theory of international relation of resistance

---


70 Genealogy is a style of historical thought which exposed the significance of power-knowledge relations. It focuses on constructed origins and given meaning to particular representations of the past that continuously guide our daily lives and set clear limits to political and social opinions. It is a form of history which historicises those things which are thought to be beyond history, including those thoughts which have been buried, covered, or excluded from while writing and making history. While, deconstruction implies an analysis of those questions which are already apparent in deconstruction of a text in terms of presupposition, ideological underpinnings, hierarchical values, and frames of reference. It depends on the techniques of close reading without reference to ideological, culture, moral opinions or information derived from an authority over the text such as the author. Jacques Derrida once observed that the world follows the grammar of a text undergoing its own deconstruction. See Rosemary E. Shinko, “Postmodernism: A Genealogy of Humanitarian Intervention,” in Jennifer Sterling Folker (ed.), *Making Sense of International Relations Theory* (New York: Lynne Rienner Publishers Inc., 2007), p. 168.

has questioned some of the basic assumptions of the traditional notions of understanding security.

The most sustained and coherent critique of traditional security studies has come from ‘Critical Security Studies’ (CSS). It argues that the researcher should avoid seeing the world through the eyes of the state as implied by using the concept of national security as a key category. They also maintain that the state is often the problem as much as the solution and the aim of research is not on institution but have to be defined in relation to human beings. Thus, the best way to conceptualise security in a way that ties it in with people, instead of the state, is to define it in terms of emancipation.

Critical theory has influenced a number of intellectual disciplines. Critical theory has usually meant showing that the notion of understanding the world as it really is, is a philosophically incoherent, theoretically deficient, and politically pernicious idea. Simon Dalby argued that the term ‘security’ has traditionally been given a very specific meaning, and this is a meaning with very negative connotation, usually associated with threat to the state. “Security is a term limited in usefulness for denoting desirable political situations, because it is formulated as protection from some threat or danger rather than as promoting a desirable situation.” Dalby also goes beyond this to note that the connotations of ‘security’ in English, when they do have a degree of positive meaning are

extremely conservative. They imply the stability of the existing order, and the continuation of that stability into the foreseeable future. This is true of much of the security related vocabulary. This usually implies stable political arrangements and social change that might upset existing arrangements is then easily targeted as a threat to security.\textsuperscript{76}

Keith Krause and Michael Williams question the focus of traditional security studies on the state, and try to deconstruct prevailing claims about security.\textsuperscript{77} For Ken Booth and Richard Wynn Jones, there is not only an apparent dissatisfaction with the statist and scientism of the orthodoxy, but there is also a clear view of how to reconceptualise security studies focused on human emancipation. Only a process of emancipation can make the prospect of security more meaningful.\textsuperscript{78} Booth starts with the premise that security means absence of threat and links the two by defining emancipation as the freeing of people from those physical and human constraints which stops them from carrying out what they would freely choose to do. Booth argues that emancipation of people was a motif of the twentieth century decolonisation, freedom of women, youth, workers, homosexuals, consumers and thought. Booth’s concept of emancipation is not built on the assumption that threats need to be existential. This raises the problem that from the perspective of ‘securitisisation’ there are no specific criteria suggested for

\textsuperscript{76} Ibid., p. 98.
\textsuperscript{78} Statism regards states as conceived in unitary and only truly significant actors in world politics. Statism involves normative claim and lays the justification for referring to “statism” rather than “state-centrism” that in political terms, states should be accorded a high, if not the highest, value in themselves. The statism of traditional security studies is based on the foundations of a realist understanding of world politics. Ken Booth, “Security and Emancipation,” \textit{Review of International Studies}, vol. 17, no. 4, October 1991, p. 319. Also see Richard Wyn Jones, \textit{Security, Strategy, and Critical Theory} (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 1999), p. 95.
deciding that any particular issue is a security issue. War and the threat of war are two of the constraints, together with poverty, inadequate education, political repression, and so on.\footnote{Ibid., p. 319-21.}

Booth viewed security a discursive and contested concept where politics is limitless and is based on ethics. He emphasised for a pragmatic idea of survival added to the idea of the good life, to open up the prospects for ‘human emancipation’. The hegemonic claims of realist international relations theory are rejected in favour of an approach that seeks to address the broader security needs of humanity as a whole. Booth calls this security study of inclusion rather than exclusion, of possibility rather than necessity.\footnote{Ibid., p. 314.} For Booth the agenda of critical security is fourfold: critiquing traditional theory, exploring the meaning and possible implications of critical theories, investigating security issues from a critical perspective and rethinking security in specific regions of the world. Booth, for example, argues that what was required was not just a “broadening” of the concept of security to embrace new domains, but also a deeper understanding of the meaning of security, in which security is investigated in terms of the potential derived from imagining different forms of politics.\footnote{Sheehan, Op.cit., p. 151.} This is a rather different approach to security. Whereas in the traditional conservative approach, security is given a restricted meaning and its application limited to the survival of the state whereas in the critical security approach, security is being explicitly linked to ideas of human emancipation. Advocates of critical theory traditionally see it as having play a critical part in changing the world by providing the oppressed with “insight and intellectual tools they can use to
empower themselves.”

Thus, Booth accordingly concludes that the question is “why should certain issues - human rights, economic justice and so on - be kept off the security agenda? They are after all, crucial security questions for somebody, if not for those benefiting from statist power structure.” In essence, critical security presents an influential critique of the traditional and apparent alternative groundwork for thinking about security.

From the above multiple interpretations, one can derive that there are many ways of approaching security and many possible referents for it. The critique of the dominant concept came not only from one approach but multiple approaches. Except the realists, all the other approaches exposed the limitation and narrowness of the concept in the way in which it has been constructed and also applied. All these approaches illustrate the possibility of understanding security from different perspectives in different contexts. But it has also to be recognised each approach is distinct in its own terms but not an absolute which can describe wholly about security. Therefore, analysing security from a single approach and understanding might be inadequate. Thus for some, it is not possible to understand the complexities of security on a global scale using a single explanatory model as there is no “master key” to a definitive interpretation. Whilst the debate still continues, it is apparent that all these approaches helped in changing the conception of security, helped in deepening and broadening the concept of security.
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4. Towards a Broader Conception of Security

In the post-Cold War period there has been a great shift on the nature and understanding of security. There was a growing consensus that the traditional approaches to security is inadequate and that a broader approach is preferable to understanding of current issues and challenges. Furthermore, the nature and meaning of security has been enlarged and an attempt to broaden the meaning of security as well as to deepen the agenda of security studies has been greatly emphasised. Nature of the threats has been redefined as there is growing consensus over non-military threats. The scope of security now encompasses political, social, economic and environmental concerns. Those attempting to deepen the meaning of security seek to move the debate either down to the level of individual or human security or up to the level of international security, with regional and societal security as possible intermediate points. Generally, many have remained within a state-centric approach but have developed diverse terms like common, co-operative, collective, comprehensive as ‘modifiers’ to security to advocate different multilateral forms of inter-security co-operation that could ameliorate, if not transcend the security dilemma.

Scholars often argue that security is a socially constructed concept which has a specific meaning within a particular social context, therefore, the perceived meaning is subject to change in the way one thinks about the issues. This process of conceptual re-evaluation was clearly evident in the thinking about security in the early 1980s. Scholars like Lawrence Freedman for instance, argued that social, economic, and environmental issues deserved greater attention because they could aggravate violence
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and trigger cross-border conflicts. Moreover, there also developed a tendency of shifting ‘strategic’ to ‘security’ studies and ‘national’ to ‘international’ studies. Freedman also insists that the question of force should always be put in a wider context, so to make sense of the particular causes of conflict. This shift in security studies thus reflected the revival of the idealist tradition and notions of multilateral cooperation, thereby serving to delegitimise force as a primary instrument of statecraft.\textsuperscript{89} This new paradigm of security impressively explains the diversity and change, difference in various regions, transition from one dominant concept to another and system transformation but not limiting it to a single issue-area or level of analysis.\textsuperscript{90}

The end of the Cold War also coincided with the rise of new threats. During this period, the traditional approach to security came under severe criticism. Generally, many held an opinion that the demise of the Cold War brought to an end the superpower military confrontation where an acute military intimidation had constantly reduced the range of threat which ultimately paved the way for addressing other previously neglected issues. But analysts however differ with the general belief by arguing that the breakthrough contributions of sustained debate came in 1983, when renewed Cold War was at its height. The same year, also witnessed, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Pact deploying new generations of nuclear weapons in Europe. President Ronald Reagan announced the Strategic Defence Initiative and in the same year, the two important critiques of traditional security thinking were published.\textsuperscript{91}


\textsuperscript{91} Sheehan, Op.cit., p. 43.
As a result, a number of scholarly works developed in the field of security studies. Some prominent works which emphasised the broader concept of security for instance, Richard H. Ullman’s article “Redefining Security” (1983) and Barry Buzan’s book *People, State and Fear: The National Security Problem in International Relations* (1983). Their arguments anticipated the UN’s Brandt Commission, whose 1980 report *North-South: A Programme for Survival* calls for a new concept of security, transcending the narrow notion of military defence and looks more towards the logic of a broader autonomy. The contribution of Buzan and Ullman suggest that the concept of security should be opened up in two ways. First, the perception of security should not be confined to the military realm. Second, the referent object of security should not be conceptualized solely in terms of the state, but should embrace the individual below the state, and the international system above it. Also Buzan’s book in its second edition argued that the decline in military threats during the 1980s enabled other threats to be perceived and while, other kinds of threats are increasing significantly regardless of the decline of military concerns.  

The attempt to widen the debate on security was furthered in the works of Buzan and his collaborations most notably with Ole Weaver and the “Copenhagen School”. As Booth has argued, “Buzan’s 1983 book *People, State and Fear* remains the most comprehensive theoretical analysis of the concept (of security) in international relations literature to date, and since its publication the rest of us have been writing footnotes to it.”  

Bill McSweeney in a similar vein argued that for European security specialist,
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Buzan’s book has been so influential that it has become a “canon and indispensable reference point for students of security.”

The main shift made by Buzan was to broaden the security agenda with an attempt to engage five sectors rather than the conventional focus on military security. Buzan added political, societal, economic and environmental security sectors. These new sectors were essential because of changing policy environment faced by the states in the 1980s. Importantly, Buzan considered the individuals as the ‘irreducible base unit’ for discussion about security. But, for Buzan, individuals could not be the referent object for the analysis of international security but state has to be because the state had to deal with the other sub-state. The state act as a dominant actor in the international political system and also the chief agent for mitigation of insecurity since, international security is normally problematic. In this sense, Buzan sought to widen the definition of security to encompass five sectors, and to focus discussion around the three levels (the sub-state, the state, and international system). But in all of this, the state was the referent object, as it is the state that stands at the interface between security dynamics at the level of the international system.

However the substantial changes in the early 1990s in European security made difficult for Buzan to maintain ‘state’ as referent object for security. In a series of publications with Weaver, he developed the concept of ‘societal security’ as the most effective way of understanding the emerging security agenda in post-Cold War Europe.
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This shift was significant as state security focused on sovereignty as the core value, on the other hand, societal security focuses on identity (the ability of a society to maintain its traditional patterns of language, culture, religious and national identity and customs). Buzan and Weaver proposed placing societal security more at the centre of analysis since, it was societal security issues that appear far more relevant to the debates of the 1990s than the notion of state security.96 This broader approach was further strengthened by the end of the Cold War.

Ullman’s contribution challenges the prevailing military-centred conception of security by calling for attention to environmental issues, arguing that since the inception of the Cold War in the late 1940s, every administration in Washington had defined American security in extremely narrow and military terms. Ullman observed that politicians found it easier to focus the attention of public on military dangers than on non-military ones where it was found easier to build a consensus on military solutions to foreign policy problems to get an agreement on the use (and, therefore, the adequate funding) of the other means of influence that the United States can bring to bear beyond its frontiers.97 Ullman also moved beyond the military conception of security and defined a security threat as an act or series of events that: a) Threatens severely and over a relatively brief period of time to degrade the quality of life for the inhabitants of a state or, b) Threatens considerably to narrow the range of policy choices available to the government of a state or to private, non-governmental entities (persons, groups,
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corporations) within a state.\textsuperscript{98} Thus, Ullman argued that defining security in traditional military terms is unhelpful in two ways. One, it leads to an underestimation of other security threats, and two, it contributes to a persistent militarisation of international relations and thereby, increases global insecurity.\textsuperscript{99}

Also, other scholarly works like that of Ole Weaver analysed the socio-political changes and the decline of superpowers led to competing organising principles concerning concepts for Europe. For Weaver, security like any other concept carries with it a history and set of connotation that it cannot escape. At the heart of the concept, there still remains an essential essence related to defence and the state. Consequently, addressing an issue in security terms, the concept still evokes an imagination of military defence-related threat perception, which gives the state a key role in addressing it.\textsuperscript{100} Thus he coined the term ‘securitisation’.\textsuperscript{101} He also further goes to say that as we imbue it with a sense of importance and urgency it legitimises the use of special measures outside of the usual political process to deal with which resulted in a militarised and confrontational approach, which defines the security questions in an ‘us versus them’ method. Instead, he proposes ‘desecuritising’ issues, that is, to remove them from the security agenda thereby, making it easier to resolve using more cooperative forms of

\textsuperscript{98} Ibid., p. 133.
\textsuperscript{99} Ibid., p. 129.
\textsuperscript{100} Sheehan, Op.cit., p. 54.
\textsuperscript{101} Securitisation refers to register the act of something being securitised, the task is not to assess some objective threats that ‘really’ endanger some object, rather it is to understand the processes of constructing a shared understanding of what is to be considered and collectively responded to as a threat. The process of securitisation is a speech act. It is not interesting as a sign referring to something is done (like giving a promise, betting, naming a ship). It is by labeling something a security issue that it becomes one not that issues are security issues in themselves and then afterwards possibly talked about in terms of security. Thus the exact definition and criteria of securitisation is the inter-subjective establishment of an existential threat with a saliency sufficient to have substantial political effects. Ibid., pp. 52-5. Also see Weaver, Op.cit., p. 9.
problem solving. This greatly influenced the Copenhagen school where the practice of securitisation as centre of their analysis became commonplace.\textsuperscript{102}

As some held that the success of the Copenhagen School emerged partly from its enthusiasm and ability to engage the widening-deepening debate in security studies that is whether the concept of security should be expanded to cover other issues or sectors than the military and also, whether entities other than the state should be able to make the claim to have its threats located under the security rubric. The extraordinary impact of the Copenhagen School has been achieved through the formulation of a ‘solution’. This allows for broadening as well as deepening ‘security’ without opening it up to an unlimited expansion which would render the concept meaningless for academic and political purposes.\textsuperscript{103} The Copenhagen School in security studies is built around three main ideas: i) securitisation, ii) sectors and iii) regional security complexes. ‘Sectors’ refer to the division between political, social, economic, environmental, and military security. The concept of ‘security complexes’ points to the significance of the regional level in security analysis and suggests an analytical method for structuring analysis of how security concerns tie together in a regional formation.\textsuperscript{104} Therefore, for the Copenhagen School, the meaning of security can be determined not so much by analysing the term as a concept, but by investigating the empirical meaning of its everyday use. The meaning lies not in what people consciously think the concept means, but in how they


\textsuperscript{104} Weaver, Op.cit., pp. 8-10.
implicitly use it in some ways but not others. Security is described as a generic term that has a distinct meaning but varies in form.\textsuperscript{105}

By the 1970s, issues such as environmental degradation were increasingly forcing themselves into the national and international political agenda. These issues were not included in the traditional security agenda, yet their impact was similar to that of traditional security. However, they lacked a conceptual framework into which a coherent policy response could be placed. Broadening the meaning of security offered a solution to this problem. By becoming ‘security’ issues, automatically they attracted governmental attention and policy response previously limited to military issues.\textsuperscript{106} As against the traditional sense, Jessica Tuchman Mathews incisively put forward a strong case for redefining the concepts of security to deal with environmental issues which she argued were more threatening. She put forward that global developments revealed the need for the concept of national security to include resources, environmental and demographic issues.\textsuperscript{107} The logic behind her argument was that the world was going through one of its periodic phases of major political evolution and the assumption and institutions that have governed international relations in the post-war era are a poor fit for these new realities.\textsuperscript{108}

In explaining the importance of non-military aspects of security such as environment, J.R. McNeill argues that the relationship between environmental and security problems is important but often oversimplifies. There is an increasing contention
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that environment change produces political instability and violent conflict, for example, does not receive strong support from the historical record. He finds that the linkage between resource competitions and conflict is stronger. Indeed, if one expands the definition of “resources” to include labour, land, and oil, then, most wars have been over resources. Adding precision to this general proposition, he argues that war are most likely when valued resources are seen as scare or when power differentials make resource seizure easy and inexpensive. Perceived resource scarcities can be triggered either by population growth or by technological developments that transform unvalued goods into strategic necessities. This does not bode well for the future. Important ecological buffers forest, fisheries, fresh water are shrinking, and this will produce more environmental relocation. Consecutively, this will generate economic, social and political tension and thereby turning into violence. Oil and water will continue to be sources of conflict and perhaps causal factors in armed conflicts. McNeill thus concludes that ecological factors and resource scarcities are becoming ever more significant concern in security affairs.  

Furthermore, many recent writings reflecting on a broader perspective by environmentalists and conventional policy-makers have suggested the necessity of extending the conventional understanding of the concept of security to include matters of economics, resources, and even broader ecological factors as these issues are quite often intertwined. Resource issues are often linked to security issues in terms of the question of access to them internationally, as many industrial developed countries survival depends on the availability of resources. For instance, these themes are not new but have been clearly articulated in the United States in the 1970s in response to the first oil crisis. The

very survival of the United States and all the industrial economies to a great extent depends on the availability of both renewable and non-renewable resources. The competition and domination to acquiring resources among different powers in different parts of the world might trigger “resource wars.” Theodore C. Sorenson’s argument in “Rethinking National Security” was an attempt to invoke economics and ecology as a national emergency to justify developing a national industrial policy which has so far been precluded by US ideological predilections for government non-interference in the economy. But tying this theme to national security has advantage in the US polity of legitimating government involvement in the normally sacrosanct private sector. Asserting that the existing system of resource flows does maintain a particular kind of international stability, at least in the short term. This is one of the perceptions of security that is prevalent, particularly in US policymaking circles after the Gulf War. The perpetuation of cheap oil supplies is deemed as essential to the maintenance of the US way of life. But in environment terms it is precisely this consumer lifestyle and its massive fossil fuel consumption that endangers the global ecological balance in terms of the greenhouse effect.

Of late, some writers have suggested that the expansion of massive industrialisation is fuelling the greenhouse, toxic waste, acid rains, deforestation and other extensive environmental threats. These threats should be considered as security issues. Ecological threats are much more diffuse than clearly identified military threats.

The ecological disruption of the planet threatens numerous facets of existence. It is opined that all-pervasiveness of ecological threats makes ecological security perhaps even more difficult to formulate than other forms of security. The Greenhouse effects and changing climate patterns, rising sea levels and ozone depletion, threaten all states and individuals with only partially predictable hazards. In addition more localised dangers of soil erosion, acid precipitation, pollution and toxic contamination mean that most facets of human existence are meeting human-generated hazards, whose vector is broadly “environmental.” These changes in environment could lead to an acute conflict.113

It is widely held among many critiques that those who have benefited much from the existing modes of development and political order are least likely to take environmental issues critically or to wish to initiate remarkable changes. Matthias Finger argues, military actions put the preservation of the state above any concerns for environmental stability or even the survival of large numbers of the state population. While, the environmentalist discourse also challenges the most basic political values of contemporary Western capitalism: the assumption of resources in nature as available for exploitation, ever-enlarging consumption, and that affluence is intrinsically superior to any other forms of society as well as faith in “the market”. Environmental politics involves dealing with matters in all their synergistic complexity. It also requires thinking and operating in longer time spans than conventional political arrangements usually accommodate.115
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At the forefront of the struggle for a new understanding of security were the critical social movements, focused on local issues but sensitive to the wider connections of their activities. They raised fundamentally important issues concerning the possibilities of reimagining political community and revisioning world politics in ways that promote themes of a just world peace and hence reinterpret security in ways that do not allow for the easy articulation of geopolitical themes. Increasingly, non-governmental organisations are acting in ways that transcend the boundaries, effective to promote international cooperation irrespective of state policies. The peace movements suggest the possibility that initiatives for security will also gradually slip away from states. The argument is not that states are redundant or to wither away but does suggest that the innovative force for formulating security comes from outside the well-established bureaucratic structures of states with their primary objectives of self-preservation. It does clearly suggest that security is no longer a safeguarded subject of the security thinkers and analysts. Unravelling security from the state opens up space for constructive interactions between peoples across boundaries, eroding the potential of constructing security in terms of exclusionist identity. The emergence of a global civic culture with its multiplicity of non-governmental organisation and trans-boundary contacts suggests the possibilities of enlarging informal decision-making. Ecological threats normally do not confine to particular political boundaries and hence, they require solutions that transcend boundaries in many cases, and yet many have locally-based origins that are amenable to local interventions. This, in turn, has lead to further the questioning of the basis of state sovereignty and the recognition that sovereignty is not necessarily related to security nor to geographically defined political communities.
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The critique of feminists, constructivists, critical theorists and post-modernists points out that not just the earlier approaches were inadequate but insisted that it was also deliberate where, the dominant groups within societies imposed particular interpretations of “reality.” This ultimately had promoted the interests of some sections of society at the expense of others, underpinning a fundamentally unjust political and economic order. Thus, the traditional approaches to security had identified it with order, predictability, and stability. During the Cold War period, the military approach was also strongly criticised by peace researchers, who argued amongst other things, too by saying that peace, can only be achieved with one’s adversary. However, it was not until the final years of the Cold War that the new thinking in security studies began to accelerate. In this way, the debate for a broader concept of security evolved in the past couple of decades.

As commonly argued ‘security’ now has no single meaning and changes according to the changing context. However, the recent attempt to broaden the definition beyond its conventional usage has created a major dilemma and reaction among scholars. On one hand, many believe that the traditional definition of security which has dominated the Western security literature has been inadequate to explain the comprehensive and multi-dimensional nature of the security problems faced by the members in the international system. Conversely, the often unsystematic broadening of the definition of security threatens to make the concept so flexible as to render it useless as an analytical tool. Stephen M. Walt argued that the attempt to include non-military discourses in the

concept of security would destroy its intellectual coherence and make it more difficult to devise solutions to any of the important problems.\(^{120}\)

Edward A. Kolodziej also contends that by taking broader and inclusive perception of security as the starting point, conterminous with whatever is in the mind of the observer, would be equivalent to say that almost every human value and interest, if perceived by the affected party to be threatened, is a security issue. One may have included so much in ones definition of security but have posed the problem in ways that obstruct or prelude ones quest for knowledge about this human concern. On the other hand, if a narrower conception of security is adopted, identified solely with force and coercive threats, it may be exclude actors and factors bearing crucially on security.\(^{121}\) Ken Booth, an advocate of a more “critical” approach to security, accepts that with the broadening of the security concept, there is a risk of the concept becoming less coherent and the security agenda becoming overloaded, but sees this as a cause for celebration rather than concern.

5. Advantages and Criticism of Broadening the Concept

The advantages of broadening the concept will enable the governments to use emergency measures to address a wider range of issues where the usual constraints on action are overcome. Proponents also anticipate that through securitisation, it will convince the decision-makers to treat certain issues as security issue.\(^{122}\) This is particularly important in areas which have been marginalised by the prevailing political agenda for example, in

---


terms of addressing the issue of world poverty. Another advantage is that the security concerns of the individual can be directly addressed. In doing so, the individual becomes the direct focus of attention and can be protected from newly securitised threats such as the effects of inadequate health provision, poor education, political oppression, and violence of various forms. It involves treating people as ends and not means and crucially, treating the state as a means and not an end.123

Broadening the concept also has the advantage of encouraging a more holistic approach in which security is seen in terms of more than just the interests of a particular state or population. In traditional narrow analysis, security specialists were compelled to ignore many factors that create and accentuate conflict, since they were outside the parameters of the definition. The perception about security between the 1940s and 1980s shows it was excessively concentrated in the sub-field of strategic studies. According to Buzan, this was indeed unfortunate as strategic studies specialists generally tend to have a narrow degree of expertise where many are essentially military specialists and therefore, interpret security through the military dimension. In addition, a great deal of strategic analysis is specifically meant to be policy-relevant for national governments and therefore, tends to be highly ethno-centric. This leads it to have an overwhelmingly national security perspective. This in turn discourages analysis of security interdependence and the more broadly systemic aspects of the concept, which is necessary when, for example, an issue such as the environment is gaining ground.124

The proponents of the broader concept also argue that the security of states and populations should be seen as being crucially affected by range of issues, not merely the

military capabilities of other states. In addition, it is argued that these new threats should be addressed with the same sense of urgency and commitment of resources previously limited to the maintenance of military balances of power and the projection of military force. The broadening of the security agenda therefore makes it possible to take account of threats that are not currently met by state policies, but that are nevertheless encountered by individuals, social groups, and movements.125

Many scholars in an attempt to broaden the concept ended up by stressing the importance of the state. Scholars like Buzan for instance, criticised initially, the traditional state-centric understandings of security but at the end, stressed the continuing primacy of the state as the central referent for security. Martin Shaw, among others, took issue with Buzan on this point and argued that unless the state-centric assumptions of traditional security thinking were challenged, the broadening move, while a valuable step forward, would have only a limited impact in terms of deepening our understanding and practice of security.126

Some traditionalists have also suggested that an expanded security definition will lead to a loss of focus. This has been argued forcefully by Stephen Walt, who suggests that introducing non-military issues onto the security agenda undermines the field’s “intellectual coherence”. He called instead for a return to a more restricted meaning of security. Security studies should be limited to analysing “the conditions that make the use of force more likely, the ways that the use of force effects individuals, states and societies, and the specific policies that states adopt in order to prepare for, prevent, or engage in war.”127

---
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Critics also argued that if the concept is widened, it would become meaningless that anything could be put forward as a security issue. To an important degree, however, the redefinition of security in the post-Cold War era did not seem to bring about much change, because in important respects statist notions continued to reign. Simply broadening the agenda only presents a broader range of threats in traditional competitive terms.\textsuperscript{128}

While, the debate on broadening the concept of security has been intensifying, there have been few notable exceptions pointing out the demerits of the broader concept of security. However, the above discussion clearly shows the diverse views and arguments that have emerged as a result of dissatisfaction against the traditional notion of security. While these debates are underway, there have also emerged ardent supporter of human security. These advocates are of the opinion that that there can be no discussion on security without taking in account the importance of individual security and security of the people. Many strongly argue that the individual should be the prime objective of security agenda which has been sidelined under mainstream security studies for past many decades. As the conception of security is shifting with the mounting issues and challenges, this has further ushered the recognition and importance of human security in security studies. Therefore, the following discussion is a way towards understanding the discourses of human security.

6. Understanding the Discourses on Human Security

Human security as a concept is of recent origin. The main idea behind the development of this concept was to address new kind of threats which are faced by the people in their

everyday lives. Though this approach seems quite positive, there has developed much contestation among scholars and policy-makers due to the ambiguity of the concept. The dilemma is largely due to the differences in the opinions and understandings especially, when it comes to its scope and application. Thus, to understand the discourse on human security and what it is all about becomes an imperative for the study.

The idea of human security can be traced back to the growing dissatisfaction of the prevailing notions of development and security in the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s. Perhaps, the most important forerunner of the idea of human security were the Report of a series of multi-national Independent Commissions in the beginning of 1970s. The Club of Rome produced a series of volumes on the ‘World Problematic.’ Then in the 1980s two independent commissions contributed to the changing thinking on development issues chaired by Willy Brandt, which in 1980 issued the *North-South Report*. The second commission of the 1980s, the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues chaired by Olof Palme, authored the famous *Common Security Report*, which drew attention to alternative ways of thinking about peace and security. While it focused on military issues of national security, it also acknowledged that Third World security were also threatened by “poverty, deprivation and economic inequality”.

---

130 Willy Brand wrote, “Our report is based on what appears to be the simplest common interest that mankind wants to survive, and one might even add has the moral obligation to survive. This not only raises traditional questions of peace and war but also how to overcome world hunger, mass misery and alarming disparities between the living conditions of rich and poor.” In arguing the North-South engagement for development, it noted that the heart of the matter was the “will to overcome dangerous tension and to produce significant and useful results for nations and regions-but, first and foremost, for human beings - in all parts of the world.” Ibid., pp. 197-98.
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enough to eat, find work and live in a world without poverty and destitution. Again in 1991, the Stockholm Initiative on Global Security and Governance issued a call for *Common Responsibility in the 1990s* which referred to the “challenges to security other than political rivalry and armaments” and to a “wider concept of security, which dealt with threats that stem from failures in development, environmental degradation, excessive population growth and movement, and lack of progress towards democracy.”

Four years later, the Commission on Global Governance’s report, *Our Global Neighbourhood*, echoed the sentiments of the Stockholm Initiative: “the concept of global security must be broadened from the traditional focus on the security of states to include the security of the people and the security of the planet.” Thus, these commission reports were the precursors to human security thinking and it was only in the early 1990s that the explicitly human security perspective was articulated with some rigour.

### 6.1 Meaning and Concept

The concept of Human security involved a fundamental departure from traditional international relations security analysis to that of state as the exclusive primary referent object. Rather, human beings and their complex social and economic relations were also given primacy with or over states. Human security is about the ability to protect people as well as to safeguard states. Human security holds that a people-centred view of security is essential for national, regional and global stability. This concept emerged in the post-Cold War, multi-disciplinary understanding of security involving a number of research fields, including Development Studies, International Relations, Strategic

---
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Studies, and Human Rights. The United Nations Development Programmes 1994 Report is considered a pioneer in the field of human security, with its argument that ensuring “freedom from want” and “freedom from fear” for all persons is the best path to tackle the problem of global insecurity.\textsuperscript{135} A detailed discussion of the UNDP’s approach is carried out in the next section.

6.2 UNDP’s Approach to Human Security

The UNDPs annual publication \textit{Human Development Report} of 1994 is the first major statement concerning ‘Human security’. Dr. Mahabub Ul Haq first drew global attention to the concept of human security in \textit{the Human Development Report} and sought to influence the UN’s 1995 World Summit on Social Development at Copenhagen. Haq answers the question of “security for whom” by replying that human security is not about states and nations, but about individuals and people. Thus, he argued that the world is “entering a new era of human security” in which the entire concept of security will change - and change dramatically. In this new conception, “security will be equated with the security of individuals, not just security of their nations or to put it differently, security of the people, not just security of territory.”\textsuperscript{136} Exposing the weakness of the traditional concept, the report argues that the concept of security has been narrowly interpreted for a long period of time. Security according to the traditional concept was defined as protecting the territory from external aggression, or protection of national interests in foreign policy from the threat of nuclear destruction but had overlooked


legitimate concerns of ordinary people seeking security in their daily lives. According to some, the reports subsequent proposal for a new concept of security ‘human security’ was no doubt, a forceful critique but lacked precision. This lack of precision can be pointed out in two ways: i) It means safety from chronic threats such as hunger, disease and repression which concern economic, political and health issues, and ii) it means protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the patterns of daily life - whether at homes, in jobs or in communities.\textsuperscript{137}

It argued that the scope of security should be expanded to include threats in seven areas; Economic, Food, Health, Political, Personal, Community and Environmental security.\textsuperscript{138} Economic security is one of the important areas of its concern which can be fulfilled through basic income from productive and remunerative work. It also identifies unemployment as one of the serious problems responsible for political tensions and ethnic violence. Food is another security that has been emphasised. It requires physical and economic access to basic food for all people. It identifies that the lack of purchasing power and poor distribution system is the root cause but not the unavailability of food and the key to tackling this problem is access to assets, work and assured income. Health is also another sector that needs priority. This can be ensured through the guaranteeing of a minimum protection from diseases and unhealthy lifestyles, where major cause of death has been found to be due to infectious and parasitic diseases. It is highly prevalent among poor’s in rural areas particularly children due to malnutrition and insufficient supply of medicine, clean water or other necessities for healthcare. UNDP also identified threats to environment and sought for its security. Political security refers to protection against


\textsuperscript{138} Ibid., p. 90.
human rights violations. Environmental security aimed to protect people from the short and long-term destruction of nature, threats for nature as a result of human activities, and deterioration of the natural environment. The global warming has also been included in this. Personal security is also another area of concern to protect people from physical violence, whether from the internal or external states, violent individuals and sub-state actors, domestic abuse, or from predatory adults. It has argued that for many people, the greatest source of anxiety is the violent crime. Lastly, community security aims to protect people from the loss of traditional relationships and value and from sectarian and ethnic violence (Cultural dignity and inter-community peace).  

Thus, UNDPs identification of the threats and inclusion of these seven sectors in the scope of global security showed that these problems were widely prevalent in majority of the Third World countries where many of their security issues have been related to this. The report has also clearly pointed out regarding the manifestation of conflicts in the developing countries. It laid down the strategies and responses to deal with the root cause of these problems. In the last decade, there has developed a vigorous debate and promotion of the concept of human security. Some middle powers like Canada have taken keen interest in this field, thereby contributing to its further promotion.

6.3 The Canadian Approach

Canada has led the way by incorporating concepts of human security in their official foreign policy. It defines human security as ‘safety for people from both violent

and non-violent threats’ which is a more traditional and narrower focus than the UNDP version. According to Canada’s Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, human security does not replace national security. Rather, state security and human security are mutually supportive. According to this narrow definition, human security is ‘freedom from fear’ and human development is ‘freedom from want’. They are mutually reinforcing but distinct concepts.\textsuperscript{140}

Lloyd Axworthy, the former Canadian foreign minister opines that human needs are paramount rather than state needs on account of more intra-state conflicts than inter-state conflicts. Since, these conflicts are fought with low technology, high causalities (75 per cent) are expected mostly to the civilians. Axworthy also notes that most of the victims of these wars are women and children. Thus for him, ‘human security’ includes security against economic privation, an acceptable quality of life, and guarantee of fundamental human rights.\textsuperscript{141}

On political level, Canadian foreign policy advocates the strengthening of legal norms and capacity building to enforce them through efforts such as the Ottawa Convention on Anti-personal Landmines and the Rome Treaty creating an International Criminal Court (ICC). Austria, Canada, Chile, Ireland, the Netherlands, Norway, Slovenia, Jordan, Switzerland and Thailand have also endorsed a more limited human security agenda. These countries focused on anti-personal landmines, small arms, children in armed conflict, and international humanitarian and human rights law.\textsuperscript{142}

The Canadian approach emphasises on a more restrictive definition of human security as freedom from pervasive threats to people’s right and safety of lives. Its formulation among other things includes safety from physical threats, achieving an acceptable quality of life, guaranteeing of fundamental human rights, the rule of law, good governance, social equity, protection of civilians in conflicts, and sustainable development. However, critiques have raised doubt whether such a “narrow” approach can truly serve the purpose in guaranteeing more fruitful results. For instance, the conflicts in Darfur are often used in questioning the effectiveness of the “Responsibility to Protect”, a key component of the freedom from fear agenda. Though the Canadian approach is less comprehensive and systematic than the UNDP report, however, it presents a significant list of threats. The 1997 Canadian paper highlights various issues, the income gap between rich and poor countries, internal conflicts and state failure, transnational crime, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, religious and ethnic discord, environmental degradation, population growth, ethnic conflict and migration, state repression, the widespread use of anti-personnel landmines, child abuse, economic underdevelopment and an unstable, protectionist international trading system. Also the 1999 paper highlights the danger posed by civil conflicts, large-scale atrocities and genocide. It also pointed out that globalisation is another factor which has brought in its wake “violent crime, drug trade, terrorism, disease and environmental deterioration” and internal war fought by “irregular forces” of ethnic and religious groups equipped with small arms. The decline of state control, the growth of warlordism, banditry, organised

crime, drug trafficking and private security forces have increased violence against individuals. In addition, a “broadening range of transnational threats” has rendered individuals more vulnerable to economic globalisation, better communications and transportation, increasing pollution, vector-borne diseases and economic instabilities globally.\(^\text{146}\)

In 1997, Canada suggested that peacekeeping, disarmament (especially the abolition of anti-personnel landmines), safeguarding the rights of children, and economic development through “rule-based trade” were the key areas of the human security endeavours for others. The Canadian paper 1999 strengthens the 1997 approach by listing six broader principles which guides its action. Combined, these boiled down to three major principles. First, the international community should consider including the use of sanctions and force if necessary. Second, national security policies should be transformed to give due consideration in the promotion of human security goals. Third, the promotion of norms and the use of developmental strategies would set a standard of conduct and would apparently bring about a condition within which it would be easier for states and non-states actors to observe those norms.\(^\text{147}\)

Despite its greater salience, the concept of human security lacks a universally accepted definition. Critics argue on the ground that its vagueness undermines its effectiveness and has become a tool for activists wishing to promote certain causes. As a result, it is less likely to help the researchers to understand what security means or help decision-makers to formulate appropriate policies. The concept of human security is also


\(^{147}\) Ibid.
severely criticised because of its expansiveness, and inability to keep the developmental agenda distinct from conceptions of security. Buzan for instance points out that “if the referent object of human security is collectivities, then the job it is trying to perform is better done by societal or identity security. If the referent objects of human security is the individual or humankind as a whole, then little if anything differentiates its agenda from that of human rights. All that is gained is the possibility of allowing human rights to be discussed in places where that term causes political difficulties”.

Roland Paris similarly says, the existing definitions of human security tend to be extraordinarily expansive and vague, encompassing everything from physical security to psychological well-being and therefore list of threats differs among different writer. Paris has pointed out clearly that there is a huge amount of work for restatement or revision of the UNDP’s list of human security issues made by many writers. It is also problematic for policy-makers and scholars as they face similar kinds of difficulty while attempting to put the definition into practical use. As for policy-makers, the challenge is to move beyond all encompassing catchphrases and to focus on definite solutions to political issues. It is complex as a result of its broad and definitional flexibility. Perhaps, it is more difficult in practice because the proponents are generally reluctant to prioritise the specific goals and principles that make up the concept. It is also not likely to help the decision makers in their daily task of allocating scarce resources among competing goals. For scholarly researchers, human security is problematic because it appears to be capable of supporting any assumption along with its opposite - depending on the prejudice and interest of the particular researcher. Furthermore, human security also encompasses

physical, social, economic, cultural and psychological well-being. Therefore, it is impractical to consider certain socio-economic factors “causing” an increase or decline in human security, given that these factors are themselves part of the definition of human security.\textsuperscript{150}

Some recent interventions in sovereign states clearly reflect the connection between human security and humanitarian intervention which evoke a strong reaction from many of the Third World states. Interventions in Kosovo, East Timor and Haiti (1994)\textsuperscript{151} Iraq and Libya are the prime examples. Further, the societies in many Third World states are in transition, therefore, it is perceived that human security will be less successful and less implemented in any meaningful way. On the other hand, intervention on the failure of implementation will bring negative consequences. At times, human security and human rights seem to overlap with each other.\textsuperscript{152} Since most of the threats which are encompassed in human security are also dealt in human rights, so the denial of human security automatically leads to human rights violation.

\textbf{6.4 The UNDP’s and Canadian Approach: A Comparative Assessment}

It has been viewed that the Canadian approach to human security overlaps with the UNDPs approach in many ways. But at the same time, it has differentiated itself from UNDPs formulation in two major statements’ of its position (1997, 1999) which largely affirmed its viewpoint. Human security for both implies security for the individual. They also acknowledged the justification of an exclusive focus on state security in certain
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situation but the dominance of the traditional perception of national security was not entirely justifiable according to them. Though security of the individual depends on state security but individual security is different from state security. In aftermath of the Cold War, conditions have changed dramatically, wherein, an individual’s security has increasingly been given more weightage and traditional national security concerns are considered secondary. But with exception, the Canadian government considers the significance of traditional national security concern but argued that they no longer suffice for “stability and peace.”¹⁵³

Firstly, they stressed that security values in the traditional national security and the conception of state sovereignty were the most important values but in the new security discourse the safety and well-being of the individual in physical terms and individual freedom has become more important. This has been aptly captured in the UNDP statement that “human security is not a concern with weapons but concerned with human life which means (physical safety and well-being) and dignity which means (freedom).”¹⁵⁴ Similarly the Canadian approach to human security implies “an acceptable quality of life” which connotes physical and well-being minimally and “a guarantee of fundamental human rights” which connotes a basic character of political freedom.¹⁵⁵

Secondly, they also made an attempt to identify the security threats to physical safety and well-being as well as basic and civil freedom. Many of the threats listed by the UNDP and the Canadian papers were related to people safety and well-being. Both identify indirect and direct threats. Among the direct threats includes the list of violent crimes, child abuses and abuses of women. While, the indirect threats are those threats
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that includes repression, terrorism, and genocide. In particularly, the Canadian papers include organised violence which is more familiar with security thinking i.e. transnational or global violence. Thus, Canada emphasised much on the violence caused by transnational crime, drug trafficking, and the proliferation of small arms which endangers people safety and well-being.\textsuperscript{156}

Thirdly, on the front of security instrument/means they argued that the traditional conception of national security can be achieved through the use of unilateral force by compelling or deterring the other states. State may seek for alliances against common enemies but cooperation with others beyond this is uncertain. Though states may create norms and institutions but they can do less while dealing with military threats. In an international system where anarchy exists, there is no higher authority that can regulate their relations therefore, states focussing on balance of power is the ultimate objective for regulating inter-state relations. The UNDP and Canadian view of “security by what means” is almost completely opposite to the national security perception. First of all, both view that force is a secondary instrument. Secondly, long-term cooperation is both possible and necessary. Thirdly, states, international organisations and NGOs can combine to foster norms of conduct in various areas of human security.\textsuperscript{157}

For decades, the state-centric perception of security has dominated the security discourse where, the security of people was subordinate to state security. But with the impact of globalisation, whether security can be wholly or primarily national, even for the most powerful state is a question that needs to be considered. Where there is a broad consensus within the advocates of human security on this point, there are different
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approaches to the focus of security. Whether our developmental needs or the threat of violence should be the primary focus, the debate still continues. The concept of human security has been in usage for some time, it was the UNDP, which added vigour to the conception by highlighting it. Countries like Canada have subsequently made it part of their foreign policy objectives and contributed much to shift the state-centric security discourse.\textsuperscript{158} From the above discussion, it is amply clear that there are similarities and differences in both the approaches. And while the debate continues, perceptively they have contributed to shifting the discourse on security.

7. Conclusion

Security has now become a flexible concept without undermining its core principles. With the passage of time and evolving nature of new threats, the concept has been redefined in order to accommodate the diverse issues and challenges. Unlike the traditional notion, the new concept can be used as an effective tool to tackle the range of issues without diluting the core idea of security which is ‘safety and security against threat’ whether that of military or non-military issues.

Debates on security held by different proponents are crucial which reflects their deep sense of dissatisfaction against the prevailing notion and their way of understanding security. This debate exposes the predominant perception and how this has been misused many a time in the name of security of the state. What the missing link was that on many occasions, security was mainly perceived as state security i.e., to protect state and its territory from military threats thereby, many misused, misunderstood and applied it for their own advantage. While in theory, the notion that protecting the state does not

necessarily denote protecting the state alone but it also includes the protection of all its inhabitants while in reality, this has excluded those who need to be protected. Secondly, one also needs to understand from the positive perspective that to protect a state means it is inclusive of all its inhabitants as destruction and chaos of the state directly affects its inhabitant’s life and security.

Finally, enlarged notion of security is significant today, as challenges to the state and people are diverse and not necessarily military but the effect could be disastrous which might be more than that of military. This does not mean the unimportance or excluding military security or state from the ambit of security but just that other threats too deserve in the scope of security. It is also true that state and military security will continue to be crucial so long as the state exists. However, not all the states face the same threats, clearly suggesting that the enlarged concept is an ultimate solution to face diverse threats and dangers faced by mankind at present and in the future.