Security Conceptualization

Dr Nyein Nyein San Ei[1]

Abstract

In the past, all human beings lived under the traditional concept of 'security': every state endeavors to protect itself from enemy states. Absolutely, 'security' is postured by the military power of a state. It is especially for the survival of that state. However, in the twentieth century, particularly after the Cold War, together with many challenges to the conventional concept of security and the changing security issues from hard to soft, the paradigm of the concept of security has been considered under a comprehensive manner. In this context, 'security' consists of not only a state's defense but also human beings' mental and physical considerations. Under the non-traditional conceptualization of security, the entire mankind has become more vulnerable than before. Therefore, given the main causes of new security conceptualization, development of security discourses and debates about the concepts, this paper will explore the critics on security conceptualization within the theoretical framework of International Relations.

KEYWORDS: security, conceptualization, conventional, paradigm, comprehensive, vulnerable, theoretical framework

Introduction

'Security' has two main controversial terms: old, traditional or conventional and new, non-traditional or non-conventional. In contrast, the new concept of security makes people more vulnerable than the old one. In comparison, the old concept always stands as one of the elements of security even in widen, deepen and new concept of security. It cannot be removed by or replaced with the new concept.

Conventional concept of security

Traditionally, despite various definitions of security, all are concentrated within the paradigm of state and military security. Security is a term which denotes no threats to scarce values. In an absolute term, it is said 'freedom from all threats' which means the equivalent of complete security. Historically, security has been postured a core value and ultimate goal of state behavior. In a foreign policy context, the traditional concept of security is stressed on the military dimension.[2] A general interpretation of security is synonymous with the accumulation of power. So, security has been regarded as a commodity and power as the ways of achieving it.[3] Roskin and Berry also mention their consideration of security as what a country does to safeguard its sovereignty. Such considerations are under the scope of old,

---

[1] Associate Professor, Department of International Relations, Yadanabon University

[2] Evans, Graham and Newnham, Jeffrey: *The Penguin Dictionary of International Relations*, 1998, Penguin Books Ltd., London, p.490 (Henceforth, Evans and Newnham: *The Penguin Dictionary of International Relations*)

[3] Baldwin, David. D: "The Concept of Security", *Review of International Studies,* British International Studies Association, 1997, p.6

traditional or conventional security.[4] Accordingly, security of a state has been to protect it from enemy states, totally depending on military power of that state. Obviously, the traditional concept of security is state-centered and military in nature. Undoubtedly, traditional security has been *unilateral competitive national military security*.[5] Hanna Newcombe asserts that each word is important. Unilateral means "put into effect without consulting others", competitive "striving to win while others lose", national "protecting one's own nation-state only", military "by using military threats or force" and security "protection from danger by continuation of the existing international system".[6] That is also known as "National Security" which implies protection of a state's sovereignty and territorial integrity from external military threat.[7] It is especially for the survival of the state. The best example is Machiavelli's idea of national security. According to him, a state can be preserved only by a prince's power. So, he must maintain his power as a primary responsibility. For this purpose, the prince can apply any kinds of actions regardless of moral implications. Machiavelli concentrates on state survival, not morality. He recognizes good leaders as first and foremost concerned with protecting the territorial integrity of the states.[8] The most basic form is that national security ensures protection against threats from other states.

The concept of 'National Security' dominated throughout the cold war period. As an assertion of the state, Max Stirner states in his '*The Ego and His Own (1845)*' that the purpose of the state is always the same: to limit the individual, to tame him, to subordinate him, to subjugate him.[9] Under this context, the state/government is the main responsible actor for security responses, depending on the state capacity: the major elements of the state and its institutions. The common theme of state capacity is ability of institutions to be effectively and efficiently public policy or official goals.[10] Nicole Jackson also asserts 'security' as a highly contested term and thus, there are debates over its definition. He states the term 'security' as a deprivation of the Latin *se* (without) and *cura* (care), meaning the absence of a threat. [11] Accordingly, security means the absence of threat which includes the stability of states, regions, the global community, networks, and/or human lives.

---

[4] Roskin, Michael G. and Berry, Nicholas O.: "Chapter 12: Security and Insecurity", *The New World of International Relations*, 2015 (tenth edition), Pearson, Boston, p.189 (Henceforth, Roskin and Berry: "Chapter 12: Security and Insecurity", *The New World of International Relations*)

[5] Newcombe, Hanna: "What is Common Security?: A Conceptual Comparison", *Peace Magazine*, August-September 1990, p.8 (Henceforth, Newcombe: "What is Common Security?: A Conceptual Comparison")

[6] *Ibid*

[7] Acharya, Amitav: "Changing Conceptions of security in the 21st Century: Power, Institutions, and Ideas", *Conference Paper*, Zhejiang University, 2009, p.1 (Henceforth, Acharya: "Changing Conceptions of security in the 21st Century: Power, Institutions, and Ideas")

[9] Haywood, Andrew: "Chapter 3: Politics and the State", *Politics*, 2013 (fourth edition), Palgrave Macmillan, UK, p.56 (Henceforth, Haywood: *Politics*)

[10] *BOSTON UNIVERSITY LAW REVIEW*, Vol. 95:1369, p.1380

[11] Jackson, Nicole: "Security", *Politics in the Developing World*, 2014, Oxford University Press, UK, p.289 (Henceforth, Jackson: "Security", *Politics in the Developing World*)

Non-conventional concept of security

The new concept of security has become wider and deeper than the old one and thus, the entire mankind has become insecure and unsafe from various security challenges. The end of the Cold War, together with the impacts of globalization, natural disasters, diseases, poverty, etc., was a turning point to revise the concept of security.[12] It means that such military nature security has been challenged by non-military issues such as the advanced technology, food and water scarcity, environmental degradation and so on. In this context, non-traditional security threats have to be defined in a comprehensive manner.[13] Eventually, *the 1994 UNDP's Human Development Report* defined non-traditional security (NTS) and "Human Security" terms including seven components of human security _ personal, food, health, economic, community, political and environmental security.[14] In detail, personal security means protecting people from physical violence, whether from the state or external states, from violent individuals or sub-state factors, from domestic abuse, and from predatory adults; food security is to ensure that all people at all times have both physical and economic access to basic food; health security is to guarantee a minimum protection from diseases and unhealthy lifestyles; economic security assures basic incomes for individuals, usually from productive and remunerative work, or, in the last resort, from some publicly financed net; community security is to protect people from the loss of traditional relationships and values, and from sectarian and ethnic violence; political security ensures that people live in a society honoring their basic human rights, and to ensure the freedom of individuals and groups from government attempts to exercise control over ideas and information; environmental security is to protect people from the short- and long-term ravages of nature, man made threats in nature, and deterioration of the natural environment.[15] In essence, the concept of security has changed from conventional to non-conventional or from military to non-military. In other words, it has become different from hard issues like peace and war to soft issues like human trafficking and terrorism in "human security".[16] Therefore, human beings have become victims of new security threats.

"Human security" is peoples' freedom from fear, want and indignity caused by domestic and/or external sources.[17] However, it does not mean that military-based state security has absolutely disappeared.[18] The best example is 9/11 case in 2001 because it proves that the dominant state-centrism and military-centrism is not completely set aside.[19] After the Cold War, new security threats like climate change and financial crisis have

---

[12] Chaudhuri, Saurabh: "Defining non-traditional Security Threats, Global India Foundation", 2010 , p.1 (Henceforth, Chaudhuri: "Defining non-traditional Security Threats, Global India Foundation")

[13] Hussein, K.,Gnisci, D. and Wanjiru, J.: Security and Human Security: An Overview of Concepts and Initiatives: What Implications for West Africa?, 2004, p.11

[14] Winter, Jacob: Freedom From Fear: A New Paradigm for Human Security?, 2014, p.41

[15] Acharya, Amitav: "Human Security", *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, 2014, Oxford University Press, UK, p.449 (Henceforth, Acharya: "Human Security", *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*)

[16] Herrmann, Wilfried A.: "ASEAN Perspective on Challenges and Opportunities of Partnerships across the Seas", Maritime Affairs: *Journal of the National Maritime Foundation of India*, 2015, p.62

[17] Acharya: "Changing Conceptions of security in the 21st Century: Power, Institutions, and Ideas", p.1

[18] Chaudhuri: "Defining non-traditional Security Threats, Global India Foundation", p.22

[19] Sykes, David: "In the Post-9/11 Era is "the Responsibility to Protect" Irrelevant?, 2009, Lancaster University, E-International Relations Publishing, p.1 (Henceforth, Sykes, "In the Post-9/11 Era is "the Responsibility to Protect" Irrelevant?)

emerged and seriously challenged the existing state institutions worldwide and non-governmental organizations have involved prominently in addressing security threats. Hence, the role of the state has become dim. However, the impact of September 11 has led to the revival of the importance of US's state institutions to counter terrorists.[20] It has also asserted the state security is essential under the concept of "Homeland Security".[21] This concept means internal security measures against terrorism.[22] Moreover, even the American's War on Terror has been criticized as an alternative way for its own National Security in the name of Humanitarian Interventions.[23] Given the conceptualization of security, some major issues include difficult ones to handle like piracy, smuggling, human-trafficking, environmental security and migration.

Elements of Human Security

The concept of human security has generated much debate because of the clashes of the old and new concepts. Traditionally, states pursue their national security throughout the Cold War, which is to protect sovereignty and territorial integrity of states from external military threats. Despite rethinking of the concept of security from the broader, non-military terms, the state remains the object of security or the main entity to be protected. However, the main reference object of human security is individuals, challenging the state-centered security. Therefore, human security is security which stresses on the people, rather than on states or governments. Undoubtedly, in an era of globalization, the concept of security must encompass a broader range of concerns and challenges than simply defending the state from external military threats.[24] Moreover, human security can be clearly distinguished by three elements: (1) its focus on individuals/people as the main object of security; (2) its multidimensional nature; and (3) its universal or global scope. The concept of human security has been influenced by four developments: (1) the rejection of economic growth as the main indicator of development and the accompanying notion of 'human development' as empowerment of people; (2) the rising incidence of internal conflicts; (3) the impact of globalization in spreading transnational dangers like terrorism; and (4) the post-cold war focus on human rights and humanitarian intervention.[25]

Causes of new security conceptualization

Generally, the concept of security changes or emerges to respond to new security threats. To understand detailed catalysts of security change, Amitav Acharya discusses six major catalysts of change in his research paper *"Changing the Concept of Security in the 21st Century: Power, Institutions and Ideas"*. First, he argues that new ideas about international relations can drive change. It means that prior ideas contributed it significantly affected the

---

[20] James E. Steiner, Dr.: "Improving Homeland Security at the State Level", Centre for the Study of Intelligent Publications, Vol.53, No.3, 2009, USA, p.1 (Henceforth, James E. Steiner: "Improving Homeland Security at the State Level")

[21] Sykes: "In the Post-9/11 Era is "the Responsibility to Protect" Irrelevant?, p.1

[22] Acharya: "Changing Conceptions of security in the 21st Century: Power, Institutions, and Ideas", p.1

[23] Sykes: "In the Post-9/11 Era is "the Responsibility to Protect" Irrelevant?, p.1

[24] Acharya: "Human Security", *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations,* p.449

[25] *ibid*

global security paradigm.[26] Second, emergence of new threats and perceptions of threats is also another catalyst to change security concept, that is, new or newly perceived events are collectively labeled as non-traditional security (NTS) issues because they are not directly concerned with military in nature, for example, financial crisis, climate change, natural disasters, etc.[27] Third, he includes power shift in international system after the Cold War, that is, power distribution during the Cold War and after the Cold War has effect on the concept change. Since the end of the Cold War, the influence of the concept of "Human Security" may be the encouragement of plurality of powers to emerge alternative views about security.[28] Fourth, domestic politics and political change have also related to the changing concept of security. As regards this point, he argues that a central element of domestic politics is regime survival and strategies of regime legitimation. Moreover, in thinking new security catalysts, it is not concerned with democratization. Hence, any shift in domestic politics can effect on new security concepts.[29] Fifth, the leading role of international institutions can create, diffuse, institutionalize new security ideas and norms and implement new security agendas.[30] A final catalyst is the changing nature of warfare from inter-state warfare to more intra-state.[31] The above mentioned are the motivating factors for new security conceptualization.

Changing Security Discourses

In analyzing change in security discourses, in the 1940s, almost all states were influenced by 'National Security'.[32] In the 1960s, the concept of "Comprehensive Security" was prominent in Asia, especially in Southeast Asia. This is because the region was hit by a plague of NTS issues like natural disasters, financial crisis and migration.[33] "Comprehensive Security" is security that goes beyond national security to non-traditional security.[34] Under "Comprehensive Security" concept, new or newly perceived events are collectively listed in non-traditional security (NTS) issues. NTS is defined as protection of a state's institutions and governing capacity from non-military threats.[35] Therefore, NTS can be seen as a subset of "Comprehensive Security".[36] As regards security concept in Southeast Asia, ASEAN accepted "Comprehensive Security" as the most suitable one for a long time. However, it was strongly criticized by the impact of the 1997 Asian financial crisis and simultaneously, state security was challenged by the suffering people. Consequently, reconceptualization of security has expanded to "Human Security".[37] Yet, all Asian countries have not accepted human security concept if/when they have prioritized the state security imperatives than other

---

[26] Acharya: "Changing Conceptions of security in the 21st Century: Power, Institutions, and Ideas", pp.2-4
[27] *Human Development Report 1944*, 1944, Oxford University Press, UK, p.3
[28] Acharya: "Changing Conceptions of security in the 21st Century: Power, Institutions, and Ideas", p.4
[29] Acharya: "Changing Conceptions of security in the 21st Century: Power, Institutions, and Ideas", p.7
[30] Acharya: "Changing Conceptions of security in the 21st Century: Power, Institutions, and Ideas", pp.3-10
[31] Caballero, Mely: "Nontraditional Security, Regionalism and the State in Southeast Asia", 2008, p.139
(Henceforth, Caballero: "Nontraditional Security, Regionalism and the State in Southeast Asia")
[32] Acharya: "Changing Conceptions of security in the 21st Century: Power, Institutions, and Ideas", p.1
[33] Caballero: "Nontraditional Security, Regionalism and the State in Southeast Asia", p.139
[34] *Ibid*
[35] Acharya: "Changing Conceptions of security in the 21st Century: Power, Institutions, and Ideas", p.1
[36] Caballero: "Nontraditional Security, Regionalism and the State in Southeast Asia", p.140
[37] Caballero: "Nontraditional Security, Regionalism and the State in Southeast Asia", p.140

cases.[38] Again, the 1970s were under the influence of "Common Security" concept is also called "mutual security". It is a flexible system of avoiding war by using diplomatic and psychological means, much less neat and orderly, just a plague of ideas for war avoidance and bilateral action between opponents.[39] In the 1980s, "Cooperative Security" has been prominent in Asia-Pacific localization of common security without human rights.[40] In fact, it is the term generally used to show a more peaceful way to security through increased international harmony and cooperation.[41] Eventually, from the 1990s to the 2000s, concepts of "Non-traditional Security" and "Human Security" embrace many parts of the world.[42] Unexpectedly, September 11 issue in 2001 has perceived the concept of security as "Homeland". However, the latest term currently used is "Non-traditional Security" because of new threats to the protection of the state's institutions and governing capacity from non-military threats. The key, responsible actors for security are also different from the orthodox notion of security. Traditionally, the state is the sole provider of security but today, that idea is increasingly challenged in many areas of the world.[43] As a result, not only the state but also new actors like non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and private businesses become vital in providing security.[44] The involvement of new actors is a challenge to the conventional perception of the role of the state and its fundamental responsibility to provide national security and more importantly, it clearly shows that many non-conventional security issues cannot be tackled by individual states alone because of their serious and transnational character.[45] In fact, non-state actors have been playing ever more important roles in responding both national and international security threats in existing security governance.

Theoretical Approaches to 'Security'

Realist view

Realists have little attention to human security or individuals' freedom. As realists convince that international system is anarchic and with unending conflicts; human-beings are selfish, aggressive and greedy; the main actors in world politics are states; states pursue self-interests (national interests), play in power politics and mainly emphasize on military self-help for survival, they define the concept of security as national security or domestic security.[46] This means that the state is the main object of security to be protected. Under this context, a sovereign state can pursue its main goals (to maintain territorial integrity and the autonomy of

---

[38] Acharya: "Changing Conceptions of security in the 21st Century: Power, Institutions, and Ideas", p.2
[39] Newcombe: "What is Common Security?: A Conceptual Comparison", p.8
[40] Acharya: "Changing Conceptions of security in the 21st Century: Power, Institutions, and Ideas", p.12
[41] Cohen,Richard and Mihalka, Michael: *Cooperative Security: New Horizons for International Order,* The Marshall Centre Paper No.3, 2012, p.1
[42] Acharya: "Changing Conceptions of security in the 21st Century: Power, Institutions, and Ideas", p.12
[43] Liss, Carolin: "New Actors and the State: Addressing Maritime Security Threats in Southeast Asia", Contemporary Southeast Asia, Vol.35, No. 2, 2013, p.142 (Henceforth, Liss: "New Actors and the State: Addressing Maritime Security Threats in Southeast Asia")
[44] Liss, Carolin: "The Privatisation of Maritime Security in Southeast Asia: the impact on regional security cooperation", *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, Vol.68, No.2, Taylor and Francis Group, 2014, p.135 (Henceforth, Liss: "The Privatisation of Maritime Security in Southeast Asia: the impact on regional security cooperation")
[45] Liss: "New Actors and the State: Addressing Maritime Security Threats in Southeast Asia", p.143
[46] Jackson: "Security", *Politics in the Developing World*, p.289

its domestic political order). Meanwhile, it can also pursue other goals like prosperity and protecting human rights but those aims must always take a back seat to survive. This is because if a state has no survival, it cannot pursue those other goals.[47] Undoubtedly, all states have been struggling for powers. For this purpose, they are primarily motivated by desire or greediness for military or economic power rather than by ideas or ethics. Therefore, realists' core theme is egoism plus equals power politics.[48] From 1940 up to now, this 'realistic' view continues to underpin most governments' foreign policy. Moreover, they refuse the act of humanitarian intervention because they accuse the state which did the action of R2P as a disguise for its national interests, for example, the 2008 USA's invasion in Iraq.[49] Therefore, the old concept of security cannot be replaced by the new, broad concept.

Liberal view

In the liberal view, security is perceived as a challenge to the negative effects of anarchy through collective security mechanisms because of new security issues which are transnational character in nature. Most of those are inevitably global concerns. Liberals adhere that the main actors in international system are not only states but also others like international organizations, non-governmental organizations, private companies and so on. Liberalism reflects a belief in the supreme importance of the human individual with equal moral worth and separate and unique identities, individual freedom or liberty but 'freedom under the law', that is, one person's liberty may not be a threat to the liberty of others, reason which aims to place their faith in the ability of individuals to make wise judgements on their own behalf, in most cases, being the best judges of their own interests by debating and arguing their differences rather than wars; toleration , consent and constitutionalism.[50] Under those liberal points, the ambitions of sovereign states can be constrained through mechanisms which take the forms of international regimes or international organizations. This is known as 'liberal institutionalism'. In essence, liberals oppose realist view of national security through supporting the idea of 'collective security'.[51] In this sense, individuals have been regarded as the main objects of security.

Critical views

 The two critical theories that address the concept of security most clearly are constructivism and feminism. Constructivists argue that interactions between states are mediated by values, norms, beliefs and assumptions that structure two main elements: how states see themselves and how they understand, and respond to, the structures within which they operate. For example, state behavior is not determined by the structural dynamics of international anarchy, but by how they view that anarchy. According to a constructivist, Alexander Wendt, anarchy is what states make of it. Some states view anarchy as dangerous and threatening but others may see it as the basis for freedom and opportunity. Hence, an 'anarchy of friends' is very

---

[47] Garner, Robert and others: *Introduction to Politics*, 2012 (Second Edition), Oxford University Press, UK, p.369 (Henceforth, Garner and others: *Introduction to Politics*)
[48] Haywood: *Politics*, p.408
[49] Garner and others: *Introduction to Politics*, p.370
[50] Haywood: *Politics*, p.33
[51] Haywood: *Politics*, p.410

different from an 'anarchy of enemies'. Constructivists argue that it is possible that states may transcend a narrow conception of self-interests and embrace the cause of global justice, even cosmopolitanism.[52] Cosmopolitanism means a belief in 'a world state'. Under the concept of cosmopolitanism, moral cosmopolitanism is considered as a belief that the world constitutes a single moral community in that people have obligation (potentially) towards all other people in the world. In this case, there is no recognition of nationality, religion, ethnicity and so on. It believes that every individual has equal moral worth to enjoy the doctrine of human rights. Moreover, political/ legal/ institutional cosmopolitanism is to reach global political institutions, possibly a world government. Nevertheless, most modern cosmopolitans prefer power sharing between global, national and local levels to power accumulation in a single world government.[53] Hence, constructivists' idea of security is based on the norm of worldwide paradigm.

There is also another critical view of feminists on the realist view of security with two other grounds. First, it is suggested masculinist assumptions about rivalry, competition and inevitable conflict. Its tendency is to see the world in terms of interactions amongst a series of power seeking, autonomous actors. Second, feminists argue that as a result of the security paradox, the conventional idea of national security tends to be self-defeating. This creates what has been called 'insecurity of security'. The concept of 'security paradox' is the paradox that a building up of military capacity designed to strengthen national security may be counter-productive, in that it encourages other states to adopt more threatening and hostile postures. For many feminists, the gendered nature of war and armed conflict amongst others also affects the gendered nature of security.[54]

Conclusion

The post-Cold War period has not only seen the emergence of new threats to international and global security but also witnessed the emergence of rethinking about the nature of security. The key shift of security conceptualization has been from an attribute of a state ('state security' or 'national security' or 'domestic security') to a matter for the individual ('human security'). In changing security discourses, different concepts of security were created by different places on the basis of various security threats. However, even human security concept has challenges. By extending the concept of security beyond 'freedom from fear' to include 'freedom from want', the concept of human security has deepened and widened the concept of security. As a result, it is potential to extend the responsibilities of the international community. Nevertheless, this risks more extending security conceptualization to be virtually meaningless and creates false expectations about the international community's capacity to banish violence and insecurity.

---

[52] Haywood: *Politics*, p.411

[53] Haywood, Andrew: *Global Politics*, 2011, Palgrave Macmillan, UK, p.21 (Henceforth, Haywood: *Global Politics*)

[54] Haywood: *Politics*, p.411

Bibliography

Acharya, Amitav: "Changing Conceptions of security in the 21st Century: Power, Institutions, and Ideas", *Conference Paper*, Zhejiang University, 2009

Acharya, Amitav: "Human Security", *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, 2014, Oxford University Press, UK

Baldwin, David. D: "The Concept of Security", *Review of International Studies,* British International Studies Association, 1997

BOSTON UNIVERSITY LAW REVIEW, Vol. 95:1369

Caballero, Mely: "Nontraditional Security, Regionalism and the State in Southeast Asia", 2008

Chaudhuri, Saurabh: "Defining non-traditional Security Threats, Global India Foundation", 2010

Cohen,Richard and Mihalka, Michael: *Cooperative Security: New Horizons for International Order,* The Marshall Centre Paper No.3, 2012

Evans, Graham and Newnham, Jeffrey: *The Penguin Dictionary of International Relations*, 1998, Penguin Books Ltd., London

Garner, Robert and others: *Introduction to Politics*, 2012 (Second Edition), Oxford University Press, UK

Haywood, Andrew: "Chapter 3: Politics and the State", *Politics*, 2013 (fourth edition), Palgrave Macmillan, UK

Haywood, Andrew: *Global Politics*, 2011, Palgrave Macmillan, UK

Herrmann, Wilfried A.: "ASEAN Perspective on Challenges and Opportunities of Partnerships across the Seas", Maritime Affairs: *Journal of the National Maritime Foundation of India*, 2015

Human Development Report 1944, 1944, Oxford University Press, UK, p.3

Hussein, K.,Gnisci, D. and Wanjiru, J.: Security and Human Security: An Overview of Concepts and Initiatives: What Implications for West Africa?

Jackson, Nicole: "Security", *Politics in the Developing World*, 2014, Oxford University Press, UK

James E. Steiner, Dr.: "Improving Homeland Security at the State Level", Centre for the Study of Intelligent Publications, Vol.53, No.3, 2009, USA

Liss, Carolin: "New Actors and the State: Addressing Maritime Security Threats in Southeast Asia", Contemporary Southeast Asia, Vol.35, No. 2, 2013

Liss, Carolin: "The Privatisation of Maritime Security in Southeast Asia: the impact on regional security cooperation", *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, Vol.68, No.2, Taylor and Francis Group, 2014

Newcombe, Hanna: "What is Common Security?: A Conceptual Comparison", *Peace Magazine*, August-September 1990

Roskin, Michael G. and Berry, Nicholas O.: "Chapter 12: Security and Insecurity", *The New World of International Relations*, 2015 (tenth edition), Pearson, Boston

Sykes, David: "In the Post-9/11 Era is "the Responsibility to Protect" Irrelevant?, 2009, Lancaster University, E-International Relations Publishing

Winter, Jacob: Freedom From Fear: A New Paradigm for Human Security?, 2014