



Critique of the statement traditional focus on state security is inadequate and needs to encompass safety and well-being for citizens

Godwin Kibet Lelan¹, D. Thomas Otieno Juma²

¹⁻² PhD Candidate, Peace and Security Studies, Kenyatta University; Assistant Lecturer Moi University, Kenya

Abstract

This study sought to critique the Statement “Traditional Focus on State Security is Inadequate and Needs to Encompass Safety and Well-being for those Living There”. It became clear that the traditional security concept stresses on military threats and by extension its application to the safety of people and communities. It largely addresses mere existence (survival) to define well-being and dignity of human beings within a populace jurisdiction. Despite its strengths, traditional security has its challenges/flaws that non-traditional security enhances. This study apart from establishing the focus of traditional security and its origins goes further to examine how non-traditional security attends to the well-being of states. Moreover, the study moves to give recommendation in its conclusion that in spite of weaknesses traditional security still offers inalienable security to states who are themselves traditional Westphalia outfits yet this is augmented with the paradigms that accrue due to contemporary security challenges. Nonetheless, this study underscores that whether traditional or non-traditional focus to state security, the final aim is safety and well-being of those living therein.

Keywords: traditional security/ non-traditional security/ security threats/ safety and well-being/ challenges to security

Introduction

Embarking on this subject of discourse prompts a thought line for this article that gives a quick distinction of what traditional and non-traditional security would mean in security parlance; sovereigntorial vis a vis non-sovereigntorial security. The two may seem to be new terminologies yet not all except in the form of application to condense an existing meaning. The first one is used in reference to security within the state jurisdiction which has always been applied and still popular to many nascent states or very accessible and naturally applied security. In contrast to the first, the second implies a broader sense of looking at security, one which includes empirical (what is) that is traditional security and extends to encompass other emerging approaches to security and its undertaking. It has to be understood that this is minimalistic in nature to understanding security. Why, because security scholars would agree that it is hard a parallel between compartmentalized concepts and contain the meaning of security. However, in general agreement, the two concepts enable readers and experts appreciate that security concept is not static as to its predisposition. Extending this discourse, in many ways the argument as presented by Arnold Wolfers in the classic essay, “National Security” is an Ambiguous Symbol’. Wolfers’ ‘specifications’ refer not only to the concept of national security as a policy objective but also to the means for its pursuit, i.e., national security policy (Wlofers, 1952).

Baldwin (1997) ^[6] succinctly suggests, redefining ‘security’ has recently become something of a cottage industry. Most such efforts, however, are more concerned with redefining the policy agendas of nation-states than with the concept of security itself. Often, this takes the form of proposals for giving high priority to such issues as human rights, economics, the environment, drug traffic, epidemics, crime, or social injustice, in addition to the

traditional concern with security from external military threats. Such proposals are usually buttressed with a mixture of normative arguments about which values of which people or groups of people should be protected, and empirical arguments as to the nature and magnitude of threats to those values. Relatively little attention is devoted to conceptual issues as such. This article seeks to disentangle the concept of security from these normative and empirical concerns, however legitimate they may be. Cloaking normative and empirical debate in conceptual rhetoric exaggerates the conceptual differences between proponents of various security policies and impedes scholarly communication. Are proponents of economic or environmental security using a concept of security that is fundamentally different from that used by Realists? Or are they simply emphasizing different aspects of a shared concept? Do those who object to ‘privileging’ the nation-state rather than, say, the individual or humanity share any conceptual views with students of ‘national security’? This article attempts to identify common conceptual distinctions underlying various conceptions of security. At the core of exercise of security to states is the country’s foreign policy. Barrie Paskins (2007) ^[28] defines security as, “a value, one among a number of evils to which we are unavoidably averse. We want security, and we fear and loathe and shun insecurity”. On the other hand, Arnold Wolfers (1962) ^[42] argued that ‘security, in any objective sense, measures the absence of threats to acquired values and in a subjective sense, the absence of fear that such values will be attacked’.

Moreover, specifically, a purview on traditional and non-traditional security borrows from the different meanings attached to security by diverse thinkers. Historically (Anonymous, Undated), national security was perceived within the traditional

framework by keeping nation-state at the centre. At the same time, the genre of foreign policy always remained traditional in nature where the emphasis was laid on conventional methods to pursue national security. Conflict control mechanism was based on the foundations of deterrence and war. Territorial wars were used as an important tool to pursue national security aims. Security was necessarily understood as a concept of equipping oneself with arms and warfare techniques to increase national strength and capability to eliminate threat in the forms of foreign aggression and invasion. In contrast to traditional security, the post-Cold War security concept concentrates upon its non-traditional dimension. Nontraditional security revolves around the human face of security where socioeconomic survival and sustenance are central. Non-traditional security is also defined as human security.

Focus of Traditional Security on State: Origins and Why?

“Security” in the political sense is not an old term. In the discipline of international relations the term means “national security” or the protection of the state from external threats. This particular meaning emerged from practices of international politics after the First World War (Tsuchiyama and Nakanishi, 2001)^[34]. The term itself (Shinoda, 2004)^[29] may convey more general meanings including safety of individuals from violence or crimes, religious peace of mind, and financial measures to sustain a certain standard of living. Therefore, speaking of security in its political sense, we may add the adjective, national, to clarify the context. Literally, “national security” points to the security of the state at least to the extent we identify the state as “national.” This is what is referred to as the “traditional” concept of security in the discipline of international relations. However, even the political connotation of the term is not purely confined to the “national” level, as shown by the use of the term at such regional levels as “Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe” or “Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia Pacific.” As the “traditional” concept of security is not the only or original meaning of the term “security,” national security is not the only political meaning of the term. Military measures and foreign policies to secure the independence of a state are not exclusive components of the term “security.”

A nation cannot “feel” secure (Shinoda, 2000)^[29], because it is not a tangible entity. The idea of security of a nation is based on an analogy between a human being and a nation, which is a result of the “anthropomorphism of nations.” It is nationalism according to Shinoda (2004)^[29] in the modern era that made it possible to conceive of a nation as a living entity, thereby making it an object of protection. For instance, security of a state mechanism possessed by a king before the modern era was not perceived as “national” security. The concept of “national” or “traditional” security was derived from the progress of national identity in modernization.

The historical contingent character of the “traditional” concept of security is important when examined in its right context. Shinoda (2004)^[29] observes; first, democratization and constitutionalism in the modern era gave governments a new role of maintaining domestic order and security, which prepared for the modern political notion of security. For instance, in Britain after the Glorious Revolution, the protection of the fundamental rights of nationals through the restriction of the king’s power constituted a pillar of constitutionalism. Social contract theory dictated that

government should be responsible for protecting individual rights, because that is the very reason why it was established. The basic premise developed in the modern era, as laissez faire political economy and utilitarianism led to minimization of the role of government or the political thought of the “night watch state.” Second, in the course of democratization the role of the state was extended to socialization of security of nationals. The minimized state based upon laissez faire economy advanced capitalism, but also nurtured mass anti-capitalistic movements. This process of socialization of security (Bull, 1977)^[8] of nationals shows a certain important change. Assertively Bull suggests maintaining economic goods like oil and food became an indispensable policy of the state in the twentieth century. Third, what we understand as the “traditional” concept of security was a result of internationalization of politics in the modern era. The balance of power was the dominant theory of foreign policy in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It was believed to be most effective to stabilize international society where states pursue national interests without super-state authority. Under such a circumstance, war was an inevitable institution to adjust the balance of power.

It is necessary to underscore that traditional security has been in many scholarly discourses associated to realism whereas its successor linked to effects of globalization. In general, realist theories define “security” as the security of the state and place particular emphasis on the preservation of the state’s territorial integrity and the physical safety of its inhabitants (Walt 1991). A state is thought to be secure if it can defend against or deter a hostile attack and prevent other states from compelling it to adjust its behavior in significant ways or to sacrifice core political values. This conception may be contrasted with alternative definitions of “security” that focus on either the individual or the global level and do not privilege the state, or those that include nonviolent threats to human life (such as disease or environmental degradation), domestic crime, economic hardship, or threats to cultural autonomy or identity (Buzan 1983; Booth 2007)^[9].

The meaning of international security (Edwards, 2016)^[19] is dependent on the context in which it is being used and also by whom it is being used. The traditional approach to security would look at the state as the primary referent object, as the key instrument of protecting civilian vital interests. A long-standing debate within international security studies is between the rationalist schools of thought: Realism and Liberalism, which both contend that the world is anarchic and that security has a narrow meaning of military action. Realists feel that states must be self-reliant and that there is a minimal chance of cooperation between states. However, they cannot explain changes to the political landscape and cannot explain the rise of international organisations. Liberalists argue that cooperation between states is possible as they want to protect and further their interests, they also believe that national and collective security can result in human security. Human security is therefore able to challenge previously entrenched notions of state sovereignty and non-intervention in traditional schools of thought.

Non-Traditional Security to Well-being of States

What is ‘non-traditional security’? At the broadest level, non-traditional conceptions of security could refer to a shift away from the state-centric, military focus of traditional security

paradigms. This however spans much territory, as our survey of post-Cold War contributions to security thinking. The evolution of non-traditional security both as a concept and an approach to Security Studies owes much to the postcolonial approach and security thinking from the Third World. More importantly, its development is also driven by the desire of some scholars from the global South to make the language of security more relevant to and representative of the kind of contemporary challenges that seriously affect people's security in the developing world.

One of the more visible developments in the enterprise of reconceptualizing security is the work done by a number of scholars from research institutions across Asia who began to map out the different kinds of security challenges that were considered most relevant in their respective domains. This community called itself the Consortium of Non-Traditional Security Studies in Asia (NTS-Asia) comprising initially of 14 institutions across Asia and led by the Centre for Non-Traditional Security Studies at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS) of Nanyang Technological University in Singapore. Officially founded in 2003, the main objectives of NTS-Asia were to promote the study of non-traditional security, consolidate existing research on related issues, as well as to mainstream and push ahead the field of non-traditional security in the discipline of International Relations and Security Studies. Aside from promoting the study of non-traditional security issues, the epistemic community also set itself the task of operationalizing the notion of non-traditional security: Non-traditional security issues are challenges to the survival and well-being of peoples and states that arise primarily out of non-military sources, such as climate change, resource scarcity, infectious diseases, natural disasters, irregular migration, food shortages, people smuggling, drug trafficking and transnational crime. These dangers are often transnational in scope, defying unilateral remedies and requiring comprehensive – political, economic, social – responses, as well as humanitarian use of military force. (Caballero-Anthony *et al.*, 2006)^[12].

On the basis of the foregoing description, non-traditional security are non-military threats which poses the following features; are transnational as to their origins, conceptions and effects; never emanate from inter-state competition or shifts in the balance of power, but more often are socio-eco-political in nature; are prone cause societal and political instability; others are caused by human-induced disturbances and have dire consequences to states and societies irreparably; require international, regional, and multilateral cooperation for solutions; and their referent on security is not traditional to (state sovereignty or territorial integrity) but extends to the people's - survival, well-being, and dignity individually and corporately.

Thus, as non-traditional security scholarship matures, it is important to recognize that just like other theories and approaches, non-traditional security is a 'product of its time and place' in a rapidly changing global environment (in line with Cox's (1981) argument that the purpose of theory is to be able to address the problematique of the world within the context of its time and place).

Despite the keen interest that Human Security generated among those scholars, the excitement soon dissipated when there was no consensus on the definitional parameters of Human Security. Security specialists argued that the range of concerns addressed by Human Security was too extensive, and would overload the security agenda, consequently rendering the concept too

ambiguous to use. Buzan (2001: 583)^[9], for instance, noted that 'Human Security is a problematic concept, particularly when taken to be part of the analysis of international security, as opposed to various other meanings of security mostly active within a domestic context'. To address concerns that the scope of Human Security was too wide, covering issues from freedom from fear to freedom from want, scholars like Suhrke (1999)^[31] argued that Human Security should focus only on 'vulnerability' as its defining feature, which in this instance referred to three categories of victims: those of war and internal conflict; those living at or below subsistence levels; and those who are victims of natural disasters. Lodgaard (2001)^[25] was among many writers who argued for a narrower definition of Human Security confined to 'vulnerability to physical violence during conflict'. Caballero-Anthony (2015)^[12] argued that broadening the conception of Human Security to include almost all forms of harm to individuals, from affronts to personal dignity to genocide, may have some advocacy value but comes at a real analytic cost: '[a] concept that aspires to explain almost everything in reality explains nothing'. Other scholars, however, preferred a more flexible interpretation of the concept. One definition sought to view the 'bases of [human] security as a comprehensive and integrated matrix of needs and rights, from which all individual and social values can flourish and be optimized' (Newman, 2004)^[27]. In an attempt to craft a middle ground, Alkire (2004)^[2] asserts that the key struggle for Human Security is to identify priority issues without the concept itself being dissipated. Thus, the ultimate aim in advancing Human Security is to create an alternative security framework that addresses security issues beyond state sovereignty while remaining narrowly focused on severe and pervasive threats to human freedoms and human fulfillment.

Before discussing how NTS challenges affect ASEAN's vision of a safe and secure community, it would be useful at the outset to briefly review ASEAN's interlocking concepts of comprehensive security and regional resilience. Unlike the conventional notion of security, which is narrowly defined to mean defending state borders from military attack, comprehensive security is a much broader conceptualisation of security that '[goes] beyond (but does not exclude) the military threats to embrace the political, economic and socio-cultural dimensions' (Alagappa, 1998: 624)^[11]. Muthiah Alagappa Caballero-Anthony (2015)^[12], one of the pioneering Asian security scholars, had pointed out that the notion of comprehensive security had been the organising concept of security in Southeast Asia, particularly during the formative years of ASEAN from the late 1970s to the early 1990s. An example Alagappa quoted to reflect this kind of thinking in the region was a statement of a former Malaysian Prime Minister who declared that 'national security was inseparable from political stability, economic success and social harmony. Without these, all the guns in the world cannot prevent a country from being overcome by its enemies, whose ambitions can be fulfilled, sometimes without firing a shot'.

Regional resilience, on the other hand, can be seen as a foundation for and a means to achieve comprehensive security. The seamless relationship between comprehensive security and regional resilience is encapsulated in the Indonesian notion of 'ketahanan nasional' (national resilience), which is defined as 'the ability of a nation to cope with, endure and survive any kind

of challenges or threats in the course of a struggle to achieve national goals'. According to Indonesian scholar Dewi Fortuna Anwar, national resilience is built on the foundations of: (1) economic development, and (2) a need to avoid involvement in international ideological confrontation (Anwar, 2006)^[5].

These transnational security challenges now constitute the concept of nontraditional security, which in the last few years has found its way into the security lexicon of ASEAN leaders, the policy and academic communities, and civil society groups in the region. Scholars have defined NTS as a concept that refers to 'challenges and threats to the survival and well-being of peoples and states that arise primarily out of nonmilitary sources, such as climate change, resources scarcity, infectious diseases, natural disasters, irregular migration, food shortages, people smuggling, drug trafficking, and transnational crime. These dangers are often transnational in scope, defying unilateral remedies and requiring comprehensive – political, economic, social – responses, as well as humanitarian use of military force' (Caballero–Anthony, 2016)^[12].

The element of cooperation due to much complex security problems reminiscence non-traditional security. Modern versions of realism proceed from a similar foundation. The central idea common to all modern versions of realism is that "the presence of multiple states in anarchy renders the security of each of them problematic and encourages them to compete with each other for power and/or security" (Walt 2003). For most realists, the imperative of obtaining security exerts far-reaching effects on states, encouraging them to act in certain predictable ways and eliminating those states who fail to compete effectively. If security were not a problem – either because humans or states ceased to care about it or because it was reliably guaranteed – realist theory would lose much of its analytic power and potential relevance.

Critique of the Traditional Focus on State Security as to Safety and Well-being of Citizens

When security studies were first founded, their primary aim was to solve issues related to state security and they mainly focused on military threats. This approach later became known as the state-centric theory as it revolves around the concept of statism, meaning it relates all issues back to the state. Its influences are strongly embedded in the realist perspective which poses state sovereignty as a core issue and regards the international system as a theatre of anarchy where states battle for the ultimate acquisition of power, which then leads to their own security. Indeed the struggle is based on a fight for survival in which each state places its own interests first.

Questions have lingered about human security even before non-traditional security was ushered in. In other words, the state security, what would be called national interest loosely overshadowed the core reason for security. Security then seemed to be injurious to why it existed – safety and well-being of people within the very borders of states. The gaps in traditional security created many questions on human suffering (human security), a big term that swings to his/her socio-eco-political well-being though emanating from political undertakings or mischief. It brought in the concept Responsibility to Protect (R2P) as a curative to the gaps.

The Responsibility to Protect (R2P) has many sources: the rise of international humanitarian law starting with the Geneva

Conventions in the late nineteenth century and accelerating in the period after World War II; and the profound sense of revulsion at the failure of the international community to act effectively in Rwanda and Bosnia. The need for a broadly accepted new norm to guide the international response to mass atrocity crimes became increasingly apparent. With the end of the Cold War, inter-state aggression largely gave way to war and violence inside states. When, during the 1990s, horrific violence broke out inside the borders of such countries as Somalia, Rwanda, and the former Yugoslavia, the world was ill-prepared to act and was paralyzed by disagreement over the limits of national sovereignty. Throughout the 1990s, the UN was deeply divided between those who insisted on a "right of humanitarian intervention" and those who viewed such a doctrine as an indefensible infringement upon state sovereignty. At the time Secretary-General Kofi Annan warned that the UN risked discrediting itself if it failed to respond to catastrophes such as Rwanda, and he challenged member states to agree on a legal and political framework for action. The 2001 report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) formulated the alternative principle of "the responsibility to protect," focusing not on the legal or moral "right" of outsiders to intervene but on the responsibility of all states to protect people at risk. In 2005 the General Assembly for the UN World Summit unanimously accepted their "responsibility to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity" (The International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, 2001).

It is pointed out that the concept of human security was often mentioned before 1994 (Kurusu, 1998), as the end of the Cold War ushered in the moment for re-examining the "traditional" concept of security. However, it was UNDP's Human Development Report 1994 that really made human security a common currency among scholars and practitioners of international affairs. Advancing the discussion on "capability" introduced by Amartya Sen and Human Development Report 1993 which first mentioned the concept of human security, the 1994 version provided a systematic explanation of it. It should be noted that the concept is therefore foremost understood as a tool for discussing a particular type of development.

According to the Report (UNDP, 1994)^[36], human development is defined as "a process of widening the range of people's choices." And human security means "that people can exercise these choices safely and freely - and that they can be relatively confident that the opportunities they have today are not totally lost tomorrow." If given the opportunities to meet their most essential needs and to earn their own living, people will set themselves free and ensure that they can make a full contribution to developments of themselves, their local communities, their countries and the world. A "more explicit definition" of human security is provided by two main aspects: "safety from such chronic threats as hunger, disease and repression," and "protection from sudden and hurtful disruption in the patterns of daily life." Quoting the US Secretary of State reporting to his government on the results of conference in San Francisco in 1945 that set up the United Nations, the Report emphasized that the two freedoms, "freedom from fear" and "freedom from want," were recognized at the founding of the UN. The Report deplors, however, that the concept of security has been linked only to "freedom from fear."

The concept of human security (Shinoda, 2004) ^[29] supplies “early warning indicators” to signal “the risk of national breakdown.” Such indicators consist of deteriorating food consumption, high unemployment and declining wages, human rights violations, incidents of ethnic violence, widening regional disparities and an overemphasis on military spending. The Report exemplifies Afghanistan, Angola, Haiti, Iraq, Mozambique, Myanmar, Sudan and Zaire (currently Democratic Republic of Congo) as countries in various stages of crises. It calls for determined national and international actions including preventive and curative development to support processes of social integration. The contrast between “traditional” security and human security is described as the contrast between “defensive” and “integrative” concepts; they are not necessarily contradictory. For instance, the Report warned against the high ratio of military spending to education and health spending in Iraq and Somalia. This showed that human security demands a well-proportioned and integrated pursuit of various security measures, and “traditional” territorial and military concerns are simply located in a broad context of human security.

There is a growing dissatisfaction (Anonymous, Undated) with the inclusion of more and more issues into contemporary security studies. We have entered an era of political science where traditional security studies have been challenged by a much broader concept, which has come to be known as Human Security, examining the role of non-traditional threats on the security of individuals. By looking at the traditional concept of security and examining its criticisms. I introduce the notion of Human security and consider, in my view, most important nontraditional additions to security, namely environmental degradation, poverty and health care. I consider the criticisms of a broader notion of security and argue that extending security to include the threats is necessary to address adequately the root causes of global insecurity.

Following the end of the Cold War and the end of certainty that came with it, many academics saw security as essentially under-conceptualized (Hough, 2004). In addition (Anonymous, Undated) observes, many criticized the orthodox security concept for its realist view, which states that the nation-state acts as referent object of security and that their motivation is the appropriation of military and economic power, rather than the pursuit of ideals or ethics. Thus, policies within this state centric view are intended to meet the requirements of nation states, as well as its institutions and values, rather than the interests of individuals or mankind as a whole. Even if threats were bigger nowadays, they certainly are not the only menace to the lives of people all around the world. Environmental destruction, poverty, famines and diseases are huge threats to the lives of millions of people all around the world. Thus, a new concept of security had to be developed.

Few today actually defend the traditional, narrow, state-centric definition of security, there is no real consensus on what a more broadly constructed conception should look like (Buzan, 1991) ^[9]. Today, alternatively, most consider security from a global perspective rather than only from the perspective of individual nations and the idea of common security. More recently, analysts, following the United Nations Development Programme's (UNDP) 1994 Human Development Report and their notion of security as “freedom from fear and want”, have settled on the phrase “human security” to emphasise the people-centred aspect

of these efforts. The negative modifications in environmental conditions heighten peoples’ vulnerability to other threats, such as disease, and are thus largely an indirect threat to human security. Hence, some studies have revealed that close to a third of deaths related to diseases world-wide have some environmental causes, such as air or water pollution (Hough, 2004). Furthermore, human induced environmental degradation, and the resulting scarcity of resources, can be the case of political instability and conflict (Terriff, 1999) ^[32].

King and Murray (2001) contend using poverty that it is often regarded as most significant threat to life, both directly, through famine and hunger, and indirectly, because it heightens vulnerability to other threats by creating unfavourable structural conditions. Thus poverty can kill directly in huge numbers when people are unable to secure sufficient food, through lack of economic means, and it is the underlying cause of human death by other security threats as it renders people more defenceless through lack of food, shelter, education and health care. Poverty then, as I understand it, is not simply a lack of material possessions, but, more general, the deprivation of any basic capabilities.

Additionally, the notion of health security, then, seeks to ensure protection from major diseases and unhealthy lifestyles. Certainly one of the most pressing issues in this context is that of AIDS and its seemingly unstoppable spread around the world. With an estimated 40 million people now living with AIDS worldwide, the disease claims around 3 million lives each year (UNAIDS, 2006). However, the critics of the concept of Human Security however argue that, if all the components of well-being are included, the term will become essentially meaningless, as it permits the inclusion of practically everything that affects any larger group of individuals adversely. Furthermore, human security could be regarded as mere polemics one of the major reasons for including non-traditional challenges into security considerations (Terriff, 1999) ^[32].

Indicatively, Walt (1991) recognizes that “military power is not the only source of national security, and military threats are not the only dangers that states face (though they are usually the most serious)”. Specifically (Coates, 2014), within the study of security, he includes ‘statecraft’, which involves arms control, diplomacy, and crisis management. Accordingly, Walt’s concept of security and security studies may be more encompassing than previously thought. For example, crisis management could refer to many types of crises, including natural disasters, technological crises, and terrorist attacks. Here technological crises could be interpreted to include cyber-attacks.

Moreover (Walt, 1991), even if one objects that this is stretching Walt’s concept of crisis management too far, these issues could still be included within Walt’s concept of security on a second level; for Walt, anything that bears “directly on the likelihood or character of war” is clearly relevant to the focus of the field. Relatedly, it should also be noted that, as Lynn-Jones (1991) ^[26] points out, many scholars within security studies have always addressed a broad range of issues. Even within a narrow, traditional framework like Walt’s, economic threats and “broader questions of diplomacy and statecraft” are considered.

In Coates (2014) many reviews built from many arguments she points; Walt acknowledges that “military power does not guarantee well-being” and that such issues deserve “sustained attention from scholars and policy makers.” However, he

believes that these should be given the utmost attention within their own area of studies, “not through a sort-of stealthy redefinition of an existing sub-field.” Adding all of these other areas to security studies “runs the risk of expanding security studies excessively; by this logic, issues such as child abuse, or economic recessions could all be viewed as threats to security.” Here Walt has a valid and sobering point. Whilst it is all good and well to want to add all the threats to human well-being onto the high politics agenda “defining the field in this way would destroy its intellectual coherence and make it more difficult to devise solutions to any of these important problems.” In a more recent interview, he confirms that he is not dismissing the importance of other issues, stating, “what I was arguing against in 1991 was making the term ‘security’ so inclusive that it included virtually anything that might affect human welfare.” Many agree with Walt in that alternative approaches that have sought to broaden and deepen security, fail to even provide a firm definition of what security is and thus fail in providing any form of policy coordination.

As R.J.B.Walker argues, “a word once uttered in hard cadences to convey brutal certainties has become embarrassingly limp and overextended” (Walker, 1997). This would support heeding Walt’s advice to limit the concept of security, in order to have a workable definition. However, Deudney and Richard (1999) ^[17] think “If everything that causes a decline in human well-being is labeled a ‘security threat’, the term loses any analytical usefulness and becomes a loose synonym of bad.” Overall, then, despite its limitations, Walt’s approach, remains stronger in that it can offer at least some focus and guidance to security studies. A fairly narrow concept of “security” (Walt, 2010) is central to the realist tradition. Indeed, one might argue that this narrow conception of “security” (i.e., protection against violent attack or coercion) has been inextricably linked to realist thought since its inception. In his famous history of the Peloponnesian War, for example, Thucydides traced its origins to the fear induced in Sparta by the growth of Athenian power (1996:16). For Niccolo Machiavelli, writing in the Italian Renaissance, the Prince’s key object must be to preserve his position and the security of his realm in a world filled with wicked men who may threaten his position.

As a result, rulers must be feared rather than loved and must be ready to act ruthlessly or treacherously if that is what “reason of state” demands (Haslam 2002:28–33) ^[20]. Working in the shadow of the English Civil War, Thomas Hobbes famously concluded that the natural condition of man was the “war of every man against every man,” although this bleak condition might be remedied for individuals by a strong government – the Leviathan – that could establish among human society a “common power to fear” (Hobbes 1651/1968:187–8). Among states, however, there was still no overarching authority that could protect them from each other and prevent conflict and war. In his *Discourse on Inequality* (1754), Jean-Jacques Rousseau agreed that the absence of a central authority inhibited efforts to cooperate and so made the state necessary, in partial contrast to the Kantian view that “well-ordered republics” might overcome the incentives for rivalry inherent in anarchy and establish a “pacific union” (Doyle 1983) ^[18].

The main argument (Caballero-Anthony, 2015) ^[12] against the traditional conception of security then is that its emphasis on state and territorial integrity to maintain order in an anarchical world

ignores other drivers of ‘disorder’ emanating from conflicts – those that are not primarily caused by interstate wars but which derive from issues related to people’s identities, histories and resources: the ethnic conflicts that haunted Bosnia-Herzegovina, the genocide in Rwanda, and the war in Darfur that can be traced to water conflicts are some examples. Also, with the key centres of the study of International Relations being located in Europe and the US, traditional conceptualizations of security have tended to reflect the worldview and interests of the West. Such arguments found a lot of traction in the developing world, particularly in postcolonial Asia and Africa where civil wars, separatist movements, ethnic and communal tensions, political instability as well as economic disparities had been identified as main security concerns. This generated the so-called ‘postcolonial’ approach to security which, while challenging traditional notions of security, also aimed to counter the Eurocentrism of Security Studies. To understand non-traditional security, we need to go back to the ‘traditional’ security concept, that is, the notions of security that dominated International Relations and Security Studies thinking during the Cold War. It suffices to observe that the traditional security framing was state-centric and military-oriented.

Conclusion

The traditional security surrounded much the notion of preservation of state rendering it more sovereign than the subjects from which it derived its sovereignty. This therefore, opened the concept and its application to often relegate safety and well-being of the citizens at the whims of the regimes and rulers who would exercise absolute power. Indeed, the inadequacy thereof became an essential ingredient for the sprouting of non-traditional security, yet all are important.

In as much as non-traditional security has ushered in human security immensely, Hough (2004) is of the view, widening the definition of security could render the concept redundant by making it too all-encompassing and diluting the important task of analysing military threats and interstate conflicts. This then according to (Krause and Williams, 1997) would not go as far as saying that threats are only what the traditional security studies say they are, hence jeopardizing security itself.

Reference

1. Alagappa M. *Asian Security Practice: Material and Ideational Influences*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998.
2. Alkire S. *Conceptual Framework for Human Security*, Working Paper 2. Oxford: Centre for Research on Inequality, Human Security and Ethnicity (CRISE). This paper reviews definitions of Human Security and offers a working definition of Human Security that can form the basis for operational responses by relevant institutions, 2003.
3. Anonymous (Undated). Chapter 2 Traditional and Non-Traditional Security Issues in Foreign Policy. http://www.shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/09_chapter%202.pdf, Accessed on 19th March 2019.
4. Anonymous (Undated). Is everything a security issue? <http://www.archive.atlantic-community.org>, Accessed on 20th March 2019.
5. Anwar DF. ‘Indonesia: National vs Regional Resilience’, in D.D. Cunha (ed.), *Southeast Asian Perspectives on Security*.

- Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 2006, pp. 82-83.
6. Baldwin David A. The concept of security. British International Studies Association. *Review of International Studies*. 1997; 23:5-26.
 7. Booth K. *Theory of World Security*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
 8. Bull Hedley. *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*. London: Macmillan, 1977.
 9. Buzan B. *Peoples, States and Fear: The National Security Problem in International Relations*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1983.
 10. Buzan B. *People, States and Fear: an agenda for international security studies in the post-Cold War era*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991.
 11. Buzan B. *People, states and fear*. 3rd ed. Harlow: Pearson Education, 2001.
 12. Caballero–Anthony M. *Regional Security in Southeast Asia, Beyond the ASEAN Way*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 2006.
 13. Caballero–Anthony M. *An Introduction to Non-Traditional Security: A Transnational Approach*. London: SAGE Publications, 2016.
 14. Caballero–Anthony Mely. *An Introduction to Non – Traditional Security Studies: A Transnational Approach*. SAGE Publications Ltd, Thousand Oaks, California, 2015.
 15. Caballero–Anthony Mely. *From Comprehensive Security to Regional Resilience: Coping with Nontraditional Security Challenges. ASEAN Political–Security Blueprint 2025 in the ASEAN Vision 2025*, 2015.
 16. Cox RW. *Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory*. Millennium. 1981; 10(1):126-55.
 17. Deudney Daniel, Richard Anthony Matthew. *Contested Grounds: Security and Conflict in the New Environmental Politics*. SUNY Press, 1999.
 18. Doyle M. Kant, Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs. *Philosophy and Public Affairs*. 1983; 12(2-3):205-35.
 19. Edwards Katy *Is Human Security Part of the International Security Agenda? E-ir, open access website for students and scholars of international politics*, 2016.
 20. Haslam J. *No Virtue Like Necessity: Realist Thought in International Relations since Machiavelli*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.
 21. Hough P. *Understanding Global Security*. London: Routledge, 2004.
 22. King G, Murray C. “Rethinking Human Security”, *Political Science Quarterly*, 2001, 116:4.
 23. Krause K, Williams M. (eds.) *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and cases*. London: UCL Press, 1997.
 24. Kurusu Kaoruko. “Ningen no anzenhoshou (Human security),” *Kokusaiseiji (International Relations)*. 1998; 117:86-89.
 25. Lodgaard S. ‘Human Security: Concept and Operationalization’. Centre for Peace and Development Studies. www.cpdindia.org. (Accessed 5 July 2015), 2001.
 26. Lynn-Jones. *International Security Studies after the Cold War: An Agenda for the Future*. CSIA Discussion Paper 91-11, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, December, 1991.
 27. Newman E. A normatively attractive but analytically weak concept’, *Security Dialogue*. 2004; 35(3):358-9.
 28. Paskins Barrie. Realism and the Just War. *Journal of Military Ethics*. 2007; 6(2):117-130.
 29. Shinoda Hideaki. *Re-examining Sovereignty: From Classical Theory to the Global Age*. London: Macmillan, 2000, p. 53.
 30. Shinoda Hideaki. Chapter 1 The Concept of Human Security: Historical and Theoretical Implications. *Conflict and Human Security: A Search for New Approaches of Peace-building*. IPSHU English Research Report Series, 2004, No.19.
 31. Suhrke A. ‘Human Security and the Interests of States’, *Security Dialogue*. 1999; 30:265-276.
 32. Terriff T. *Security Studies Today*. Cambridge: Polity, 1999.
 33. The International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty. *The Responsibility to Protect: A Background Briefing*. UN General Assembly, Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect, 2001.
 34. Tsuchiyama Jitsuo, Nakanishi Hiroshi. A historical re-examination of the concept of security in Akaneya Tatsuo and Ochiai Kotaro (eds.). *A New Perspective of New Security*. Tokyo: Aki Shobou, 2001, pp. 33-36.
 35. UNAIDS. “Overview of the global AIDS epidemic”, available, 2006. at http://data.unaids.org/pub/GlobalReport/2006/2006_GR_C_H02_en.pdf, accessed on 14.11.06.
 36. UNDP. *Human Development Report*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994, p. 23.
 37. Walker RJB. ‘The Subject of Security’ Chap 3 in Krause, Keith, and Michael Charles Williams. *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*. Taylor & Francis Group, 1997, Pg. 62.
 38. Walt SM. The Renaissance of Security Studies. *International Studies Quarterly*. 1991; 35(2):211-39.
 39. Walt SM. The Enduring Relevance of the Realist Tradition. In I. Katznelson and H.V. Milner (eds.) *Political Science: State of the Discipline*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2003.
 40. Walt Stephen M. “The Renaissance of Security Studies.” *International Studies Quarterly*. 1991; 35(1):211-239. doi:10.2307/2600471.
 41. Walt Stephen M. *Realism and Security*. *Security Studies, Online Publication*, 2010. DOI: 10.1093/acrefore/9780190846626.013.286.
 42. Wolfers Arnold. ' "National Security" as an Ambiguous Symbol', *Political Science Quarterly*, 1952, 67, p. 483.
 43. Wolfers Arnold. *Discord and Collaboration: Essays on International Politics* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, Chapter Five, "The Goals of Foreign Policy, 1962, pp. 67-80.