Hasanuddin Journal of International Affairs
Volume 4, No 2, August 2024
ISSN: 2774-7328 (PRINT), 2775-3336 (Online)

The Concept of International Security

Abhaya Shekhar Adhikari
Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal
avayshekhar@gmail.com

Abstract

It is crucial to clarify the broader notion of security to grasp the idea of international security. A complete understanding of global security can only be attained once the concept of security is comprehended. The shift in the understanding of security from the traditional approach to a more expansive one has created challenges in defining what security truly entails, resulting in it being considered as an essentially contested concept. Nevertheless, it is essential not to use this disagreement as an excuse to avoid providing one's own definition. It is imperative to establish one's own conceptualization of security before delving into any work on security. This study formulates a comprehensive conceptualization of security reinstating the unique role of state in security affairs that the expansionist concept has shadowed. The paper then applies the framework to conceptualize international security considering the unique complexities associated with the global context.

Keywords: *Security, International security, essentially contested concept, Traditional security, Non-traditional security, Securitization.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Before beginning any studies in the realm of international security, a clear conceptualization of it is necessary. To understand the concept of international security, conceptual clarification in the broader aspect of security is a must. Only when the concept of security is comprehended a complete understanding of international security can be achieved.

It has been evident that security has been subject to diverse interpretations, from conceptual to empirical levels. The divergent conceptualization and delineation of specifications have laid the foundation for security being treated as an essentially contested concept. The contradictions in understanding security have contributed to categorizing security into traditional and non-traditional forms.

It may be challenging to construct a comprehensive concept of security. Still, own framework of security is required before beginning any work in security which must encompass the conceptualization, empirical delineation and operational specifications. The characterization of the concept of security as an essentially contested concept cannot be used as an excuse for not providing one's own definition. The concept of international security can then be aligned with the framework with its own intricacies and idiosyncrasies for having a comprehensive understanding. This study endeavors to establish a comprehensive framework of the concept of security as a foundation and subsequently, utilizes it for formulation of a framework for international security taking into account the distinct peculiarities associated with the global context.

2. METHODS

This is explanatory research which firstly explored the long-established concept of security and identified the limitations existent in the understanding of the concept. The study then analyzed the variables and formulated a conceptualization of security reinstating the

special role of state in security affairs. Throughout the study secondary data from published literatures, books and other authentic sources were employed.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Evolution of the Concept of Security in International Relations

The concept of security in international relations has evolved significantly over time, reflecting the changing nature of global challenges and the perception of what constitutes as a threat. The traditional notion of security in international relations was primarily centered around the protection of state (Williams, 2008). Military capabilities and deterrence played a crucial role in ensuring a state's security, with a strong emphasis on territorial defense and the potential use of force to safeguard national interests (Buzan, 1991).

However, the understanding of security has been expanded to encompass a broader range of issues that can impact actors other than the states. The recognition of these security threats is led by the evolving nature of global challenges that can transcend national borders (Spring & Brauch , 2008). While traditional security threats like interstate conflicts and military aggression remain relevant, unconventional security challenges such as cyber threats, climate change, pandemics, and economic crises have gained prominence. The September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on the United States marked a turning point in broadening the understanding of security and thus highlighting the need to address asymmetric threats (Buzan & Hansen, 2009).

Furthermore, the concept of security in international relations has been expanded to include human security, a multidisciplinary and people-centered understanding of security that draws from various academic domains (Anthony & Cook, 2013). Human security places individuals at the center of security concerns, prioritizing their protection and well-being (Jolly & Ray, 2006). It encompasses various dimensions such as economic security, food security, health security, personal security, and environmental security. By focusing on human security, the international community recognizes that the security of individuals is crucial for the overall stability and peace of societies and states. Human security recognizes that threats to individuals, such as poverty, inequality, and human rights violations, have significant implications for international peace and security (Jolly & Ray, 2006).

At the end of the Cold War, a number of forces came together to produce the discourse on human security (Spanish Institute of Strategic Studies, 2011). A space was created for the concepts of "development" and "security" to be reexamined by the increasing speed of globalization, the failure of liberal state-building through the Washington Consensus's tools, the diminished threat of nuclear war between the superpowers, the exponential growth in the spread and consolidation of democratization, and international human rights standards (Sunga, 2009). The discourse in the understanding of security started as societies, international communities, and the planet Earth started gaining acknowledgment as referent objects to security, leading to the recognition of security as an essentially contested concept.

3.2 Traditional Notions of Security

The traditional notion of security is primarily a state-centric concept, where the survival and interests of the state take precedence. The primary concern of states is to safeguard their territorial integrity and political autonomy and to protect themselves from external threats, including military aggression or invasion by other states (Attina, 2016). The use of military force is considered an essential element of the traditional concept of security, and states may resort to the use of force in self-defense or to protect their national interests. Military capabilities, including armed forces, weaponry, defense strategies, and deterrence, are thus seen as critical components in ensuring a state's security.

The traditional notion of security emerged from the philosophy of seeing security as being virtually synonymous with the accumulation of power. From this perspective, security is understood as a commodity (i.e., to be secure, actors must possess certain things such as

property, money, weapons, armies, and so on). In particular, power is thought to be the route to security: the more power (especially military power) actors can accumulate, the more secure they will be (Williams, 2008).

The traditional notion of security originated with the formation of the modern nation-state system and spread widely during the Cold War era. The Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, which marked a pivotal moment in the development of the modern state system (Baylis, 2008), established the principle of state sovereignty, where states were recognized as independent entities with exclusive control over their territories and as the primary actors responsible for ensuring security (Croxton, 1999). The rein of the same concept peaked during the second half of the 20th century, which was shaped by the Cold War. The emphasis on military capabilities and strategic calculations dominated the security discourse, and the balance of power between two superpowers led to a focus on deterrence, which shaped the security notion.

Theoretically, this notion of security relates to the realist theory of international relations that emphasizes power, survival, self-interest, and the competitive nature of the states in an anarchic international system thus influencing the understanding of security (Jackson & Sorensen, 2013). Realists believe that conflict is an inevitable part of international politics and that states must be prepared to defend their security interests. Realism places the state as the primary actor in the anarchic international system and sees security as primarily the responsibility of states. This self-help approach implies that the states are compelled to pursue power, build military capabilities, and engage in balancing behavior to protect their interests and deter potential threats. The states, thus, prioritize their own security and survival and act in ways that maximize their power and protect their interests (Heywood, 2011).

3.3 Expansion in the Concept of Security

The traditional approach to security was challenged after the Cold War period due to the newer perspectives that were introduced in world politics (Baylis, 2008). Interstate relations became just one aspect of the security dynamics that characterize contemporary world politics (Williams, 2008) because the substantive specifications of security that were appropriate during the Cold War differed from those appropriate for the 1990s (Baldwin, 1997).

At a philosophical level, the idea that security flows from power was challenged. Instead, the philosophy sees security as being based on emancipation. From this perspective, security is understood as a relationship between different actors rather than a commodity. These relationships may be understood in either negative terms (i.e., security is about the absence of something threatening) or positive terms (i.e., involving phenomena that are enabling and make things possible). This distinction is commonly reflected in the ideas of ‘freedom from’ and ‘freedom to.’ As Ken Booth (2007) puts it as “survival plus”, the “plus” being some freedom from life determining threats, and therefore some life choices.

The expanded concept of security involves the recognition that security is not limited to military threats states as referent objects, and encompasses a broader range of non-military concerns that impact at levels other than the state (Baldwin, 1997). States are one of many key actors, and they are not the only relevant referent objects for security (Williams, 2008).

In 1983, Barry Buzan's book People, States, and Fear was published, which stated that security was not about states but about all human collectivities (Williams, 2008). Other analysts suggested that attention should be given to individuals because security makes no sense without reference to particular individuals (Booth, 1991). A different approach emphasized the concept of 'society' as the most significant referent object for security studies, owing to the fact that humans do not always consider group identities and collectivities in merely instrumental terms. Rather, being completely human entails belonging to distinct social groupings (Shaw, 1994, as cited in Baylis, 2008). Another approach was a level of analysis insight, providing an analytical framework for thinking about possible referent objects, starting at the lowest level (the individual) and progressing through various sources of collective identities (including bureaucracies, states, regions, and civilizations) to the level of the international system (Williams, 2008).

Similarly, other critics assert that global society should be given more attention. They contend that the most important contemporary trend is globalization, which introduces new risks and hazards such as international terrorism, the breakdown of the global monetary system, global warming, and the dangers of nuclear events. On a global scale, these security challenges are considered to be largely beyond the authority of nation-states. Only the formation of a global community might fully address the challenge (Baylis, 2008). Similarly, the approach calls for greater attention to be directed to planet Earth rather than to this or that group of humans who happen to live on it. This perspective argues that, at a fundamental level, security approaches must make ecological sense. They must acknowledge, in particular, that humans are a part of nature and are dependent on ecosystems and the environment, as they are the critical support system on which all other humans rely (Buzan, 1991). All other referents are meaningless without an inhabitable environment (Williams, 2008).

The expansion in the concept of security also emerged on another aspect - from which threats? The expanded concept recognized newer issues such as cyber threats, climate change, pandemics, resource scarcity, and many others (Spring & Brauch , 2008). In the revised and expanded second edition of the book People, States and Fear, published in 1991, Barry Buzan provided a timely way of thinking about security after the Cold War that effectively attempted to place such issues within their political (focusing on the organizational stability of states, systems of government and the ideologies that give them their legitimacy), societal (centering on the sustainability and evolution of traditional patterns of language, culture, and religious and national identity and custom), economic (revolving around access to the resources, finance and markets necessary to sustain acceptable levels of welfare and state power) and environmental context (concerning with the maintenance of the local and the planetary biosphere as the essential support system on which all other human enterprises depend), along with military aspects (concerning with the interplay between the armed offensive and defensive capabilities of states and states' perceptions of each other's intentions) (Baylis, 2008 & Williams, 2008).

The critical theories, and specifically, Robert Cox, argue that states should not be the center of analysis due to their diverse character, being often part of the problem (rather than the solution) of insecurity. Attention should be focused on the individuals rather than the state, and security can best be assured through human emancipation, which is defined as freeing individuals and groups (Baylis, 2008).

Similarly, feminist writers also challenge the traditional emphasis on the state. Enloe challenges the concept of 'national security', arguing that this term often preserves the prevailing male-dominated order rather than protecting the state from external attack (Spring & Brauch , 2008). Feminist writers argue that if gender is brought more explicitly into the study of security, not only will new issues and alternative perspectives be added to the security agenda, but also the result will be fundamentally different (Baylis, 2008).

Normative approaches, on the other hand, combining constructivist ontology with a critical normative stance, agree that ideas discourse and 'the logic of interpretation' are crucial in understanding international politics and security. These, the so-called post-modernists, like other proponents of the critical security studies approach, see Realism as a central problem of insecurity and wish to replace the discourse of realism or power with a different discourse and alternative interpretations of concepts such as "danger" and what constitutes a threat to "national security." Individuals, states, and regions will learn to work with each other, and global politics will become more peaceful once the 'software' program of realism that people carry around in their heads is replaced by a new 'software' program based on cooperative norms (Baylis, 2008).

3.4 The Security Problematique

The evolution in the concept of security from the traditional approach to a newer expanded understanding caused a problem in comprehending what security actually is, further resulting in the consideration as an essentially contested concept. Essentially, contested

concepts are those concepts that are so value-laden that no amount of argument or evidence can ever lead to agreement on a single version as the 'correct or standard use' (Baldwin, 1997). In other words, essentially contested notions are those for which there can be no agreement on their meaning (Williams, 2008). Although it appears that everyone has a fundamental understanding of what the term security implies and entails, experts have struggled to create a clear definition and disagree on how far the idea can or should be broadened (Gorne, 2012), presenting security as inherently contested. Security has meant very different things to people depending on their time and place in human history (Rothschild, 1995). This contestation has come up at two levels, importantly theoretical and empirical.

Theoretically, security is understood in various ways. The understanding of security by Realism is different from how Liberalism views it. The understanding is completely different from constructivism and other critical theories, which theorize on different epistemological and ontological grounds. This variation establishes a base for the contestation of the concept of security.

Empirically, the security debate centers around two factors: security from what and security for whom. As previously stated, the traditional notion concentrates on states as referent objects, whereas the non-traditional ones focus on multiple actors. Booth (2007) highlights the contentedness of security by discussing how the term evolved through time and how it can no longer be associated with inter-state warfare in the post-Cold War era. He proposed viewing security in terms of emancipation. Similarly, there is disagreement regarding what threats security is to be provided. Is it the military, as traditionalists argued, or other non-traditional ones, like environmental, political, societal, and economic, as wideners preached?

The debate is not just about what the concepts of security are or should be, and to what extent security provisions should influence, but also about whether security is a fundamentally contested concept or not. According to Wolfers, security is a contentious concept because one of the difficulties in defining security is its subjective aspect (Gorne, 2012). Contrasting to this, Baldwin, with his justifications, argues that security is not an essentially contested concept in the definition of Walter Bryce Gallie and concludes that "security is appropriately described as a confused or inadequately explicated concept."

Similarly, the expansion in the concept of security has been criticized, especially by the traditionalists, arguing that the expansion undermines the utility of the concept and carries the risk of decline in important practices of state security (Smith, 2002). The concept, they further argue, has little usage since it is used so widely that it no longer has a core meaning, leading to the erosion of the coherence of the concept (Smith, 2002).

Although the discourse on the essentially contested nature of security and on the intellectual incoherence brought by the expansion of the concept exists, it is important not to use the contestation as an excuse for not providing one's own definition. It may be difficult to construct a comprehensive concept of security, but one's own conceptualization of security is required before beginning any work in security. Specifications are required in addition to conceptualization since the concept can be dangerously ambiguous if applied without specifications (Baldwin, 1997).

3.5 Framing the Security Concept

The concept of security, at a broader level, can be framed as what Baldwin posits, "a low probability of damage to acquired values" (p.13). This formulation reflects the fundamental intuitive notion underpinning the term security and allows for the inclusion of both traditional and non-traditional security threats. As Baldwin (1997) demonstrates, states develop deterrence strategies in response to traditional military threats in order to provide security by lowering the likelihood of an attack occurring. Similarly, in reaction to the likelihood of earthquakes, a non-traditional threat, states implement building codes that reduce the probability of damage to acquired values.

The definition of security needs further specifications. The vital specifications for a comprehensive understanding of security are- security for whom and security for what threats.

Concerning the question of which threats security measures should be used against, it can be argued that both conventional and unconventional threats can be considered security threats. Induced by the changed international affairs, newer threats such as economic crisis, climate change and global warming, identity crisis, and cyber hacking, along with many others, have shown the potential to elicit security concerns. The cases of pandemics, or broadly, the threats from biological incidents, have demonstrated that they hold the ability to annihilate the security of states and disrupt the state affairs, putting the survival of the state at peril (Adhikari, 2020). Similar is the case with economic, technological, and political issues.

Similarly, for the discourse on the referent objects to security, states are undoubtedly the chief referent objects, but not the only ones. Securing the states guarantees the security of actors that remain as a subset to them- individuals and society, and of actors that are constituted through their groupings- the international community. However, actors at various levels, other than states, are also the referent objects to security. In the post-Cold War era, the acknowledgment of individuals, society, the international community, and the planet Earth as referent objects to security is also rational and convincing because a danger to any of these can take the form of a security issue. As a result, it is possible to argue that considering all of these players as the referent object of security is valid.

3.6 The Role of the State

Although the concept of security was expanded with the incorporation of multiple actors and threats from multiple sectors, a pattern worth noticing and self-inferring is that factors other than military are not capable of eliciting securitization at all times. An incident gains the status of security concern only under specific conditions. When the disease or health is taken, for example, a question can arise: has all the epidemics or the normal disease emergence been able to gain the status of security issue? Any particular epidemic or health issue with higher lethality and disruptive potentiality can be prevalent, but only those that possess the potentiality to threaten the security of the state or disrupt the state affairs gain the status of threat. It can be seen from the fact that non-communicable diseases have never gained the status of a threat, although the mortality rate is equal to that of diseases that have gained it. Since these non-communicable diseases have not been able to disrupt the state affairs and put the functioning of the state at peril, like those of Covid or Ebola threat, they have never been able to gain the status of threats to security. By principle, even a relatively smaller number of individuals should be equally entitled to security provisions if individuals are considered as referent objects of security. However, in the course of operating state affairs, these issues rarely get addressed. The argument can also be justified with the instance of HIV/AIDS being securitized (Koblentz, 2010) but not cancer or heart disease. As a result, the conclusion may be reached that while many actors are regarded as the referent object for security, they only attain the status of security threat when they begin to project damage to state affairs. This raises the question of whether actors other than states can be treated as referent objects to security.

Similarly, societal issues such as identity crisis, exclusion, or marginalization are never considered for political attention under normal conditions, but when the issues begin to take the form of protest or revolution against the state or government, they are not only politicized but also directly securitized. If such societal challenges are seen as security threats, then proper security policies and actions must be implemented at all times, even if the situation does not worsen. This demonstrates that while such concerns do not affect state security or have an impact on state affairs, they are not classified as a security threat. This, in turn, raises the question of whether units other than states are referent objects to security.

3.7 Security of Which Values?

The notion of security, when understood through the specifications- security from which threats and -security for whom, seems to be incomprehensive when the role of states in security is taken into consideration. The role of states in the determination of the security

status, as presented earlier, indicates the necessity of a newer specification in comprehending the concept of security. The analysis of the role of states infers that some important values of states are to be threatened in order for the issue to take the status as a security threat. This introduced approach will act as the third specification to the concept of security, as -security of which values.

As argued an issue takes the form of a security threat only when it has the potential to threaten the state affairs and the overall functioning of the state; the question arises what are those values to which a threat should impact so that they gain the status of a security threat? The general answer to this is that for any issue to become a security threat, it must be able to threaten the basic values of the state, which include territorial integrity, sovereignty, independence, and authority and legitimacy of government. Whenever any of these elements become threatened by any factor, the issue becomes securitized.

3.8 Securitization

In this framework, it is now necessary to discuss the process of securitization. Understanding the securitization process necessitates answering two questions: first, how are threats securitized, and second, who securitizes the threats. Concerning how threats are securitized, the process can take one of two ways: the first is threats are securitized based on calculations of the probability of the threat occurring and the degree of impact that may be faced, and the second issue are securitized for reasons other than solely providing security against the threat, or, in other words, for fulfilling some vested interests of states.

Considering the first way- securitizing issues based on probability and impact projections- the issues can be categorized as unpoliticized, politicized, and securitized, similar to the criteria set by the Copenhagen School (Buzan, Weaver, & Wilde, 1998). According to the calculations, when both the probability and the consequences of the threats are low, the issue is unpoliticized. Similarly, when either the probability or the consequences are high, the issue is politicized; when both the probability and the consequences are high, the issue is securitized.

Table 1 Securitizing process matrix

		Consequences	
		High	**Low**
Probability	**High**	Securitized	Politicized
	Low	Politicized	Un-politicized

Source : processed by researchers

Regarding securitization via the second process, threats are securitized even when no real threat exists, but the issue is still presented as a threat (Buzan, Weaver, & Wilde, 1998). This is done to achieve the state's disguised vested interests. In other words, even if threats do not appear to be of high concern, they are securitized because of the benefits they bring to the securitizing actor. This can be seen when there is a revolt against the government, and the governing body securitizes some issues in order to reduce incidents that could go against the government.

Now, the question arises: who securitizes the threats? The major actor for validating any issue as a security issue is the state. Unless the state endorses any issue as a security threat, the issue is not securitized. The process of securitization can or almost always begins with the

state, but as Buzan argues, other social entities can bring an issue to the level of broad consideration or even to sanctioned urgency among themselves (Buzan, Weaver, & Wilde, 1998). In this situation, even though the issue arises from other social entities, the conclusion of its securitization is exclusively dependent on state validation. Unless and until the issue is confirmed by the state as a security threat, regardless of its origin or demand to be securitized, it is not securitized. As a result, the state is the most important actor in the field of security.

Furthermore, in relation to the second process of securitization, i.e., securitizing to achieve the disguised vested interest of states, even if some issues do not appear to be appropriate for consideration as security issues, the validation by the state compels the issue's placement as a security threat. Even if it does not exist, one must deal with it or endure the repercussions of security measures. This is related to Buzan's observation that security is a self-referential practice because it is in this practice that the issue becomes a security concern--not necessarily because a real existential threat exists, but because the issue is presented as one (Buzan, Weaver, & Wilde, 1998).

Based on the preceding arguments, it can be concluded that states are the chief actors in security affairs because only when states' affairs and functionality threatened is the issue is securitized, and states are the only authority to decide whether to securitize or not to securitize any specific issue. States also hold the extraordinary authority to securitize even those issues that are not a concern of security and not to securitize those threats that are, in reality, a security threat. Although the concept of security has been expanded from the traditional to the non-traditional with recognition of actors other than states as referent objects to security, the special placement of states in security affairs indicates that states reserve a special status as a referent object than other actors.

3.9 International Security

Similar to the concept of security- as the provision of low probability of damage to vital values of states from all the traditional and non-traditional threats, international security can also be considered the same. International security, thus, is the low probability of damage to the basic values of states from a wide array of traditional and non-traditional threats. However, the provisions of collaboration between states exist in the latter.

3.10 Historical Development of The Concept

With the change in the global context marked by the end of the Cold War, the trend of globalization and interconnectedness emerged, which brought new challenges to the field of security. Globalization induced transnationalism, economic interdependence, technological advancement, and cross-border movement to the forefront of world politics. Along with these trends in world politics, security threats like terrorism and organized crimes that can transcend national borders also got introduced. Globalization has led to increased economic interdependence between states, creating vulnerabilities that can be exploited for security purposes. Disruptions in the global economy, such as financial crises or trade disputes, had far-reaching security implications, including social unrest, political instability, and conflicts over resources (Galbraith, 2008). Similarly, rapid technological advancements have presented the world with newer security threats such as cyber threats. Interconnectedness has also facilitated increased cross-border movement, creating challenges related to migration, refugee flows, and the spread of infectious diseases. Migration patterns, whether due to conflict, economic reasons, or environmental factors, present implications for social cohesion, strained resources, and potential conflicts.

With these newer threats transcending national borders and having influence over a relatively broad geography, cooperation among states to effectively address them was necessitated, triggering the interdependencies among states and the need for collective action to address such common challenges. These threats enlightened us that no single state can achieve security in isolation and that the security of one state is interconnected with the security of others. Apart from this, the spread of democratic and communitarian values, some of the

process of globalization, and the generally cooperative effects of international institutions have played an important part in dampening the competitiveness between aspects in the field of security (Baylis, 2008), thus triggering cooperation in security matters.

3.11 International Security in Academia

The new post-Cold War period also offered a new way of thinking about the nature of security in academia. The discourse in academics started with the argument that the emphasis on the state and interstate relations ignores the fundamental changes that have been taking place in world politics (Baylis, 2008). Although the past may have been characterized by constant wars and conflicts, important changes have taken place in international relations in the early twenty-first century which created the opportunity to dampen down the traditional security competition between states. Although most contemporary realists or neo-realist writers see a little prospect of a significant change in the nature of security in the post-Cold War world, other realists view the prospect of cooperation in the field of security (Baylis, 2008). Writers like Waltz and Mearsheimer do not deny that states often cooperate or that in the post-Cold War era there are greater opportunities for states to work together (Baylis, 2008). Despite their differences they share the view that greater future international security is possible through cooperation (Baylis, 2008). Charles Glaser accepted many assumptions of structural realism, but he argued that there are many conditions in which adversaries can best achieve their security goals through cooperative policies, rather than competitive ones. These neo-realists reject the competition-bias inherent in the theory. Because international relations are characterized by self-help behaviour does not necessarily mean that states are damned to perpetual competition resulting in war. States often pursue cooperation precisely because of the dangers of seeking relative advantages. As the security dilemma literature suggests, it is often best in security terms to accept rough parity rather than seek maximum gains which will spark off another round of arm race leading to less security for al in the longer term (Baylis, 2008).

Similarly, the liberal theorists believed in the role of international institutions that were gaining prominence after the end of Cold War. The approach of 'liberal institutionalism' argues that international institutions are much more important in helping achieve cooperation and stability than 'structural realists' acknowledge. This view was shared by many academic writers during the 1980's and early 1990's who were convinced that the pattern of institutionalized cooperation between states opens up unprecedented opportunities to achieve greater international security. According to Keohane and Martin, "institutions can provide information, reduce transaction costs, make commitments more credible, establish focal points for coordination and, in general, facilitate the operation of reciprocity" (as cited in Baylis, 2008, p.499). Thus, international institutions operating on the basis of reciprocity can be a component of any lasting peace (Baylis, 2008).

Liberal institutionalism also argues that although international institutions are unlikely to eradicate war, they can help to achieve greater cooperation between states. The British Foreign Secretary, Douglas Hurd, stated in June 1992 that institutions themselves have continued to play a crucial role in enhancing security, particularly in Europe. The West had developed "a set of international institutions which have proved their worth for one set of problems" (Baylis, 2008, p. 499).

Barry Buzan, and other members of what has become known as 'the Copenhagen School', have argued that one of the interesting and important features of the 1980's and 1990's was the gradual emergence of a rather more 'mature anarchy' in which states recognized the intense dangers of continuing to compete aggressively in a nuclear world. While accepting the tendency of states to focus on their own narrow parochial security interests, Buzan argued that there was a growing recognition amongst the more 'mature' states in the international system that there were good (security) reasons for taking into account the interests of their neighbours when making their own policies. States are increasingly internalizing "the understanding that national securities are interdependent and that

excessively self-referenced security policies, whatever their jingoistic attractions, are ultimately self-defeating" (Buzan, 1983, p. 208).

Buzan argues that a change away from national security towards a greater emphasis on international security was at least possible, and certainly desirable (Baylis, 2008). Supporters of the concept of 'mature anarchy' argue that this ongoing 'civilizing' process in Europe can be extended further to achieve a wider security community by embracing other regions with whom economic and political cooperation is increasingly taking place (Baylis, 2008).

3.12 Barry Buzan and the Classical Security Complex Theory

Furthermore, Buzan contends that all states in the system are intertwined in a worldwide web of security interdependence, and that the pattern of security interdependence in a geographically diversified, anarchic international system is one of regionally based clusters known as "security complexes" (Buzan, Weaver, & Wilde, 1998). He also emphasizes that security interdependence is markedly greater among nations within such complexes than among states outside of them. Because they are established by local groups of stats, such complexes not only play an important role in relations among their members, but they also play a critical part in determining how and whether stronger outside powers infiltrate the region (Buzan, Weaver, & Wilde, 1998).

The internal dynamics of a security complex can be located along a spectrum according to whether the defining security interdependence is driven by amity or enmity. At the negative end, there is conflict creation, which results in interdependence as a result of fear, rivalry, and mutual perception of threat. Security regimes in the middle exist, in which states continue to perceive each other as potential threats but have implemented reassurance mechanisms to alleviate the security dilemma among them. A pluralistic security community exists at the positive end of the spectrum, in which states no longer expect or prepare to employ force in their interactions with one another (Buzan, Weaver, & Wilde, 1998).

3.13 The Concept of International Security

International security, in a broader sense, is the state security in a global context (Sheehan, 2005). It refers to measures implemented collectively by states or through international organizations to whom governments have delegated authority. The primary goal is to preserve the existence and safety of states and the established state system. Although the concept of international security is centered on the ultimate security of states, international organizations and the international system are included because they are products of states' interests (Mearshiemer, 1994 as cited in Baylis, 2008) and any disruption in it will ultimately affect the states at the most basic level.

States collaborate or cooperate in security matters for a variety of reasons. The fundamental reason is to ensure security among states. Due to threats from one state to the next, states make an agreement to observe particular principles in order to ensure mutual security for all. It can be considered that the states commit to follow specific non-interference rules in order to feel secure from the other. Cooperating when security is assured is better for the state than living in constant fear of attacks.

The states also cooperate in terms of security when a common threat exists or when the threat is not limited to a state. With the common issue as a security threat, states rely on collective action, which is more successful than individual actions. Similarly, states rely on cooperation guided by the fact that a single state cannot address a threat alone due to limited capability, or by the awareness that when acted collectively, states achieve efficient and effective results, leading states to cooperate in security concerns (Osisanya, nd).

4. CONCLUSION

The paper has developed a comprehensive framework for understanding security and international security by bridging conceptualization and empirical analysis in security studies . With the formulation of a clear conceptualization of security as "a low probability of damage to

acquired values," the paper establishes a foundation for analyzing security phenomena. Additionally, the paper highlights the significance of considering "security for whom" and "security from threats " as key specifications to fully grasp security at the empirical level.

The paper acknowledges security as an essentially contested concept with diverse interpretations and contestations arising from both theoretical and empirical perspectives. By providing a systematic framework that includes states and actors other than states as referent objects for security, as well as incorporating conventional and unconventional threats, the study offers a comprehensive perspective on security issues.

An essential aspect emphasized in this paper is the unique role of states in security affairs. While various actors and threats are encompassed within the security domain, states are shown to hold a special position as the referent objects, as threats are only classified as security threats when they directly impact state survival or affect state affairs. This recognition of the state's centrality in security affairs provides insights into the dynamics of security studiesFurthermore, the paper extends the formulated framework to the realm of international security, acknowledging the pecularities that exists in the global context. International security is described as the low probability of damage to the basic values of states from a diverse array of traditional and non-traditional threats. The importance of collaboration among states in international security affairs is also underscored.

REFERENCES

Adhikari, A. S. (2020). Viewing microorganisms through the lenses of realism. *Tribhuvan University Journal, 34*(Covid-19 Special Issue), 115-122. doi:https://doi.org/10.3126/tuj.v34i0.31544

Anthony, M., & Cook, A. (2013). Non-Traditional Security in Asia: Issues, Challenges and Framework for Action. *Institute of Southeast Asian Studies*.

Attina, F. (2016). Traditional Security Issues. In W. Son, & J. Wang, *China, the European Union and the international politics of global governance* (pp. 175-194). Palgrave.

Baldwin, D. A. (1997). The concept of security. *Review of International Studies*(23), 5-26.

Baylis, J. (2008). The concept of security in international relations. In H. G. Brauch, Ú. O. Spring, C. Mesjasz, J. Grin, P. Dunay, N. C. Behera, . . . P. Liotta , *Globalization and Environmental Challenges: Reconceptualizing Security in the 21st Century* (pp. 495-502). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer.

Booth, K. (1991). Security and emancipation. *Review of International Studies*, 313-326.

Booth, K. (2007). Theory of world security. In D. Mutimer, *Ethics and International Affairs* (pp. 429-430). Cambridge University Press.

Buzan, B. (1983). *People, States, and Fear: The National Security Problem in International Relations.* University of North Carolina Press.

Buzan, B. (1991). *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-cold War Era.* ECPR, Colchester.

Buzan, B., & Hansen, L. (2009). *The Evolution of International Security Studies.* Cambridge University Press.

Buzan, B., Weaver, O., & Wilde, J. (1998). *Security: A New Framework for Analysis.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Croxton, D. (1999). The peace of westphalia of 1648 and the origins of sovereignty. *The International History Review, 21*(3).

Galbraith, J. (2008). Policy and security implications of the financial crisis: A plan for America. *Challenge*, 6-25.

Gorne, N. (2012). Why is security an “essentially contested concept” and what ways are there to overcome this? *GRIN*.

Heywood, A. (2011). Theories of global politics. In A. Heywood, *Global Politics* (pp. 53-82). Palgrave Macmillan.

Jackson, R., & Sorensen, G. (2013). *Introduction to international Relations: Theories and Approaches* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Jolly, R., & Ray, D. B. (2006). *The human security framework and national human development reports: a review of experiences and current debates.* United Nations Development Programme.

Koblentz, G. (2010). Biosecurity reconsidered : Calibrating biological threats and responses. *International Security, 34*(4), 96-132.

Osisanya, S. (n.d.). National security versus global security. *UN Chronicle*.

Rothschild, E. (1995). What is security? *Daedalus, 124*(3), 53-98.

Sheehan, M. (2005). *International security: An analytical survey.* Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Smith, S. (2002). The concept of security before and after September 11. *RSIS Working Paper, 23*.

Spanish Institute of Strategic Studies. (2011). *The Evolution of the Concept of Security*. Ministry of Defense, Spain.

Spring, Ú., & Brauch , H. (2008). Reconceptualizing security in the 21st Century: Conclusions for research and policy-making. In *Globalization and Environmental Challenges* (pp. 941-954). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer.

Sunga, L. S. (2009). The Concept of Human Security: Does it Add Anything of Value to International Legal Theory or Practice? *Power and Justice in International Relations Interdisciplinary Approaches to Global Challenges Power and Justice in International Relations*.

Williams, P. D. (2008). Security studies: An introduction. In P. D. Williams, *Security Studies: An Introduction.* Routledge.