

FAULT LINES AFTER THE COLD WAR: THE VERTICAL EXPANSION OF THE CONCEPT OF SECURITY, SECURITIZATION AND HUMAN SECURITY

LINHAS DE FRATURA APÓS A GUERRA FRIA: A EXPANSÃO VERTICAL DO CONCEITO DE SEGURANÇA, SECURITIZAÇÃO E SEGURANÇA HUMANA

CARLOS FREDERICO DA SILVA PEREIRA GAMA

Professor de Relações Internacionais da PUC-Rio

Doutor em Relações Internacionais pela PUC-Rio

E-mail: surrealogos@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: The paper approaches the “vertical expansion of the concept of security” reconstructing the debate on the concept of security within the discipline of International Relations after the Cold War. Considering that security is an “essentially contested concept”, it offers a handful of comparisons between different conceptions, which provide different accounts of “broadening” security. Barry Buzan’s Securitization approach was the first to engage seriously the challenges of “broadening” security in IR. For its merits, however, Buzan’s communitarian ontology poses a problem to “broadening” security, as it reiterates the state as the gatekeeper of protection and as the authoritative site for defining existential threats. In this sense, in spite of all its overriding ambiguity, Human Security provides a better alternative for the “vertical expansion of the concept of security” than securitization. The paper, therefore, considers the respective contributions of securitization and human security to the debate on the vertical expansion of security under the light of the relationship between states and human beings.

Keywords: Security, Securitization, Human Security

RESUMO: O artigo aborda a “expansão vertical do conceito de Segurança” através da reconstrução do debate sobre o conceito na disciplina de Relações Internacionais após o fim da Guerra Fria. Considerando a Segurança como “um conceito essencialmente contestado”, o artigo estabelece comparações entre diferentes concepções, as quais tornam possíveis diferentes “ampliações” da



CARLOS FREDERICO DA SILVA PEREIRA GAMA

Segurança. A Securitização proposta por Barry Buzan foi a primeira abordagem a encarar seriamente os desafios de “ampliar” Segurança nas RI. Apesar de seus méritos, porém, a *ontologia comunitarista* de Buzan impõe limites à “ampliação” da Segurança, ao passo que reitera o estado como principal provedor de proteção e lócus autoritativo para definir *ameaças existenciais*. Nesse sentido, apesar de sua considerável ambiguidade, a Segurança Humana nos proporciona uma alternativa mais adequada para a “expansão vertical do conceito de Segurança” que a Securitização. O artigo, portanto, aborda as contribuições respectivas da Securitização e da Segurança Humana para o debate sobre a “expansão vertical do conceito de Segurança” à luz do relacionamento entre estados e seres humanos.

Palavras-chave: Segurança, Securitização, Segurança Humana

INTRODUCTION

Security has been a key issue for International Relations (IR); usually, it has been considered a foundational issue. We often find lessons, in IR manuals, on how the grim events of World War I inspired the birth of the discipline – as said by Carr (1939). References to foundational great debates – for example, Banks (1985) and Kahler (1997) – are numerous and security occupies a privileged place in most of them – if not all. According to Williams (2008: 1), “*Security matters*”. This is an interesting starting point. In what sense could *defining security* matter?

Defining security, in hindsight, can be considered a matter of *discipline-building*. By defining security this or that way, the borders between disciplines in social sciences may or may not be shaken accordingly. It is particularly relevant, for IR as a *contested* discipline, to take into consideration the relevance of this kind of meta-theoretical reflection.

Even this said IR students and practitioners, sovereigns, international bureaucrats and many other human beings related to *the international realm* in some fashion diverge in what regards the meaning of *security*. The very definition of security has become an entrenched political landscape for turf wars, within and



CARLOS FREDERICO DA SILVA PEREIRA GAMA

beyond IR. In such a context, (re)thinking security becomes akin to reflecting on some of IR's (alleged) foundations. Being succinct not always pays off. There are strong *inter-disciplinary* incentives for reflecting on the concept of security, its limits and proposed expansions. The debate is not only driven by matters of problem solving within a discipline – it also impinges on *defining disciplines and managing their borders*.

In the words of Sheehan (2005), Security is a contested concept. We can translate that contestation in terms of security being a social construction, as said by Booth (2005). Those involved in defining security simultaneously mobilize material and symbolic resources. Security is not just an academic enterprise; what is framed as *security* reverbs through social networks, in which concepts are turned into policies, impacting the lives of human beings. Concepts as *pragmatic* entities can be mobilized either to legitimize a given social order or to unsettle its foundations. Security, usually considered the highest goal of human collectivities, dwells under sheets of urgency and exceptionality. Security as a concept becomes oblique.

Routinely dealing with a contested concept that matters, a growing awareness in the IR community is arising in what regards the non-triviality of defining, reflecting on, delving into security. Approaching security with eyes wide opened, in this paper I notice a series of ambivalent accounts overlapping, remarkably contrasting with the rather predictable, grayscale picture of decades ago. The *sedimentary* form of current *security studies* is a challenge to practitioners and ordinary people alike. All at once we deal with *expansion, critical accounts, new dimensions, referents, "sectors"*, a host of *securities* apart from the usual suspects (*national, international and collective security*) – *environmental security, economic security, societal security, human security, etc.*



CARLOS FREDERICO DA SILVA PEREIRA GAMA

In this paper I approach a particular kind of expansion of the concept of security, the so-called *vertical* expansion. By taking sides with a *vertical* expansion one can arguably ask what would account for a *horizontal* one. Then we have a resulting two-dimensional security *matrix*. The picture of this *matrix* mirrors the impulse of *mapping* new meanings attributed to security. Matrices are one of the most striking (re)inventions of Modernity. The Cartesian plan, the geometric perspective in Renaissance, the Mercator projection in Geography – all matrices of space and time that informed our routes to Modernity. As this two-dimensional metaphor gets under the skin, ambiguities abound. What is tailor-made for the rows and what is adequate for the columns? Our contested concept that matters maybe prove too good for the metaphor's own good. By adopting an approach informed by the *angularity* of a vertical-horizontal matrix of *expanded* security, will we arrive at new wine in old bottles? What about remains spilling over and only duly acquiescing to a two-dimensional categorization?

My paper does not provide answers to those meta-theoretical inquiries. Rather, it brings to surface some *fault lines* triggered when the *vertical expansion of the concept of security* was invoked in the IR literature. By doing so, the paper constitutes a reflective effort on the *ontological* relevance of *defining* security.

Barry Buzan's Securitization approach was the first to engage seriously the challenges of "broadening" security in IR. For its merits, however, Buzan's communitarian ontology poses a problem to "broadening" security. It reiterates the state as the gatekeeper of protection, as the authoritative site for defining existential threats.

In this sense, in spite of all its overriding ambiguity, Human Security provides a better alternative for the "vertical expansion of the concept of security" than securitization. My paper, therefore, considers the respective contributions of securitization and human security to the debate on the vertical expansion of security under the light of the relationship between states and human beings.



CARLOS FREDERICO DA SILVA PEREIRA GAMA

In order to access the *vertical expansion of the concept of security*, firstly it is important to approach the "*original*" inception of the concept. The next section will provide a starting point for this debate.

THE TRADITIONAL CONCEPTION

Witnessing the end of Cold War, Stephen Walt (1991) provided an eloquent, fiery defence of what he calls the *traditional concept* of security, in his attempt to reorganize a discipline "*in disarray*" during a tectonic shift in international relations. According to Walt, the siren's call of sudden change should not undermine the efforts of generations of *security studies* practitioners – the perils of disciplinary decadence were, then, present as never before. After recapitulating "*the successes and findings*" of *security studies* (and *strategic studies*) in the 20th century, as well as the political relevance of this field of study for the lives of human beings living in a world of sovereign states, Walt criticizes the search for alternative, *broad* conceptions of security.

Adhering to an unchangeable, parsimonious, "*scientific*" definition of security, the author reaffirms that security deals with "*the threat, actual use and control of military force between sovereign states*" (Ibid. 212), a definition inherited from strategic studies and consecrated in the first issue of "*the field's prominent journal, International Security*" (Ibid.). In Walt's words, the traditional definition sees the states' survival associated with their ability to deter and respond to internal and external aggression. Security is, thus, framed as military capabilities (the creation, the maintenance and the possible or actual use of military force by sovereign states).

Walt's traditional conception of security rests, according to Bartelson (2001), on an *ontological* distinction – between the sovereign *domestic* realm of a given state and the anarchical *international* realm of sovereign states. Those



CARLOS FREDERICO DA SILVA PEREIRA GAMA

realms are politically diverse. The *domestic* realm is a politically *secure* environment in which citizens authorize their state and the resulting hierarchy feeds back as security. On the other hand, the *international* realm is a politically *insecure* environment, in which the absence of authority limits the prospects of security provision.

International anarchy, in the words of one of its prominent proponents, Kenneth Waltz (1979) is a political system in which its agents, the sovereign states, relentlessly compete for security. Sovereign states are *self-help* agents, in the sense that they can only resort to their own efforts seeking for survival in the anarchical context. The logic of sovereign states' interaction differs from the logics of individuals interacting within a given sovereign state, something Waltz admits. Other IR realists such as Hans Morgenthau (1948) highlight the ethical implications of such ontological distinction between the domestic and the international realms – involving rationality, the *national interest* problematic and the struggle for *power* and *status*.

We are left chronically insecure, as the binary *sovereignty-anarchy* informs the ontology of security. *International* security becomes a game of *self-help* sovereign states, each counting on its own conception of "*national security*". Survival equals preserving the state's sovereignty – hierarchy on the "*inside*" and anarchy on the "*outside*". Sovereignty and anarchy are mutually reinforcing features in the traditional conception. It presupposes that the divide between the domestic and the international stands still.

The aforementioned divide arises from a particular conception of political relations on the "*inside*" that spills over into political relations on the "*outside*". In domestic political relations, the traditional conception postulates an exclusive *security bond* between the sovereign state and its citizens. It is said to be tantamount, for the sovereign state, to keep its citizens *safe* from other political entities. The latter are depicted as potential or actual *security* threats. However,



CARLOS FREDERICO DA SILVA PEREIRA GAMA

there is another relevance to those alleged threats – they may unsettle the domestic authority of the sovereign state, providing a window of opportunity for subversion, dissidence, rebellion, revolution, secessionism, insurrection.

The political relevance of “threats” is mirrored at the “international level” once the aforementioned domestic exclusive bond between citizens and sovereign state becomes “representation” when the sovereign state interacts with other sovereign states. The state is considered the representative of its citizens; there is no direct interaction between human beings in the “international”, accordingly. The traditional conception professes an explicit scepticism regarding the prospects of human beings seeking security beyond the sovereign state. Through sovereign states, what is possible is an *ad hoc mutual restraint* situation, in which sovereign states form groups (through *the balance of power* mechanism).

As this paper deals with the *vertical expansion* of the concept of security, one arguably may ask why the concept needs to be expanded, by adopting the traditional conception – as Benjamin Miller (2001) did.

Miller criticized the idea of expanding the concept of security employing arguments similar to Walt’s reaffirmation of the so-called traditional conception of Security. According to Walt, if the concept of security inherited from strategic studies was loosened, there would no point in talking about security anymore, once the definition is what constitutes the concept (and its correlate discipline) vis-à-vis others. Security Studies would lose its cohesion, its coherence and even its scientific status as a result of such “*temerity*”.

If we remain within the confines of military relations between sovereign states, the overtly “*critical*” alternative to the traditional conception of security is *collective security*. Authors such as Inis Claude (1962) highlighted the idea that states, acting collectively, could employ armed force as a matter of perpetuating the *status quo*, supporting the inviolability of borders by countering and deterring



CARLOS FREDERICO DA SILVA PEREIRA GAMA

aggression. When the majority of sovereign states share a minimal amount of *status quo* behaviour in an *international* system, in the words of Claude, we fulfil one criterion for the emergence of a *collective security* system. It presupposes material capabilities, but it rests on normative ground. 19th century European order (from the Congress of Vienna onwards), taken as a social system, was able to spread this kind of behaviour – the Concert of Europe stands as a dry run. In an optimistic account of the traditional concept, the use of force by sovereign states shifts from part of the problem to a key asset in the *management* of international *anarchy*.

But there was another requirement that 19th century Europe couldn't fulfil – adequate international institution to handle collective security matters in "*neutral*" fashion (as neutral as one can get with great powers at the heart of such a system, as stressed by Claude). The Concert of Europe was just the first inception of an extended process of social change that would include the *international bureaus* of the 19th century, as well as late 19th-early 20th century's Peace Conferences at The Hague.

It was only after World War I that most states fell (for a moment) under the spell of *status quo* behaviour; conditions were adequate for the inception of an international organization specialized at helping states avoid the scourge of war and handle force collectively. We know this first attempt, the League of Nations, was not an extraordinary success – but its pioneering character cannot be underestimated. The United Nations (UN) followed another global conflict. Back in 1945, the UN was engendered as a "*collective security*" organization comprising the sovereign states that won World War II. It was an organization raised from the smithereens of a global conflict, meant as an international asset for restricting the use of force – for rendering exceptional the use of force between sovereign states.



CARLOS FREDERICO DA SILVA PEREIRA GAMA

Collective security kept the use of force at bay but it still presupposed the centrality of states and the prevalence of *high over low* politics. As a matter of ruptures within the field of security studies, other alternatives provided more daring challenges.

BROADENING SECURITY: *HORIZONTALITY WITHOUT VERTICALITY*

The debate on expanding the concept of security arises from critical approaches to security – such as Booth (2005), Krause & Williams (1997). Critical approaches to security open the concept's "*black box*" – its ontology. Such openness brings to the fore entities beneath and above the sovereign state as "*referents*" of security (*vertical expansion*). It also represents the emergence of *issue-areas* challenging military issues as sources of threats (*horizontal expansion*).

As above-mentioned, traditional approaches to Security (adopted by strategic studies and IR's strands of realism) define security by associating the concept with state's survival. Human beings are seen as beneficiaries of state's security ("*human*" security is redundant). Expanding the concept of security beyond the confines of the state implicates falling prey to an *idealistic* deontology or, at least, a *cosmopolitan* teleology.

1983 was a pivotal year for the debate on the expansion of the concept of security. It spawned two relevant contributions, one promising a tentative middle ground, the other more overtly critic of the traditional concept. The former contribution, Richard Ullman's "*Redefining Security*" will be detailed as follows. The latter, Barry Buzan's "*People, State and Fear*", will be analysed in the next session.



CARLOS FREDERICO DA SILVA PEREIRA GAMA

By symptomatically titling his article "*Redefining Security*" Ullman (1983) poses a question: *why shall be security redefined?* The anarchical character of the international system provides the answer. The growing level of interaction between sovereign states, cutting across every boundary, engenders new security threats at the *international* level, which reverberate at the *domestic* level as renewed need for policymaking. Therefore, Ullman neither undermines state sovereignty, nor replaces international anarchy with a new organizing principle or authoritative norm. The exclusive bond between state and citizens remains. Expanding security is a complimentary, pragmatic device.

That is why Ullman starts with *national security*. Sovereign states shall expand their conception of security to respond to emergent threats at the *international* level – drug trafficking, the (unsettling by 1983) ozone layer depletion, terrorism etc. Writing in the early 1980s, Ullman considers such threats unable to replace the Cold War's security agenda geared at superpowers – rather, they enhance its complexity.

The traditional conception, focused on military affairs, is rather inadequate a guide for action as we face other *issue-areas* which have become dangerous in their own ways. One of the most relevant contributions of Ullman's approach is the (re)opening of security's *black box* – bringing to surface its political implications. Besides military issues, there are other *issues that matter*. In this sense, Ullman proposes a *horizontal* expansion of the concept of security. *What values does Security promote? What would we be ready to do* (in terms of symbolic and material sacrifices) *in order to foster security?*

Ullman defines the state as a social phenomenon, a security provider. All socially relevant values would depend on security – in doing so, the author recalls Thomas Hobbes. Security on "*the inside*" and on "*the outside*" comprises the two sides of the social coin. *Contra* Hobbes, Ullman believes security to be a relative value, not an absolute one – societies can trade security for freedom, especially



CARLOS FREDERICO DA SILVA PEREIRA GAMA

democratic ones. There is a set of possible trade-offs between security and other values.

Highlighting the trade-offs between security and freedom, Ullman sidelines a potential *ontological paradox* of his account. By emphasizing democratic societies, which engender sovereign states, Ullman consider as unusual events states threatening the lives and values of its citizens. He recognizes that trade-offs between security and other values may eventually place citizens under *friendly fire* (for example, in "*totalitarian*" states such as the former USSR). That is why the author, remarkably, affirms that national security and Human Rights go hand in hand in democratic societies.

However, when Human Rights are tangled up in national security, we are left with no alternative to exclusive bonds between state and citizens – the traditional ontology is reaffirmed. The state remains the stronger element in this relationship. It is the state that *represents* citizens in the *international realm*. There is no escape from sovereignty and, paradoxically, Human Rights become a preserve of sovereign states instead of non-sovereign international organizations. Parodying Ullman, both superpowers defended their respective version of *rights* during the Cold War, according to their respective *national security* goals. Ullman's redefinition of security avoids the complexity of a *vertical* dimension.

The *state-as-threat* approach was left for other alternative conceptualizations of security. Barry Buzan's contribution comprises the next few sections.

BROADENING SECURITY: *HORIZONTALITY WITH (SOME) VERTICALITY*

Barry Buzan's groundbreaking "*People, States and Fear*" (1983) challenged the realist orthodoxy in IR, just a few years after Kenneth Waltz's powerful reinvention of realism in his "*Theory of International Politics*". Waltz did not deny



CARLOS FREDERICO DA SILVA PEREIRA GAMA

the existence, or the relevance, of other political entities apart from the sovereign state. He also did not deny the relevance of non-military issues. The decisive move in his work, conferring centrality to states and consecrating the prevalence of *high politics* over *low politics*, derives from his account of anarchy as a *social structuring principle*, which triggers competition between political unities (engulfing the prospect of cooperation in other issue-areas), and which places sovereignty above other social phenomena. Therefore, the states' primacy was a matter of systemic competitive efficiency.

It was Buzan who, for the first time, put into question the preponderance of *high politics*. He affirms that security was "*systematically forgotten*" in IR (Ibid. 35). Trying to *rescue* security from the wilderness, the author highlighted *the politics of defining security*. Security involves a perennial reflection on the core values of a collectivity – and on the ways of fostering them. This was not entirely new – realists such as Morgenthau and Arnold Wolfers dealt with *agonistic* challenges (in their view, propelling *self-help* behaviour).

Nevertheless, Buzan, Olaf Weaver and others added nuances to carve an image of the world unsettling for realists. For the latter, security was a matter of *high politics*; there was a fixed set of threats to (state) integrity and values, which comprised the whole field of security studies. This alleged "parsimony" and "natural character" were pivotal elements in Stephen Walt's defence of the traditional approach and would provide justification for his disapproval of "broadening" alternatives. For Buzan *et al*, security is a matter of politics, simply put. Security is what political communities make of it. Therefore, they propose that the concept of security shall be expanded to account for new referents of security and non-military threats – as exposed in Buzan, Wæver and deWilde (1998) – instead of sticking to the old divide between *high* and *low* politics. Emerging threats to communal security (including environmental ones) become



CARLOS FREDERICO DA SILVA PEREIRA GAMA

as relevant, if not more relevant than, the threat of use of force by another sovereign state.

Buzan's contributions range from its 1983 book to latter works, which alternate between the *English School* of IR and the Copenhagen School of security studies. The author initially provides a critical account of Waltz's "*Man, the State and War*".

Waltz organized and evaluated the merits of a set of answers given by the discipline of *international political theory* to the question of the causes of war. He reaches three answers or *images* – man, the structure of states as *units* and the international system.

The author postulates that there is no relevant empirical correlation between the structure of states *as units* and the frequency, or the outbreak, of wars. In a critique addressed to 1950s behaviourists, Waltz says that empirical evidence does not match any of the proposed accounts of "*human nature*" by the 20th century. Therefore, we are left with the *third* image, the international system. Waltz says that this may prove a valuable hypothesis: that the anarchical character of the international system accounts for the frequency and the outbreak of wars.

That hypothesis was outlined in depth in Waltz's 1979 book *Theory of International Politics*. Anarchy is said to be an "*organizing principle*". Like-units (sovereign states) compete for security in an anarchical international system. Anarchy affects states' behaviour and the prospects for cooperation. It triggers the "*self-help*" behaviour. States regard other states as actual or potential threats and thus gather (material) resources for a future conflict, or for deterring aggressions. The formation of alliances is an outcome of the "*self-help*" behaviour. The enemy of my enemy becomes my temporary ally. By virtue of anarchy the whole international system becomes "*balanced*" and "*imbalanced*" from time to time.



CARLOS FREDERICO DA SILVA PEREIRA GAMA

Waltz (1959: 1) considers that men live in states and states live in a world of states. Buzan's starting point is a critical reflection on those relationships: men-state, state(s)-state(s).

Buzan considers that security is an underdeveloped concept in IR – usually cast in loose conceptions of "*national power*". Discarding the idea that the concept may prove too complex to handle, he considers other hypotheses – that there is an overlapping between security and power; that so-called alternative theories in IR are recalcitrant of dealing with a concept wholeheartedly associated with Realism; the long-lasting effects of methodological obsessions associated with the behaviourist "revolution"; the impact of *Strategic Studies* and its interface with governments; finally, and most relevant, Buzan (1983: 5-8) considers that depicting something as "*security*" evades the confines of *domestic* policymaking.

The author advances his reflection, disentangling individual security from state security, on grounds that both *entities* are relevant for "*societal construction of security*" (Ibid. 35). Contradictions and ambivalence abound in the relationship once individuals' security is not just a matter of "material satisfaction". Additionally, the state as sovereign can be a source of threat at least as much as it can provide security; the state has "*two faces*" (Ibid. 36-37). Buzan also disentangled state (national) security from international security on grounds that anarchy, as a permissive cause of conflict, doesn't inevitably entail conflict (Ibid. 37-38). The relevance of "*context*" is noticeable when the author sees different and conflicting accounts of *international* security arising in different parts of the globe.

The previous paragraphs sketch Buzan's justification for expanding the concept of security. In a certain sense, the individual is the only "*irreducible object of security*" (Ibid. 34) but states also have a conception of security that cannot be reduced to a sum of individual *securities*. The same can be said of the *international realm* as a political and social space – it is not just an anarchical



CARLOS FREDERICO DA SILVA PEREIRA GAMA

system. Altogether, those security theses mean the state no longer monopolizes the concept. This is an early version of the *vertical expansion* of the concept of security.

One step further (*widening and deepening*) in his ground-breaking contribution to the debate on the concept of security, during the 1990s Buzan and scholars associated with the Copenhagen School of security studies attributed to human communities the ability to *make* security, that is, to dialogically constitute which would be the most relevant, urgent threats to socially consecrated values. *Horizontal* expansion corresponds to translating collective deliberation into policies for *issue-areas* (the environment, economy etc.).

Securitization brings about a discontinuity with the traditional approach when it considers that the meaning of "*security*" is indeterminate. What shall be *secured*? Who is relevant to be *secured*? By which means shall we *secure*? Those questions have no *a priori* answers. Security falls under the scrutiny of human communities/collectivities. Human beings collectively organized (an element which will be dealt extensively in the *Fault lines* section) decide what is essential in terms of being turned into "*security*".

The traditional conception presupposes a set of fundamental *political decisions*. Such decisions preside over the distinction between the domestic polity and the international anarchy. They also set citizens apart from their sovereign state (hierarchically superior), which is their representative in *the international realm*. Sovereignty implicates anarchy and, in the traditional approach, sovereignty is driven by security. Security matters are not simply thrown away to the "*other side*" of the border, in the wilderness of the *international realm*. Sovereignty implicates the state's autonomy to act *in the name of* its citizens – even if they may disagree. *Domestic* hierarchy becomes *international* acquiescence when citizens are turned into soldiers or non-combatants. *They are neither deciding to wage war nor making peace*.



CARLOS FREDERICO DA SILVA PEREIRA GAMA

Buzan says there is a set of political *channels* and institutions that structure the domestic policymaking process – “*business as usual*”. Political questions can be solved within this *legal* framework, through established forms of authority. Security, on the other hand, transcends those channels – it is placed beyond “*business as usual*”. Usually, dysfunctional political processes *make* an initially *non-security* issue become more dangerous, an *existential* threat.

Securitization implicates that *something* deemed essential is detached from the usual funnels of domestic political decision; that *something* is managed, as a matter of priority, in urgent terms, as a special political decision that is placed above politics itself – as stated in Buzan et al (1998: 23). The pragmatic character of language is essential in such an approach, allowing the compatibilization of “*worldviews*” and the constitution of collective action (Ibid.). On the other hand, the notion of security as something objective and neutral is lost, once we produce knowledge through language and language modifies the objects of inquiry.

Ontology is a constant feature in Buzan’s works. In the case of securitization, ontological implications are immediate. Securitization promotes twofold reorganization – lexical and practical. Security no longer refers to a specific, *a priori* set of phenomena; it becomes a contextual human artefact. *Making* security becomes interwoven with communication, collective deliberation. The sovereign state is just one among other human collectivities. Securitization becomes a dialogic process, what differs substantially from the set of positivist epistemologies that inform the traditional conception. Even this said, for Buzan *et al*, securitization is compatible with Imre Lakatos’ (1980) standards of scientific practice; it would be even able to *incorporate* the traditional approach alluding to the concept of “*threat*” and the study of “*sectors*”.



FAULT LINES

Previously I addressed Buzan's reworking of Waltz's ontology inside out, unveiling the correspondent need for *expanding* the concept of security beyond the *traditional* one-dimensional, state-centric, military-focused conception. However, there is more to his contribution than simply pioneering a *matrix* metaphor. Buzan's re-reading of Waltz *Man, the State and War's* triptych of "*alleged causes of war*" (man, state and international system) allowed for the disentanglement of the entities – individuals, states, the international system, each taken as a particular "*referent of security*". The outcome is a plurality of possible security *arrangements* arising from different "issue-areas", not confined to military issues between sovereign states. *Vertical* and *horizontal* expansion?

Even considering that Waltz' anarchy may be too narrow an anarchy, the *logic of anarchy* remains a powerful drive in PSF. Buzan bears a more than deceptive resemblance to structural realism, as his account of anarchy keeps pushing individuals to states. In an anarchical system, even though a non-Hobbesian one, states remain the focal point.

In Buzan's ontology, there are traces of international security as well as blossoming demands for individual security. Nevertheless, one of his striking features – the disentanglement of *men, state and international system* – is somehow reversed when Buzan considers that the state is not just a different referent of security. The state remains, in Buzan (1983: 61), "*the most efficient provider of security*" to other referents. The ever growing but still diffuse "*international social environment*" is not as secure a provider of security as the sovereign state. It depends on the loose process of "*regionalization*" and "*internationalization*" of social practices to become *significant* as a security provider.



CARLOS FREDERICO DA SILVA PEREIRA GAMA

The relative fluidity of the *international realm* converges to a rump state-centrism. On the other hand, men are vulnerable and "*state security*" cannot be reduced to a sum of individual securities (Ibid. 37-40). The ontological distinction between referents and the ontological vulnerability attributed to men push forward an "*alliance*" between state and men.

As Buzan and his colleagues gradually developed "*securitization*" this *ontological drawback* got more sophisticated. Securitization presupposes human beings collectively organized, *making* security through collective deliberation.

One of Buzan's most noticeable contributions to the debate on the concept of security is the *politicization* of security. It is not devoid of problems, though. Securitization *politicizes* security by treating security as the outcome of a compelling process of collective deliberation, not restricted to military and diplomatic bureaucracies. *The distinction of security and politics becomes political*. That constitutive process feeds back internally, as strengthening or weakening of the state's authority; it also spills over to the *international realm* through representation.

It is, thus, the *absence* of human beings collectively organized that accounts for Buzan's sparse accounts of *international* security. Collective deliberation at the *international* level is further complicated (in dialogic terms, *distorted*) by human beings' membership in bounded political communities, which engender particular, conflicting, often *incommensurable* conceptions of "*existential threats*". The *international realm* is too pluralistic – a Tower of Babel – and it lacks the benefits of a bounded, *enrooted* community of belonging. Buzan, in this sense, embraces a *communitarian ontology*. Communities are presupposed; they persist in time. The resilience of human communities (a set of specific human communities) poses obstacles to *securitizing* beyond and beneath the state.



CARLOS FREDERICO DA SILVA PEREIRA GAMA

Another ontological problem is unveiled by Daniel Deudney's (1990) critique of *securitization* (from an environmental standpoint). Deudney considers shallow the prospects of the environment becoming more *secure* through *securitization*. In the author's words, the collective deliberation that turns *something* into *security* is not a neutral, *tabula rasa* process. Collective deliberation starts with the image of threats to socially consecrated values. There is an *elective affinity* between this concept of security and the traditional concern with military issues. The military as a *symbolic* resource previously available to human collectivities decisively informs securitizing moves that frame threats and issue-areas *as if they were* traditional threats in military terms – even when such issue-areas are ontologically distinct from the actual or potential use of violence. There is a *symbolic spillover*, according to Deudney. The environment not only would have been framed *as a military issue accordingly*, military and diplomatic bureaucracies remain in charge of environmental affairs. Steven Elbe (2005) employs a similar argument to criticize the idea of *securitizing* HIV/AIDS.

As innovative and challenging as Buzan's and Copenhagen scholars' works have been, there is a noticeable amount of continuity in securitization. It implicates the kind of exclusive bond – between human beings and a specific political entity endowed with the monopoly of the legitimate use of force – typical of modern politics. Securitization presupposes a fixed authority relation, between states and citizens in the domestic realm, whereas in the international real sovereign states rule themselves in anarchy (in this account of international society Copenhagen gets closer to England). This postulate – *that we need a political community whose boundaries are given before we can make security, as a collective enterprise* – frames the state in tones not that dissimilar to the traditional conception: human beings' protector and the pivotal political framework in Modernity.



CARLOS FREDERICO DA SILVA PEREIRA GAMA

Buzan *et al* presuppose an *a priori* consolidated political framework through which collective deliberation *makes* security. This "*logocentric*" – as said by David Campbell (1996) – element entices the resilience of relations of authority and representation *from* the state *to* its citizens. Therefore, *inner* limits rear their head, impacting the constitutive/constructive potential of securitization. Epistemology and "*scientificity*" also provide unsuspected limits – for example, when Buzan, Wilde e DeWaap (1998) say that some threats exist independently of how agents perceive them. This *ad hoc philosophical realism* provides a bridge that may prove interesting for exchanges with the traditional conception, but it limits inter-subjectivity and communication.

Through decades of relevant contribution to IR's reflection on security Buzan kept this feature of his ontology intact. Thus, the *vertical expansion of the concept of security* is a matter of *levels of analysis*. In what regards those levels, we have a previous ontological articulation between men, state and the international system, a hierarchy with dependences and assumptions, which gets loosened, but not transcended, by allusions to either *horizontal* or *vertical* expansion moves. Buzan unsettles Waltz' ontology – just not enough. Thus, Buzan invest his efforts in the *horizontal* expansion of the concept of security (*sectors*), and tacitly puts aside *vertical* expansion.

Addressing threats that transcend states' borders may be the most relevant contribution of Buzan's (and Ullman's) works to debates on the expansion of the concept of security. However, as ontology goes, Ullman and (to a lesser extent) Buzan remained attached to authority and representation, with bounded political communities at the core.

Another alternative conceptualization of would cast a shadow over Buzan's and Waltz' ontological assumptions – states usually provide human beings security and that relations of authority are fixed "*inside*" and absent "*outside*".



CARLOS FREDERICO DA SILVA PEREIRA GAMA

This is the case of the plethora of definitions gathered under the "*human security*" umbrella.

BROADENING SECURITY: *VERTICALITY BEYOND HORIZONTALITY*

Firstly, "*human security*" does not share with its counterparts the presupposition that the sovereign state is a security provider. On the one hand, interstate rivalry, enmity and jealousy are events that usually threaten the lives and well-being of populations. In an anarchic world, realists use to say, states are benign monsters; they may kill us, they sometimes make preys. Once we get secured by our particular state, we are in the (second) best of possible worlds. Against such claim, critical security theorists affirm that the state, even in domestic settings, usually falls short of security provision. "*Failed*" states are not the exclusive focus of the aforementioned critique.

What is at stake is the exclusive bond between state, the sovereign, and human beings as citizens. Sovereignty implies a Faustian deed; human lives are placed on states' hands and states draw the lines of belonging. Who counts as a citizen? Who belongs to the *social net* of Security? Uncountable ethnic minorities and political groups were *de facto* deprived of its citizenship *status* under the formal auspices of state sovereignty. Genocides, ethnic cleansing, forced displacement, *pathologic homogenization* as exposed by Heather Rae (2002) follow.

If the state becomes a source of insecurity, if sovereignty doesn't stand as a fixed principle of authority, human beings may be able to build security bonds across *the international realm* – which is also a social space – through, in spite of, state borders, building new authoritative relationships *in a global scale*. That is the bedrock of what this paper associates with Human Security.



CARLOS FREDERICO DA SILVA PEREIRA GAMA

As Nizar Messari (2002) says, neither the state is the only political entity able to provide Security, nor do Politics die down at states' borders with one another. For him, the process of statebuilding involves the building of borders, excluding human beings from the political community and *capturing* politics within the state. The state is *simultaneously a security provider to its citizens and a threat to the remainder*. It is not anarchy, but the *capture* of politics within the state that engender *depoliticized* and conflictive relations between states (what the author calls *interstatality*).

In tandem with Messari, Pinar Bilgin (2003) considers that the traditional conception of Security translates threats as externalities. It presupposes the state as a pacifier in the domestic realm and as a protector in the international realm. Once both presuppositions no longer hold, we can think of human beings seeking Security elsewhere in the *international realm* – especially those human beings in a situation of extreme fragility. The possibility of each human being living in peace within the frontiers of his respective state assumes different contours than it would in other approaches to Security. That statement belongs to UNDP's 1994 Human Development report, the document that pioneered the concept of "*Human Security*".

According to UNDP's 1994 report, Human Security aims at providing protection against sudden and harmful breakdowns of daily life. Human beings, not sovereign states, are the first subjects of Security and the state figures in the listing of actual spoilers of daily life. UNDP's concept, instead of just talking of a collective security of states, also considers "*humanity as a whole*" a subject of Security, in the sense that social international relations can bring about both Security and insecurity. In this sense, humanity-scale enterprises such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) become a relevant precedent to the 1994 proposal.



CARLOS FREDERICO DA SILVA PEREIRA GAMA

Bilgin and other authors present an array of Human Security concepts that emerged from, interacted with, or challenged UNDP's 1994 proposal. All those proposals consider the state a possible spoiler and highlight the need for transnational, global forms of authority in tandem with transnational, global security *safe nets*. Non-sovereign entities like NGOs – and the UN in special – assume a pivotal role in such academic-politic enterprise of refurbishing Security beyond and in spite of the sovereign state. Some of them are presented as follows.

Kanji Bajpai (2003: 195), considering that Human Security deals with "*how free we really are as individuals*", builds a genealogy of the concept starting in the 1970s – highlighting the normative and practical changes in Security that took place during, not just after, the Cold War. Bajpai eventually arrives at a cleavage between:

- The 1994 United Nations Development Program (UNDP) definition which, comprised "*economic security, food security, sanitary security, environmental security, personal security, communal security and political security*";
- The definition provided by *middle powers* of the 1990s, comprising states such as Canada, Japan and Norway. Bajpai employs the 1999 Canadian definition, which deals with

"...the international community's responsibility to intervene, if necessary; national policies fulfilling global patterns of Security; the intensive use of norms and strategies of Development to bring closer developed states and developing states".

Bajpai brings to surface the overriding ambiguity of Human Security. It is not a clear-cut concept that burst out of a sudden from a single source. Roland Paris (2001) reinforces that mixed feeling when he considers ironically – and



CARLOS FREDERICO DA SILVA PEREIRA GAMA

pragmatically – that the concept provides the *glue* that holds a disparate array of middle powers, Development agencies and NGOs together, otherwise fighting for dire resources and publicity that may enhance the prospects for an alternative approach to security. This is another way of saying Human Security is an emergent set of practices which wasn't fully appreciated or institutionalized; therefore sketchy, messy, demanding thick descriptions.

Even supporters of Human Security provide vivid criticism. Edward Newman (2001) says it is markedly academic and only marginally political an affair. Taylor Owens (2004) considers Human Security itself a political focus for turf wars. Anaradha M. Chenoy (2005: 167), considering the issue to be founded upon "*human rights, human aspirations and human capabilities*" says the concept is limited in what regards gender issues. Elke Krahnemann (2003) considers the UNDP proposal a supplement of the UN's policies towards states, therefore, its mainstreaming in political circles. Alex Bellamy & Matt McDonald (2002) affirm that the states' grip on of Human Security locks the unsettling changes envisioned by the concept within a traditional framework. Kerstin Mechlen (2004) considers Human Security's impacts on domestic relations of authority, once ordinary people are entitled to demand their rights in the *international realm*.

Bellamy, this time alongside Mark Beeson (2003), considers that Human Security is another way of coping, in critical key, with globalization, which produces inequalities and hardships in a global scale and which induces reflection on the relevance of borders for processes of identity-formation. Simon Dalby (1997) arguably correctly points that skipping the sovereign state does not automatically translate as a solution for Security problems in a global scale; the state may have provided some kind of tentative solution during Modernity's onset and, in this sense, alternative solutions may have to deal with their own limits in the future. In tandem with Chenoy's feminist critique, Robert BJ Walker (2006) also rather correctly affirms that the "*generic individual*" or "*humanity as a whole*"



CARLOS FREDERICO DA SILVA PEREIRA GAMA

are Modern abstractions as much the sovereign state itself – as such, they often become excuses for renewed forms of discrimination and oblivion of “others”.

The relationship between Human Security and international organizations such as the UN is relevant for reflecting on the *vertical expansion of security* as the UN, devoid of sovereignty but usually called upon to act or criticized “as if it were a state” according to Gama (2009), since its inception mirrors the ambiguities of the human beings-sovereign states relationship.

The UN was born in 1945 out of the victors of World War II – “the United Nations”. Its Charter evokes the centrality of state’s sovereignty and the inviolability of territorial borders. According to Pinar Bilgin (2003) the UN Charter mirrored a 300-years’ reflections on the *international realm* which conferred prominence to interstate conflict. Security equalled *interstate security*. Alternative conceptions of security (including, but not restricted to, cosmopolitan views) lost adeptness once the European system of states was universalized through emulation as said by Bull (1977) from an English School standpoint and violence, as stated by “critical globalists” such as Scholte (2000). An exclusive bond between states and human beings (sovereignty) becomes a covenant domestically as well internationally – a given state is (said to be) in charge of human lives “inside” and “outside”. It is hardly compelling to speak on Human Security before this exclusive bond is submitted to critical scrutiny.

This minimalist regime of Security – state as referent, territorial sovereignty as the organizing principle – decisively informed the UN’s creation. However, another unsettling event was printed all over UN’s DNA – the genocidal practices of World War II which have arisen, at least partially, from the exclusive bond between ruler and ruled, state and citizens. The UN Charter can be seen as an ambiguous deed between sovereignty and the recognition of its limits. One may even think of sovereigns selectively deconstructing the consecrated principle of their own entitlement.



Beyond the hypocrisy (or the malleability) of sovereignty we can notice that the UN is involved in a normative compromise. An often forgotten mention to "*the peoples of United Nations*" in the UN's Charter was attached to the recognition of UN member-states' sovereign prerogatives. As the *world organization* was born it was not only as collective security system, to save the legacy of the League of Nations from the scourge of war. It was an international organization built upon the idea of freedom – *freedom from want* and *freedom from fear*. Besides security, the promotion of adequate patterns of human living across the globe, through cooperative measures of member-states, was the second task of young UN. Since 1945 security and development gradually interlocked within the UN, bursting through the practices of the *world organization, exported* to the *international realm* through institutional innovation. That is mirrored, for example, in institutional changes that fostered the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The same can be said of the reconfiguration of UN peacekeeping operations (UNPKOs) during and after the Cold War as shown in Gama (2009).

Human Security, in this sense, is not a "*post-military*" strand of security but a handful of phenomena that takes place in the *borders* of the remaining security conceptions. Additionally, it does not advocate *abolishing* the state for the sake of transcending Modernity. Zaryab Iqbal (2006) acutely criticizes this rather hollow anti-statism by saying that *human insecurity* does not derive from states' interactions only. Putting an end to interstate war would not implicate human security. There are societal dimensions of Human Security "*above*" and "*beneath*" sovereign states.

Other critiques directed to Human Security highlight the complex relationship between men, states and the *international realm*. Far from a *levels-of-analysis*' perspective, Simon Dalby says Human Security, apart from coping



CARLOS FREDERICO DA SILVA PEREIRA GAMA

with remaining problems from other conceptions, engender problems of its own. Dalby, Chenoy and Walker, from different standpoints (critical theory, feminism, post-structuralism) affirm that reducing the security problematic to a "*states versus human*" dualism obliterates other politically relevant symbolic exclusions. Gender bias and a "*generic humanity*" share some problematic ontological assumptions of the traditional conception. Finally, Keith Krause and Michael Williams (1997) bring to surface the need to dig deeper into sovereignty and identity. If one sticks to a *contractual* version of sovereignty and to *context-free* individualism (mutually reinforcing), her/his alternative conceptions fall prey to traditional vices. They highlight the specificities of human practice in space and time.

FINAL REMARKS

Through the paper, I exposed the idea that the relationship between states and human beings is the *core* of the debate on *the vertical expansion of the concept of security*. The traditional conception configures the human beings-state relationship around the concept of sovereignty, which *implicates* international anarchy. The traditional conception engenders two ontological outgrowths – authority and representation –, which keep human beings tied to sovereign states. Those outgrowths are held, even as collective security tries to *reform* the traditional conception, by modifying the *outlook* of international anarchy without altering its foundations.

The relevance of the different alternatives to the traditional conception – Ullman's "*redefinition of security*", Buzan's securitization and human security – was addressed in terms of their challenge to the traditional conception. By pushing the boundaries of the traditional conception in different ways, the



CARLOS FREDERICO DA SILVA PEREIRA GAMA

aforementioned contributions provide interesting, sometimes conflicting, accounts of security's expansion.

Non-traditional conceptions gradually disentangle human beings and the state. The resulting picture is an amalgam. It may be a dysfunctional amalgam when states threaten human beings. Natural security no longer equals citizens' security.

According to Ullman's "*redefinition of security*", the momentary absence of military threats to a given sovereign state does not equal *security*. A series of non-military threats in meantime calls upon statesmen's attention. His proposal does not dismantle state's sovereignty; it means sovereign interaction engenders emerging threats. Interdependence, interaction implicate a renewed, more complex international anarchy.

While Ullman kept almost intact the traditional bond between human beings and the state, Buzan criticizes such a formulation. Securitization proposes a new articulation between sovereignties and anarchy. On the one hand, states' sovereignty is reconciled with domestic authority and particularity. Being a sovereign state, *contra* Waltz, implicates espousing a particular set of values, distilled through different *issue-areas*, not just military affairs. In the words of the Copenhagen School, security becomes a matter of politics beyond politics. At any given time, the *security agenda* can be expanded or contracted according to collective deliberation.

On the other hand, paraphrasing Alexander Wendt (1992), anarchy is what the states make of it. Traces of securitization in the *international realm* can be seen, for example, in the *branding* of activities – ranging from transnational drug trafficking to piracy and terrorism – as threats to the *international community* as a whole, during the last decades. *Regionalization* stresses securitization moves beyond the nation state.



CARLOS FREDERICO DA SILVA PEREIRA GAMA

A surprising *drawback* to authority and representation in Buzan's works, thus, is not due either to blindfold state-centrism or to the remnants of Waltz's account of international anarchy. Rather, Buzan's *communitarian* ontology relies on collective deliberation by human beings collectively organized. That consideration unsettles the autonomy of both *individual* security and Buzan's *international* security (apart from his affinity with English School's idea of an *international society of sovereigns*) – eventually resorting to the sovereign state, the alleged "*most efficient provider*" of security. Buzan, thus, emphasizes *horizontal* rather than *vertical* expansion.

Human security, on the other hand, precisely by questioning the assumption of a fundamental bond between human beings and sovereign states, provides a more adequate account of the resulting ambiguity, a *thicker interpretation* of taken-for-granted IR assumptions (social relations of authority and representation).

Human security approaches are more radical (than Buzan) in what regards questioning the state's primacy. States' actions – unilaterally or in interaction – are insufficient to provide human beings security. The state is an *actual or potential* threat to human beings "*inside*" and "*outside*". Representation shall be submitted to criticism – there is no exclusive bond between human beings and the state. Human solidarity beyond borders becomes relevant, in a context of interdependence and globalization.

Another relevant contribution of human security to the *vertical expansion* of the concept of security is the critique of the *domestic-international divide* – that is, the critique of sovereignty. On the one hand, the sovereign bond is relaxed; human beings have not only the capacity to, they actually and intensively interact across borders, building multiple *international* relationships. On the other hand, sovereignty is pushed to the breaking point. It is not just about *freedom*



CARLOS FREDERICO DA SILVA PEREIRA GAMA

from fear; it also implicates *freedom from want*. States are often dysfunctional "security providers", alternatives accounts say.

Human security criticizes international anarchy – though not because it implicates interstate war. Anarchy poses a series of difficulties for human beings interacting beyond the sovereign state. Human security highlights the role of international institutions in overtaking the uncertainty of anarchy. More than just facilitating interaction and, providing information, institutions are a social space in which men and states "make" security in renewed ways. The United Nations is one of such institutions. Ambiguity is not a matter of problem solving, it a matter of constituting and defining international "agency" in ever-changing contexts.

Human security is, thus, an *umbrella* for theorization, grasping a host of challenges to traditional and *horizontally expanded* conceptions of security. It is also a *project*, a set of practices stemming from several international agents (prominently, the UN as a *hybrid* security-development organization) with the explicit aim of modifying current relationships between men, states and *international* entities.

Ramesh Thakur (1995) recapitulates the polemic on human security. The never-ending debate on security conceptions – alternative and traditional – derives from the character of security itself – an inter-subjective artefact, a set of ideas and concepts whose particular array translates into different guidelines for human action. Security is an essentially contested concept because it is a human artefact, symbolic and material. It is not something objectively given to human scrutiny; it arises from human practices and informs human practices. Security is an essentially contested concept *that matters*.

Security refers to a set of social phenomena, which arise from human practices. Such practices depend on inter-subjective arrangements that encompass not only the *social content* of action; they constitute what we know as *agency*. Human action engenders social structures, which inform subsequent



CARLOS FREDERICO DA SILVA PEREIRA GAMA

human action in space and time. Social practices are means and ends simultaneously – *structured structures* as said by Giddens (1984). Security is a dynamic concept, enrooted in and detached from varying social contexts, in relation to which the production of knowledge becomes constitutive.

Therefore, we can affirm that the polemic on security dealt with in this paper is a logical consequence of security being a human artefact, not a natural phenomenon. *Security is simultaneously an academic field of study and the outcome of diverse human practices*. The plasticity and complexity of human action are cornerstones of the two-pronged debate on the concept of security. The ethical implications of "*making*" security are easy to discern in all aforementioned conceptions.

REFERENCES

- BAJPAI, Kanji. 2003. "The Idea of Human Security". *International Studies* 40: 195-228.
- BANKS, Michael. 1985. "The Inter-Paradigm Debate". In: LIGHT, Margot. GROOM, Arthur John (orgs.). *International Relations: A Handbook of Current Theory*. Londres, Pinter, pp. 7-26.
- BARTELSON, Jens. 2001. *The critique of the state*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- BEESON, Mark; BELLAMY, Alex J. 2003. "Globalisation, Security and International Order". *Australian Journal of Politics and History* 49(3): 339-354.
- BELLAMY, Alex J. MCDONALD, Matt. 2002. "'The utility of human security': Which humans? What security? A reply to Thomas & Tow". *Security Dialogue* 33(3): 373-377.
- BILGIN, Pinar. 2003. "Individual and Societal Dimensions of Security". *International Studies Review* 5: 203-222.
- BOOTH, Ken. 2005. *Critical Security Studies and World Order*. Boulder, Lynne Rienner.
- BULL, Hedley. 1977. *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*. Londres, Macmillan.
- BUZAN, Barry. 1983. *Peoples, States and Fear: The National Security Problem in International Relations*. Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press.



CARLOS FREDERICO DA SILVA PEREIRA GAMA

BUZAN, Barry. WAEVER, Ole. DEWILDE, Jaap. 1998. *Security - A New Framework for Analysis*. Londres, Lynne Rienner.

CAMPBELL, David. 1996. "Political Prosaics, Transversal Politics, and the Anarchical World". In: SHAPIRO, Michael J. ALKER, Hayward R. (org.). *Challenging Boundaries: Global Flows, Territorial Identities*. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, pp. 07-31.

CANADA. Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade. 1999. *Human Security: Safety for People in a Changing World*. Ottawa, Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade.

CARR, Edward Hallett. 1939. *The Twenty Years' Crisis*. Londres, Macmillan.

CHENOY, Anuradha M. 2005. "A Plea for Engendering Human Security". *International Studies* 42: 167-179.

CLAUDE, Inis. 1962. *Power and International Relations*. Nova York, Random House.

DALBY, Simon. 1997. "Contesting an Essential Concept: Reading the Dilemmas in Contemporary Security Discourse". In: KRAUSE, Keith. WILLIAMS, Michael (org.). *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, pp. 3-31.

DEUDNEY, Daniel. 1990. "The Case Against Linking Environmental Degradation and National Security". *Millennium – Journal of International Studies* 19: 461-476.

ELBE, Stefan. 2005. "AIDS, Security, Biopolitics". *International Relations*, vol.19(4): 403-419.

GAMA, Carlos Frederico Pereira da Silva. 2009. "Bridge Over Troubled Waters: United Nations, Peace Operations and Human Security". *Journal of Human Security*, vol.5 (1): 9-31.

GIDDENS, Anthony. 1984. *The Constitution of Society*. Cambridge, Polity Press.

IQBAL, Zaryab. 2006. "Health and Human Security: The Public Health Impact on Violent Conflict". *International Studies Quarterly* 50(3): 631-649.

KAHLER, Miles. 1997. "Inventing International Relations: International Relations Theory after 1945". In: DOYLE, Michael W. IKENBERRY, G. John (org.). *New Thinking in International Relations Theory*. Boulder, Westview Press, pp. 20-53.

KRAHMANN, Elke. 2003. "Conceptualizing Security Governance". *Cooperation and Conflict* 38(1): 5-26.

KRAUSE, Keith; WILLIAMS, Michael. C. (eds.). 1997. *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*. Londres, UCL Press.

LAKATOS, Imre. 1980. *The Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes: Volume 1: Philosophical Papers*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.



CARLOS FREDERICO DA SILVA PEREIRA GAMA

MECHLEN, Kerstin. 2004. "Food Security and the Right to Food in the Discourse of the United Nations". *European Law Journal* 10(5): 631-648.

MESSARI, Nizar. 2002. "The State and Dilemmas of Security: the Middle East and the Balkans". *Security Dialogue* 33(4): 415-427.

MILLER, Benjamin. 2001. "The Concept of Security: Should it be Redefined?". *The Journal of Strategic Studies*, vol.24 (2): 1-29.

MORGENTHAU, Hans J. 1948. *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. Nova York, Alfred A. Knopf.

NEWMAN, Edward. 2001. "Human Security and Constructivism". *International Studies Perspectives* 2: 239-251.

ORGANIZAÇÃO DAS NAÇÕES UNIDAS. United Nations Development Program. 1994. *Human Development Report 1994*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

OWENS, Taylor. 2004. "Human Security – Conflict, Critique and Consensus: Colloquium Remarks and a Proposal for a Threshold-Based Definition". *Security Dialogue* 35(3): 373-387.

PARIS, Roland. 2001. "Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?". *International Security*, vol.26 (2): 87-102.

RAE, Heather. 2002. *State Identities and the Homogenization of Peoples*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

SCHOLTE, Jan Aart. 2000. *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*. Nova York, Palgrave Macmillan.

SHEEHAN, Michael. 2005. *International Security – An Analytical Survey*. Boulder, Lynne Rienner.

THAKUR, Ramesh. 1995. "Freedom From Fear – Equitable, Efficient, and Equitable Security". In: HEINBECKER, Paul. GOFF, Patricia (org.). *Irrelevant or Indispensable? The United Nations in the 21st Century*. Ontario, Wilfred Laurier University Press, pp. 115-130.

ULLMAN, Richard H. 1983. "Redefining Security". *International Security*, Vol. 8, No. 1 (Summer): 129-153.

WALKER, Robert B. J. 2006. "The Double Outside of the Modern International". *Ephemera – Theory and Politics in Organization*, vol.6 (1): 56-69.

WALT, Stephen. 1991. "The Renaissance of Security Studies". *International Studies Quarterly* 35(2): 211-239.

WALTZ, Kenneth N. 1959. *Man, the State and War: A Theoretical Analysis*. Nova York, Columbia University Press.

WALTZ, Kenneth N. 1979. *Theory of International Politics*. Boston, Addison-Wesley.



CARLOS FREDERICO DA SILVA PEREIRA GAMA

WENDT, Alexander. 1992. "Anarchy is what States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics". *International Organization*, vol. 46 (2): 391-425.

WILLIAMS, Paul. 2008. *Security Studies – An Introduction*. Londres, Routledge.

Recebido em: 23 de novembro de 2013

Aprovado em: 31 de dezembro de 2013