CONCEPTUALISING AND THEORISING SECURITY

Ashitha R
Student. (Research Scholar) School of International Relations and Politics Mahatma Gandhi University , Kottayam, Kerala.

Abstract
The question of security has long since preoccupied the minds of International theorists. The traditional concept of security with the state as the main referent has been up for extensive debate. The paper tries to analyse the changing perception on security from cold war to the contemporary era. In the times of cold war security gave utmost importance to military security alone .With the broader agenda of security recognized that the term not only as national security alone but also the other related concepts like human security , economic security . Societal security and environmental security. A nation which could not addressing these concepts of security national security become irrelevant. The paper also analyses theories in international relations and its implications on the concept of security. In the globalised era the concept of security assumed new dimensions due to the impact of international terrorism. Terrorism challenges the very basic fabric of every nation .The counter terror strategies developed in the post 9/11 resulted national security become the primary concern of every nation.

Key words: Security, Five sectors on security, Theories on security, Globalisation.

Introduction

Security is a complex concept which plays a vital role in the existence of nation states at any given time. The twentieth century brought about enormous changes in world political order with the development of technology, changes in political structure, flow of information and a major contribution being the generation of a changed perception on security. Traditionally, security was mostly understood in reference to the security of states and military security, because of which it was associated only with national security and became almost synonymous with defense. It was during the Cold War period when this the concept gradually shifted its sphere from "national security" to "international security". National security was centered on certain developmental policies designed to allow the state to increase their military security, either through unilateral force improvements or through membership of alliances. As the Cold War evolved toward the superpower détente of the 1970s, the prevailing terminology was increasingly referred to that of international security. In the context of a nuclear hostage relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union, with the massive military capabilities of both the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Pact, it became necessary to seek ways of enhancing one's own security without necessarily threatening to reduce that of the other. Also maintaining the overall stability of the international system was considered to be an important factor. For most of this period however, the concept of security was fixed around military security and the military capability of other states. It was during the 1980s and 1990s that the concept of security was studied in a wider and deeper perspective which included exploration of its meaning and application into broader areas. Barry Buzan and the Copenhagen School initiated this study, identifying a number of new domains associated with security such as in the field of economics and environmental studies.

The Broader Agenda of Security

The "broadening" of the concept of security to encompass additional sectors took place in the 1980's. Security is a socially constructed concept and is defined mostly within a particular social context. The meaning is therefore subjected to change as a result of material changes in the external environment and change in the ways in which we perceive it. The period of 1980's witnessed the traditional approach to security becoming subjected to criticism. It was thought to be caused as a natural result of the change in power configurations and eventual end of the Cold War. The super power military confrontation faded which resulted in bringing up previously ignored conceptions of security. The period witnessed publication of two important critiques on traditional security thinking, Richard Ullman's article *'Redefining Security'* (1983) in the flagship realist journal International Security and Barry Buzan's book, *'People, States, and Fear'*. They suggest that the concept of security need to be opened up in two directions, firstly that the notion of security should no longer be limited to the military domain. Referring to which, it should have general meaning that could be applied not only to the military realm, but also to the economic, the societal, the environmental, and political fields. The second concept was on the referent object of "security" that needs to be secured. It said that the term should not be conceptualized solely in terms of the state, but should embrace the individual below the state, and the international system above it. This revised view about security offered the possibility of extending the areas of social realm into which the concept of security can be applied.

Buzan's Five Sectors of Security: Barry Buzan, in *People, States, and Fear* stressed the fact that security as a concept had come to be associated with the idea of "national security". Thinking about security through a nationalist perspective easily

Research Paper
Impact Factor: 3.567
Peer Reviewed Journal

IJMDRR
E- ISSN –2395-1885
ISSN -2395-1877

led to the assumption that it can only be identified with military issues. In the world we live in, human existence and the lives of people are affected by various threats arises from political, economic, societal, and environmental sectors as well. According to Buzan, the security of human collectivities can be affected by factors arising from five major sectors:

Military Sector: It concerns the two level interplay of armed offensive and defensive capabilities of concerning states and their perception on each other's intentions.

Political Sector: In which concerns the organizational stability of states, systems of government and ideologies that give them legitimacy

Economic sector: It concerns the access to resources, finance and markets necessary to sustain acceptable levels of welfare and state power.

Societal sector: It concerns the sustainability, within acceptable conditions for evolution, of traditional patterns of language, culture and religious and national identity and custom.

Environmental sector: It concerns the maintenance of the local and the planetary biosphere as the essential support system on which all other human enterprises depend.

Security: The Definitional Task

The word 'security' derives from the Latin Word "Securitas, which comes from Sinecura-sine (without), Cura /Curio (troubling). There is still so far no agreed agreement on the concept of security. Reviewing the wide range of studies on the concept of security which got published over the past sixty years, no single generally accepted definition of security has been came about. The concept of security is as contested as ever. In everyday usage, security relates to survival, to the protection from threats to existence, and being relatively free from human inflicted by others. While in academics it generally relates to the protection of something that is valued, which may be physical life, the organization of political life in a particular nation state, democracy, language, property, and so on.

A traditional definition of security, stressing the centrality of war as given by Bellany (1981: 102) says "security is a relative freedom from war, coupled with a relatively high expectation that defeat will not be a consequence of any war that should occur."

Barry Buzan defines it as, "security is taken to be about the pursuit of freedom from threat and the ability of states and societies to maintain their independent identity and their functional integrity against forces of change, which they see as hostile. The bottom line of security is survival, but it also reasonably includes a substantial range of concerns about the conditions of existence. Quite where this range of concerns ceases to merit the urgency of the "security" label (which identifies threats as significant enough to warrant emergency action and exceptional measures including the use of force) and becomes part of everyday uncertainties of life is one of the difficulties of the concept".

Theories on Security

Security has been and will be an essential concern of state leaders. Analyzing International Relations theory, it becomes obvious that there is no universal accepted definition of security. Each international relations theory or approach uses and promotes its own definition of security.

Realism vs. Security

Realism is the view that world politics is triggered by competitive self interest. Realists advocate that decisive dynamic among countries is a struggle for power in an effort by each to preserve or improve its own military security and economic capabilities in comparison with the other countries. Origin of the concept of realism can be traced back to ancient thinkers as Sun Tzu (544-496 B.C), Thucydides (460-399 B.C), and Kautiliya (4th Century B.C). Kautilya in *Arthasasthra* stated that "a king shall always endeavor to augment his own power ". In recent times realism also marked its place in diplomacy through statesman Ottovon Bismark (1815-1898). Realism emerged as a dominant theory in International Relations during the period of World War II as a reaction to the failure to sustain a peaceful world order after World War I. A stand point made clear by the realist in the discipline of International Relations is that the system is anarchic. Also that is there is no need of any international governing bodies over national governments to maintain law, administer justice and to prevent large scale outbreaks of violence.

Neo realism vs. Security

Realism continues to dominate the sector of security studies in present day academics in the form of Neo-realism. As per the neo-realists, the end of the Cold War did not lead to a change in the earlier Realist conception of security. Kenneth Waltz, the

major proponent of neo-realism emphasizes in his work, The International Political Theory, the significance of a structure of the international system, and of its security concerns .He also stated that the end of Cold War did not lead to a change in this structure, which had always been anarchic. The neo-realists believe the world still to be driven by competition among states. The neo-realist in general believes that the international system is anarchic with the absence of a central body for control. They also advocate that the primary objective of the state is survival as the anarchic nature of the system will not provide individual states with protection or help. Kenneth Waltz made his point that in a system governed by the principle of self help, states are made to acquire security by their own means. They carry this task out either by building up their own military capability or by developing effective strategies that allows them to have advantage over other states in the system. A good example is state's forming alliances to strengthen themselves and to weaken opposing alliances.

Neo liberalism vs. Security
With regard to the influence made by globalization upon states, the realists consider the state to be the most important actors. Although they recognize that up to a certain level the influence of states was reduced by transnational movements (**Lamy, 2005, 218),** they are still capable of managing the after effects of globalization. The criticisms arrowed against the realist theory is their lack of a definition of security and the refusal of realists to extend the concept towards other fields on the reason that any extension would make the concept incoherent and the impossibility to explain the role of non-state actors in ensuring security.

Neo liberalism is the successor of liberalism, advocates that international peace and security to be ensured through the existence of international law, international organizations, political integration and democratization. Neo liberalism starts from the assumption that there is cooperation between states at the international level through institutions. One of the most prominent representatives of neo liberalism, Robert Keohane defines the institutions as "persistent and connected set of rules (formal and informal) that prescribe behavioral roles, constrain activity, and shape expectations" (Keohane, 1989, 3**).**

Evaluating the debate between the two major theoretical traditions of International Relations, neo-realism and neo-liberalism, one could witness that while neo-realism concentrates on war and security problems, neo-liberalism analyzes issues such as cooperation, economic relations between states and international politics.

Neoliberals argue that states have common interests, hence they cooperate. This perspective states that a state's primary goals are the absolute and not the relative gains as in contrast with the neorealist view. According to the former, the costs of transaction and formation of credible arrangements not only limit the incidence of war but can also contribute to increased level of cooperation between states.

On a deeper study, we can find common arguments within the two theories. First of which, both consider the international system as being anarchic and that the institutional structure, cooperation and coordination in international relations are endogenous this leads to the agreement that they are products of the actions of the system's constituent components. Secondly both theories consider states as being unitary actors and as being the major constituent parts of the international system. Finally, states are considered by both theories to be rational actors that act strategically in international relations (Niou, 1991, 483).

Constructivism vs. Security
Socio-constructivism emerged around early 90s in International Relations because of the realization that the dominant theories of neo-realism and neo-liberalism are incapable of explaining certain changes happening at the international level. Socio-constructivism is not to be considered as a general theory but an approach which is based on the idea that international relations are socially constructed. The term constructivism was introduced in International Relations in 1989 by Nicholas Onuf and was later developed by Alexander Wendt. In the domain of security, the main idea of socio-constructivists is that security is not an objective condition, that threats to security do not represent only an issue of correct perception of more material forces, and that the object of security is not stable or unchanging .In other words, socio-constructivists do not see security as being something that exists somewhere and waits to be discovered and analyzed by analysts and theoreticians, but see security as being constructed and re-constructed through inter subjective human understandings (Smith, 2002, 7).Change is possible in morality and politics, not just technology.

Feminism vs Security
This approach came into the arena of International Relations at the end of the last century and has come to include multiple approaches. In the opinion of some authors, there are four types of feminist approaches in International Relations, namely the Standpoint feminist theory, Liberal feminism, Post-modern feminism and Marxist feminism (Smith, 2002, 8), while other authors would add two more types of feminism: critical theory feminism and constructivist feminism (Toderean, 2006, 165-

77). A common agreeable idea of all these approaches is that international relations are strongly affected by gender in their consequences but also in the forms of identification and subjectivities that they constitute and the discipline disregards its gender bias. In other words, security was written and practiced from the male point of view. These theoreticians argue that a female point of view would enrich the field of security studies and make the world more peaceful.

Marxism vs Security
There are a series of approaches towards understanding Marxism as an international relation model; from Lenin's imperialistic theory; through dependency theory proposed by Raul prebisch and to the system theory as developed by Immanuel Wallerstein Nevertheless, the common elements of all Marxist theories can be summed up as being: holistically ideated and materialistically driven vision upon history, the conflict between the classes and the idea that when it comes to international relations , the classes shall prevail as the main actors ; while the nation states are not. The Marxists' standpoint on security is that, the structure of global capitalism is the determining factor for all international events, be it war treaties or international aid actions.

Post Modernism vs   Security
Post-modernist security studies underline the role of identity, discourse and narration in the analysis of security. Like in the case of critical studies the main object of reference is not be the state but non-state actors, from individuals to cultural and ethnic groups, regional blocs, nongovernmental organizations, including multinational corporations and the security of individuals is clearly superior to that of the state (Sarcinski, 2005, 11). The aim of the Post-modernist theoreticians is to replace the dominant realist discourse prevailing in International relations and to state their inherent conception that there can be multiple realities which are relative in nature.

Changing Notions on Security
The concept of security has evolved considerably over the years. Traditionally, security was evaluated primarily at the nation-state level and almost exclusively through the military domain. This focus on external military threat to national security was specifically dominant during the Cold War period. This traditional security model is reflected on the term National Security which according to G. Kennan (1948) is "the continued ability of the country to pursue the development of its internal life without serious interference, or threat of interference, from foreign powers".

National security revolves around the dominant realist paradigm on which global policies are evaluated as a struggle between States to acquire power under a situation of prevailing anarchy, where they compete to fulfill their national interests. Within such an order, states rely on military capabilities to ensure those interests, counteracting the threats that arise from other states. This way national sovereignty and the balance of power, distributed between different states are directly understood in terms of the traditional security perspective. These activities are carried out with an aim to protect the national interests and internal order. In order to understand the development of this concept we have to go through the different periods in the development of security studies.

Security Questions before the Cold War
The interwar period played a significant role in the development of security studies. During this period scholars stressed that democracy; international understanding and arbitration were the main ways to promote peace and security (Fox, 1949: 69)**.** The scholars of this period emphasized the importance of international law and institutions rather than military force **(**Baldwin, 1995: 119). The new international system was viewed as a 'community of power' in which all states are willing to cooperate for a common cause, providing security and justice for all rather than engaging in competition and coercion (Haftendorn, 1991: 7)**.** Later the first decade after the Second World War academic interest in security studies increased significantly. Even though questions of national security were generally treated within the broader framework of International Relations and foreign policy, this period has been described as 'the most creative and exciting period in the entire history of security studies' (Baldwin, 1995: 121).

Although scholars were well aware of military instruments of statecraft, at this stage the field of security studies was not yet as preoccupied with deterrence and nuclear weaponry as it would become during the Cold war era. Baldwin (1995: 122) identifies four recurrent themes during the period 1945-1955. First, security was viewed not as the primary goal of all states at all times but rather as one among several values being the relative importance of which varied across time and space. Second, national security was viewed as a goal to be pursued by both military and nonmilitary techniques of statecraft. Third, emphasis on caution and prudence with respect to military policy were commonplace. Fourth, much scholarly attention was

devoted to the relationship between national security and domestic affairs which includes factors such as the economy, civil liberties and democratic political processes.

Security in the Cold War Era
The twentieth century witnessed the ideological battle between Capitalism and Communism and the year 1945 marked a dramatic shift in the trajectory of this battle. It came about through an important transformation in world order while the USA and the USSR emerged as 'super powers' that predominated the course of world history. The super power era was characterized by the Cold War, a period of remarkable tension between an increasingly US-dominated West and a Soviet dominated east. The Cold War was a period of sustained tension which was waged on political, economic and propaganda fronts and an alarming raise of weapons.

Explaining the Broader Implications of Security
The broadening of the concept of security came about with the post Cold War era has the term now implies different social dimensions. The contemporary era associates the concept of security into fields such as economic security, human security, environmental security, societal security and so on instead of narrowing it within a framework of national interest.

Economic Security
A broader view on the concept of security helped itself to go beyond the traditional standpoint which gave prominence only to military and state security. On further evaluation on many of these new sectors it is observable that there is no single analytical approach, rather, a number of significantly different interpretations exist under the same heading. Security is centrally related to the practice of politics and within, there is a significant economic dimension. In the traditional realist approaches on security, the economic dimension is seen crucial among other factors as it is an important means to acquire power. It is a much older concept as compared with other security elements like societal or environmental. Barry Buzan defined that "economic security concerns access to the resources, finance and markets necessary to sustain acceptable levels of welfare and state power".

Human Security
Human security is a much accepted term in International Relations which identifies the security of human lives as central to the objective of pursuing national and international security. This approach broadened the scope of security analysis and policy formulation from territorial security to the security of people. The concept has become increasingly referred to since the mid 1990s .It was initially used in close association with state policies, in a search for new frontiers in international security and development agendas after the end of the Cold War. It is also increasingly used in policy advocacy by civil society groups on a broader range of contemporary issues from civil war to migration to climate change.

The human security approach was introduced through the 1994 Global Human Development Report (HDR), which triggered the wide publication of literature and initiatives budding from the idea. The 1994 HDR highlighted two major components of human security: 'freedom from fear' and 'freedom from want'. These 'freedoms' from the preamble of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and are part of the four human freedoms that President Franklin D. Roosevelt famously referred to in a speech in 1941. He advocated for a world founded on: freedom of speech and expression, freedom of worship, freedom from want and freedom from fear. Subsequent debates in the 1990s added the freedom 'to live in dignity' alongside the others. Central to the approach is the idea that people have 'the right to live in freedom and dignity, free from poverty and despair with an equal opportunity to enjoy all their rights and fully develop their human potential. In a way, human security extended the traditional notions of security. This has also led to the broadening of its scope through inclusion of issue not necessarily confined to military threats such as poverty, inequality, environmental degradation and human rights.

Environmental Security
As in the case of economic sector, the environmental sector falls clearly within the broader aspects of security agenda. The securitization of the environment is the most important step in securing the survival of humanity on planet earth. The environmental issue has received more attention than any of the other domains in recent times. Environmental Security has been defined as concerning "the maintenance of the local and planetary biosphere as the essential support system on which all other human enterprises depend. (**Buzan, 1991:19).** The issue of environment gained momentum on the broadened security agenda through the past twenty years and has emerged as a vital policy making factor for many states. Environmental security addresses threats to humanity posed by human impact upon the natural environment and deals with issues such as of atmospheric composition change, deforestation, chemical pollution, soil erosion and so on.

Environmental security has major implications in terms of identifying the providers of security for example in the traditional Cold War discourse the provider of security was state centered, and the instrumental providers were the armed forces. But when damage to the environment becomes a security issue, it can be seen that the state seek to maximize security measures with the help of non-governmental organizations, epistemic communities such as scientists and even individual to take part in resolving the issue.

Societal Security

The concept of societal security, along with the others developed in the post Cold War scenario by the Copenhagen School of Security Studies that refers it to "the ability of a society to persist in its essential character under changing conditions and possible or actual threats". In the words of Barry Buzan, societal security is "the sustainability, within conditions for evolution, of traditional patterns of language, culture and religious and national identity and custom".

The post Cold War notions on security are determined on the basis of globalization, terrorism and counter terrorism strategies. Since 9/11 the concept had got wider implications especially in the area of national security. Traditionally security, as we discussed earlier is understood in terms of 'national security' which is centered on a military-security dimension. The process of globalization has impacted the nature of security in various fields, facilitating a new idealism of economic openness, political transparency and global culture. The impact of globalization on security is rather a complex phenomenon. Due to the impact of this process the modern nation state is sidelined to focus mostly on national security matters alone. National security is unquestionably an important factor, so are the other security issues arising out of multiple frontiers. These factors should not be neglect as they inevitably results in direct implications on national security. The state should take into serious account that issues like human security, societal security, economic security and environmental security are basic pillars to the smooth functioning of national security and neglecting any of this will bring about to the dilution of the whole security regime.

Security: Globalised Era

Globalization is a recent ongoing socio economic and political phenomenon, different scholars give different interpretations to this concept. It has different dimensions on social, political and economic context. Globalisation simply means that flow of goods and services easily from one place to another. In the contemporary era the globalisational impact severely affected on the national security questions. The issue of international terrorism has connected with the technological advancement and globalisational factors. When terrorism challenged the security of a nation, it creates severe impact on entire nation. The nation understand the threat of terrorism only after the 9/11 attacks on US. The net result of the attack was the national security becomes the predominant agenda of the entire world. The 9/11 created an image that in the post cold war era the most important security issue is terrorism. In the post 9/11 era the primary concern of every nation is their national security which seeks protection of its borders and the lives of its citizens.

Conclusion

The concept of security assumed new dimensions in the contemporary era. During the period of cold war the term means military security only. But in the present era security which involves not only the national security but also some other concept related wit security such as human security, environmental security, economic security and societal security. So it is the challenge or duty of the modern nation state to address these security issues. Without addressing these issues the national security has to become irrelevant.

References

1. Buzan, Barry and Lene Hansen (2007*): International Security Vol I: The Cold War Deterrence,* London: Sage Publications.
2. Buzan, Barry and Lene Hansen (2009): *The Evolution of International security Studies,* Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
3. Dannreuther, Ronald (2007*): International Security: The Contemporary Agenda,* polity press: Cambridge.
4. Heywood, Andrew (2011*): Global Politics,* Palgrave: Newyork.
5. Jones, Richard Wyn *(1990): Security, strategy and critical Theory,* Lynne Rienner Publishers: London
6. Kanti P Bajpayee and Harsh V Path (ed.) (2013): *India's National Security: A Reader,* Oxford University press*: Newyork.*
7. Lamy, Steven L ((2005): "Contemporary *Mainstream Approaches: Neo-Realism and Neo-Liberalism",* in John Baylis and Steven Smith(ed). Newyork: Oxford University Press.
8. Menon, Sudha (ed.) (2008): *Human security: Global perspective,* The Icfai University Press: Hydrabad.

9.   Ommen, T.K (2006*): Understanding Security: A New Perspective,* New Delhi: Macmillan India Ltd.

10. Sajad Ibrahim, K.M (2012)*: Globalisation   Fundamentalism and Terrorism issues in South India,* Abhjeeth Publications: New Delhi

11. Sheehan, Micheal (2006*): International Security: An Analytical Survey,* New Delhi: Viva Books Ltd.

12. Swain, Ashok (2013): *Understanding Emerging Security Challenges: Threats and Opportunities,* London: Routledge .

13. **Articles**

14. Arowolo, E Dale (2013): "Terrorism, Democracy and Global Security", European scientific Journal, Vol 19, No 2.pp 100-111.

15. Baldwin, A David (1997): "The Concept of Security", *Review of International Studies*, 23(1), January: pp 25-26.

16. Bellany, I. (1981) "Towards a Theory of International Security", *Political Studies, vol. 29, no. 1.*

17. Buzan, Barry (1991): "New Patterns of Global Security in the 21st Century", *International Affairs,* 67(3), pp 431-451

18. Cha, Victor D (2000): "Globalisation and the Study of International Security", *Journal of Peace Research,* 37(3), May: pp 391-403.

19. Haftendorn, H. (1991): "The Security Puzzle: Theory-Building and Discipline-Building in International Security", *International Studies Quarterly,* vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 3-17.

20. Smith, Steve, (2002): "*The Concept of Security in a Globalized World*", Paper presented at the conference organized at Otago University, June . .

21. Niou, Emerson M.S (1991): "Realism versus Neoliberalism: A Formulation", *American Journal of Political Science,* Vol. 35, No. 2. pp. 481-511.

22. Stibli, Florin (2010): *"Terrorism in the Context of Globalisation", Aarms Vol 19 No 1 pp1-7*

23. Wolfer, Arnold *(*1952):"National security: An Ambiguous Symbol", *Political Science Quarterly,* 67(4).pp 481-502.