"Security is about survival" assessment of the assumption underlying the securitization theory

Robinson Masua
Ph.D Student, Department of Security and Correction Science, School of Security, Diplomacy and Peace Studies,
Kenyatta University, Nairobi, Kenya.
Email - masuarobinson@gmail.com

Abstract: Theories in Security Studies have been evolving since its inception as a discipline in 19th Century. The evolution as that of other disciplines has seen divergent views with new paradigms as well as adjustments of the old paradigms. These critiques followed different paths and different theoretical inputs to create alternatives. One the divergent paradigms in Security Studies in that of Securitization theory associated with critical schools like Copenhagen School, Welsh School (Critical Security Studies), Paris School and Frankfurt School.

The securitization paradigm brought about the concept of widening the Security Studies discipline from her traditional concept of looking at security only in terms of military and state protection from external threats through military and political power.

The traditional objective of security through military and political power was only dominance and manipulation towards the powerful state interest. On the hand the objective of securitization theory where the security concept is broadened to include not only military and political sectors, but also societal, economic and environmental sectors is survival of the state, individuals, groups, communities, regions, and ecologies.

The idea behind labelling a threat as existential to a state, group, individual, communities, region and ecology is basically to protect the existence and balance of equilibrium in those referent objects. The thesis in this paper is that security is all about survival of the referent objects through securitization moves by the securitization actors.

Securitization theory has its own challenges in contemporary security studies. The idea of security as a means of survival is too narrow to its end in explaining contemporary security. As discussed in this paper the theory is highly criticized in explaining contemporary security studies where some the criticism includes its function as a paradigm for analyzing security processes and in overcoming the normative dilemma of analyzing contemporary global security. But it strength lies in the widening of security studies bringing new dimensions, methods, actors and referent objects.

Key Words: Security Studies; Securitization theory; Security; Survival; Securitization; Insecuritization.

1. INTRODUCTION.

The discipline of security studies came largely in limelight post-World War II. During this Early period, it was regarded as sub-discipline of International Relations until later years of the Cold War when it was a field of study and practice mainly in the Anglo-American thinking. During this time Security Studies was equated with Strategic Studies and main focus was military.

Security studies is seen as meeting point between strategic studies and peace research. This is as result of the end of Cold War. The End of Cold war brought changes in Soviet Union with the rise of Gorbachev and Shevardnadze in the mid-1980s.

Post- Cold war era is associated with evolution of Security studies theories where the field of International Relations (IR) witnessed the rise of constructivism as a new paradigm for analysing processes in the international system. This new paradigm challenged ontological and epistemological assumptions and rationales of the traditional established IR theory (Wendt, 1995). At the same time constructivists questioned not only the overarching social structures existence which are under continuous construction but also questioned that even if there are such objectively existing structures, we can acquire objective knowledge about them (Lapid, 1989).

The emergency of constructivism within IR saw a new light on the concept of security studies. During the Cold war, security was conceptualized in the international system in terms of military, hence Security studies was a sub-field of IR. The concern in this era about security was about arms races, nuclear weapons and balance of power, basically

realistic approach. As the Cold war ended there was paradigm shifts that occurred between 1989 and 1993 while Soviet Union was dissolute and sudden failure of the Warsaw Pact which led to a wider and deepening of the traditional or military conceptualization of security (Weaver, 2004). In this new paradigm researchers started to include a new range of threats in to the security framework and therefore including concepts of non-military security. As Allenby (2000), says, the scope of security was broadened to include economy, migration, drug cartels and even such issues as environment.

One of the paradigms that came out of this new thinking of security studies in 1990s is the securitization theory. It developed first in Copenhagen School (CS) and specifically in European Schools like Welsh or Aberystwyth School referred mostly as Critical Studies School and Paris School (Weaver, 2004).

All these three post-Cold War Security Studies European Schools- CS, Welsh School and Paris School- with a constructive perspective included other perspectives like postmodernist/feminist approaches under the umbrella label Critical Security Studies (CSS) (Peoples & Vaughan-Williams, 2010).

Copenhagen School and securitization theory are the most influential and most profound of the three security studies "schools" with a constructive, post-positivist approaches. Her basic theoretical framework has been developed in the 1990s by scholars Ole Weaver(Danish) and Barry Buzan (British).

2. SECURITIZATION THEORY.

Securitization is one of the most talked about, contested and revised concept of theoretical framework in Security Studies and specifically in Critical Security Studies.

According to Williams, (2003), the concept is connected with the Copenhagen School and is seen as a synthesis of constructivist and classical political realism in its approach.

Buzan and Weaver defined securitization as:

> a successful speech act through which an intersubjective understanding is constructed within a political community to treat something as an existential threat to a valued referent object, and to enable a call for urgent and exceptional measures to deal with the threat (Buzan & Weaver, 2003, p. 491).

According to Lieven (2020, pp. 6-9), securitization begins with a speech act concerning a particular threat, by an authoritative national leader, institution, or party. The speech act attempts to shift the threat from normal politics into a security concern, thereby legitimating extraordinary measures to contain the threat.

Securitization is a process-oriented conception of security, which stands in contrast to materialist approaches of classical security studies. Classical approaches of security focus on the material dispositions of the threat including distribution of power, military capabilities, and polarity, whereas securitization examines how a certain issue is transformed by an actor into a matter of security in order to allow for the use of extraordinary measures.

Moreover, the securitization act, to be successful, must be accepted by the audience, regardless of the subject matter being a real threat. As Thierry Balzacq puts it: "securitization is a rule-governed practice, the success of which does not necessarily depend on the existence of a real threat, but on the discursive ability to effectively endow a development with such a specific complexion" (Balzacq, 2005). The audience may take several forms including technical, bureaucratic, public, and policymaking, and different audiences can perform different functions by accepting a securitization, as has been explored by (Roe, 2008).

Securitization is the intersubjective establishment of an existential threat, which demands urgent and immediate attention, as well as the use of extraordinary measures to counter this threat (Buzan, Weaver, & Wilde, 1998; Wæver, 1995)

Like any other concepts in social science the concept of securitization has been revised and developed but there are still key concepts that has stood time and space. For example, the idea that security is not something real or given, but a process or move that someone applies in order to bring a discussion beyond the realm of everyday politics and to a sphere where extra ordinary, out-of- hand measures ought to be deployed and "actions outside of normal bounds of political procedure" (Buzan, Weaver, & Wilde, 1998, p. 24) are justified.

It is important to note that securitization as a process is different from politicization. According to Buzan, Weaver and Wilde, (1998), a public issue can be politicized once it is discussed in political debate and a politicized issue will subsequently require government decisions based – at least in democracies- on careful consideration of possible odds reflecting logics and features on the individual political system.

For that reason, securitized issue is perceived as an issue that constitutes Existential threat to a certain entity be it the state or else and requires extra-ordinary and emergency measures (Buzan, Weaver, & Wilde, 1998, pp. 23-24). Within politicized issues there is room for debate and the outcome of such debate is generally or better theoretically open.

On the other hand, securitization demands firm actions and does not offer much room for political choice because it is so urgent that it should not be exposed to the normal haggling of political but should be dealt with decisively by top leaders prior to other issues (Buzan, Weaver, & Wilde, 1998, p. 29)

In the securitization process the term existential threat is very important as it provides the crucial criterion for analysis of securitization as some authors suggest should be textual analysis (Buzan, Weaver, & Wilde, 1998, p. 29).

This idea of labelling a threat as existential means that not only extra ordinary measures outside legal framework as a coercive necessity but also provides a moral or ontological justification for "emergency measures". The assumption here in is that if the enemy is not stopped or the threat is not contained the most precious feature of a state/society/habitat is at stake and its very existence and survival. Look at the case of Saddam Hussein Iraq and USA invasion in 1993. It was informed by this logic of extentialism of Iraq as a threat to the other neighbouring countries including Kuwait.

Buzan, Weaver and Wilde (1998, p. 25) asserts, a securitization must be intersubjective and accompanied by "saliency sufficient to have substantial political effects". This bring about debate on securitization and political again, that not everyone could perform it as long as it is not successful, that is has a measurable political impact (Buzan, Weaver, & Wilde, 1998). Also Buzan, Weaver and Wilde, (1998) call it as many securitization moves, which include speech acts performed towards an audience by securitization actor seeking to convince it of existential character of a threat towards referent object. Therefore, the emergency measures should be taken to contain or eliminate the existential threat.

Where we have a recurring or pervasive threats to certain referent object, the securitization can become institutionalized. Examples of institutionalized securitization is of a state where it sustains a standing army or relies on the services of its secret agencies and also the dikes preventing large parts of the Netherlands from being flooded which are a commonly agreed upon feature of the Dutch security (Buzan, Weaver, & Wilde, 1998, p. 28).

Figure 1: The Securitization Process. *Source*: (Emmmers, 2010, p. 138).

According to Buzan, Weaver and Wilde (1998, p. 24), the securitization process is a three-way process- can go either side or come from one side to the other in the cycle. That an issue can either be non-politicized (the state does not deal with it, and it is not an issue in the public debate)- de-securitization, politicized (an issue that is part of public debate and policy) or securitized (an issue that is presented as an existential threat, and can be dealt with using measures outside normal politics), and that 'any issue can end up on any part of the spectrum' (Buzan, Weaver, & Wilde, 1998, p. 24) . So apart from security issue being securitized as shown on above figure, or after being securitized it can be de-securitized again. Therefore, de-securitizations are processes 'in which a political community downgrades or ceases to treat something as an existential threat to a valued referent object, and reduces or stops calling for exceptional measures to deal with the threat' stated by Buzan and Waever, cited in (Coskun, 2008, p. 405). Thus, the key aim of (de)securitization theory is to identify what, when, where and how an issue is moved from being part of the normal environment of politics to become a threat to security and beyond normal politics – and the other way around (Snetkov, 2017).

3. MAJOR SCHOOLS IN SECURITIZATION THEORY:

Securitizations theory was developed by the Copenhagen School (CS), which formed at the Copenhagen Peace Research Institute in the 1980s (McSweeney, 1996). But also other various schools were involved in its evolution.

3.1 COPENHAGEN SCHOOL

The institute that hosted most of the academics involved in the development of Copenhagen School (CS) was the 1985-established Center for Peace and Conflict Research (later Conflict and Peace Research Institute (COPRI)) in the Danish capital Copenhagen, hence the name Copenhagen school (Huysmans, `Security! What Do You Mean? From Concept to Thick Signifier', 1998).

Its two main theoretical contributors are Ole Wæver and Barry Buzan. The whole framework of the Copenhagen School is still work in progress, it being a theory which has been constantly reviewed and revised by a considerable amount of academics and scholars out of the whole European field of Security Studies (Stritzel, 2007).

They were provoked by critique voiced by many realist thinkers on the widening of Security Studies (Huysmans, 1998). Their objective was widening the concept of international security and how such study could be kept comprehensive and coherent.

Widening meant along the referent object-axis. That security is not military defence of the state it is also x and y and z, that security is an endless expanding realm until it encompasses the whole social and political agenda. (Huysmans, 1998)

Copenhagen School (CS) scholars intended to redefine the concept of Security Studies by applying the new understanding of security, that security is a process engineered by social events and inner logic inherent in every individual security issue be it military or else (Huysmans, 1998). The logic here is that inner logics of security discourse can be applied to widened area of sectors. Therefore, the CS paradigm both provides answers to those who criticizes who question the incoherence of widened security concept and also includes different sectors of security outside traditional military security nexus.

The major three concepts most prominently linked to works of CS are; Securitization- as a process; Sectors of Security- Political, Military, Societal, Economic and Environmental; Regional Security Complexes. Some concepts such as securitization and security sectors have been introduced from other areas and then developed further by CS (Wæver, 1995).

But what comes clear is that these three concepts have been widely recognized as that main CS's contribution to modern security studies theory development (Huysmans, 1998)

3.2 CRITICAL SECURITY STUDIES (CSS).

Widening of security studies project associated with Copenhagen School had its flaws in filling the gaps of realism and liberalism. Copenhagen School widened, while the Critical Security Studies (CSS) deepened the security studies approach. Basically the Critical Security Studies (CSS) approach to security challenges realism and performatively proves that security is a paradoxical, epistemologically flawed and ontologically unstable concept with no fixed definition (Lal, 2004, p. 3).

There are different versions of these criticism to widening and realism perspective of security studies. One version is by Cox (1981) where he identifies two critical schools of security. One being *problem-solving theory*, or Copenhagen School which takes the world as it finds it and seeks to make it work by dealing effectively with particular sources of trouble and thereby replicating what exists. The second one is *Critical theory*, or Critical Security Studies, which unlike problem-solving theory, Cox argues, calls prevailing social and power relationships and institutions into question "by concerning itself with their origins and how and whether they might be in the process of changing (Cox, 1981). Thus, Critical Security Studies is an unorthodox and questioning outlook to the dominant social and power structure, institutions, and ideologies (Lal, 2004, p. 4). Another view is by Booth (2005, p. 12), that, that critical theory recognizes "change, the openness of history, and the unfinished nature of the human experiment". Therefore, as Lal (2004, p. 4) says, Critical Security Studies questions prevailing structures and attitudes, it is less concerned with alternatives and more concerned with a deeper understanding of security.

According to Lal (2004, p. 4), Critical Security Studies scholars are divided into two distinct categories: wideners and deepeners. For wideners the greatest threat to state survival is not military-based, but 5 economic, social and environmental sectors or threats. Deepeners on the other hand focuses on the question of whose security is threatened and whether the security project is better achieved with an individual or society- centred referent rather than the state (Krause & Williams, 1996, p. 230). The two approaches are not mutually exclusive (Lal, 2004, p. 4). The most enduring theme in Critical Security Studies is the emancipation of the individual which is absent in Copenhagen School or securitization theory. Key schools in Critical Security Studies are Frankfurt, Welsh, Paris Schools and Feminist Theory as discussed below.

3.4 FRANKFURT SCHOOL

The Frankfurt School, also known as the Institute of Social Research (Institut für Sozialforschung), is a social and political philosophical movement of thought located in Frankfurt and Main, Germany (Corradetti, 2013, p. 1). It is

the original source of what is known as Critical Theory (Corradetti, 2013, p. 1). The Institute was founded, thanks to a donation by Felix Weil in 1923, with the aim of developing Marxist studies in Germany. The Institute eventually generated a specific school of thought after 1933 when the Nazis forced it to close and move to the United States, where it found hospitality at Columbia University, New York (Corradetti, 2013).

According to Corradetti, (2013), the academic influence of the "critical" method is far reaching in terms of educational institutions in which such tradition is taught and in terms of the problems it addresses. Some of its core issues involve the critique of modernities and of capitalist society, the definition of social emancipation and the perceived pathologies of society. Critical theory provides a specific interpretation of Marxist philosophy and reinterprets some of its central economic and political notions such as commodification, reification, fetishization and critique of mass culture (Corradetti, 2013).

Also Corradetti, (2013)points out that some of the most prominent figures of the first generation of Critical Theorists are Max Horkheimer (1895-1973), Theodor Adorno (1903-1969), Herbert Marcuse (1898-1979), Walter Benjamin (1892-1940), Friedrich Pollock (1894-1970), Leo Lowenthal (1900-1993), Eric Fromm (1900-1980). Since the 1970s, the second generation has been led by Jürgen Habermas who has greatly contributed to fostering the dialogue between the so called "continental" and "analytical" tradition. The philosophical impact of the school has been worldwide. Early in the second decade of the twenty-first century, a fourth generation of critical theory scholars emerged and coalesced around one of its most proactive representatives: Rainer Forst (Corradetti, 2013).
Specifically, Frankfurt School was not purely concerned with Critical Security Studies but general Critical theory. The is considered to be the bedrock where other Critical Security Studies were built upon.

3.5 WELSH SCHOOL
As Anthony Burke noted, one important line of approach to security in realist terms has come from the Welsh School of critical security studies (2007, p. 6). It was driven by scholars based at the University of wales, Aberystwyth such as Ken Booth, Richard Wyn Jones and Andrew Linklater (Burke, 2007).
It is important to note that although Welsh School in always seen under the CSS (Critical Security Studies) it has some different characteristics. The Aberystwyth School of security studies or Critical Security Studies works within the tradition of Critical Theory which has its roots in Marxism. CSS is based on the pioneering work of Ken Booth (Booth, 1991) and Richard Jones Wyn (Wyn, 1995), which is heavily influenced by Gramscian critical theory and Frankfurt School critical social theory as well as by radical International Relations theory most recently associated with the neogramscian theorist Robert W. Cox (Booth, 2007). As diverse as these approaches might seem, they all originate in the Marxian productivist paradigm, seeking to develop a social theory orientated toward social transformation by exploring and elucidating human emancipation's barriers and possibilities (Wyn, 2001)

The main concept introduced by Wyn Jones and Booth as part of critiques to traditional security is emancipation as the main focus in broadening the Security Studies.

According to them only a process of emancipation can make the prospect of 'true' human security more likely. For Booth and Wyn Jones, the realist understanding of security as 'power' and 'order' can never lead to 'true' security. For them, the sovereign state is not the main provider of security, but one of the main causes of insecurity. Indeed, during the last hundred years far more people have been killed by their own governments than by foreign armies. (H.S.C, 2005, p. VIII). True security, Booth argues, "can only be achieved by people and groups if they do not deprive others of it" (Booth, 1991, p. 139). In order to achieve true security, it must be understood as emancipation. For Booth, emancipation "offers a theory of progress for politics, it provides a politics of hope and gives guidance to a politics of resistance (…) Emancipation is the only permanent hope of becoming" (Booth, 1991, p. 46). For Booth (1999, p. 319). security and emancipation are two sides of the same coin

Furthermore, Booth rejects the claim that security is a 'contested concept'. In order to achieve security, Booth contends, we have to define it; and "[t]he best starting point for conceptualizing security lies in the real conditions of insecurity suffered by people and collectives" (Booth, 2005, p. 12). What is immediately striking, Booth argues, is that biological drives for security are universal (to have food, shelter, safety etc.) as well as the fact that the lack of security is a life determining condition. Booth calls this condition survival, which he defines as the struggle of a person or a group of people in order to exist. "Survival is not synonymous with living tolerably well, and less still with having the conditions to pursue cherished political and social ambitions"; for the latter, Booth argues, "security is required, and not just survival. In this sense security is equivalent to survival-plus (the plus being some freedom from life determining threats, and therefore space to make choices)" (Booth, 2007, p. 102). In short, survival is being alive; security is living. In summary, the Welsh School views security studies through the lens of emancipatory theory. It has several characteristics; most notable is that it places the emphasis on individual security rather than on that of the state. The roots of its critical perspective are said to derive from theorist Antonio Gramsci and the Frankfurt School (notably Theodor W. Adorno, Max Horkheimer, and Jürgen Habermas), and its emphasis is on fostering the emancipation of

individuals as a path to peace. The school is also said to be distinguished from other schools of security studies in its aim to foster a political awareness of critical security rather than just political event analysis.

In practical terms it notes how the state can threaten the security of individuals, especially those who are disenfranchised by the current world order. Rather than emphasize the power and authority of states, this perspective looks to social justice (e.g., eliminating gender, class, and other barriers) to emancipate the individual in order to achieve peace. Booth (1991), is cited for equating security to emancipation and asserting that states are primarily a means (not an ends) for ensuring the individuals' security because states often create insecurity and are only meant to be instruments. Wyn (2001) has articulated the nature of the emancipation of the CSSWS by noting that complete emancipation will never be fully realized because there will always be a goal for improvement and greater emancipation.

Welsh school has been criticized as it focuses more on making social progress through dialogue than with articulating what is ethically good. Also it is questioned whether its goal of emancipation might be better versed in the language of justice, human rights, or economics. Finally, critics have asked for more clarification of the emancipationist response to global acts of human genocide and mass killing.

3.6 PARIS SCHOOL

The Paris School believes that security is not the only concern of international relations scholars, as this school is grounded in sociology and the writings of Michel Foucault and Pierre Bourdieu. Didier Bigo of Kings College, London, is a leading figure of this school.

Its works are inspired by prominent figures such as Pierre Bourdieu and Michel Foucault and are a result of culmination and synthesis of an interdisciplinary research including (political) sociology and criminology. Didier Bigo (of Science-Po Paris) and his French-language journal Cultures & Conflicts are the main proponents of this approach; hence the name 'Paris School'.

The Paris School claims that the bureaucratic routines and everyday practices of security professionals institutionalize the field of security, therefore giving the governments and bureaucracies control over the political processes (Buzan & Hansen, 2009). The Paris School's emphasis is on praxis rather than discourse as it can be inferred from their representation of institutionalisation of security (Wæver, 2004).

More specifically the Paris School of critical security studies is a collaboration of scholars with post-positivist commitments around the journal Cultures & Conflicts that focuses on the internal and external dimensions of security practices with an emphasis on the process of insecuritisation. While the leading figure is Didier Bigo, many scholars such as Anastassia Tsoukala, Elspeth Guild, and Tugba Basaran are considered within this school.

Security, according to the PS, is not actually a concept that has a concrete meaning echoing the claim that has almost become slogan-like in security studies (which has been inevitably cited numerous times in the previous chapters and sections): "security is an essentially contested concept", tt is rather a result of a process of '(in)securitisation' and a set of practices (Bigo, 2000).

In contrast to CS's securitisation theory, Paris School emphasizes (in)securitisation which essentially refers to the construction of insecurities through discourses and practices of security.

Insecuritisation refers to the aforementioned Foucauldian 'technique of government' where security technology and expert knowledge form the essence of modern society and social relations, and the 'threat definitions' are being embedded in this modern social relations (Bigo, 2000). Insecuritisation points at similar processes as captured by securitization theory.

Advocates for combination of external and internal security. For examples since 'external' security agencies such as the army have started to focus on the inside of the borders to find enemies, 'internal' security agencies like the police forces have been looking for their 'enemies' outside the borders (Bigo, 2000). The school brings about interdisciplinary focus of security studies. The two distinct spheres of security that is external and internal security converge in Paris School. According to Bigo (2006), although it is widely claimed that the 11 September attacks caused this change, PS argues that the reasons behind the convergence are the structural evolutions of various distinct agencies working in the area of security, and their relations with political professionals.

Bigo, (2002), also explains that security professionals and agencies (whether internal or external) fight (within the agencies and without) for their survival as well as dominance for practices of security. This, according to the Paris School leads to insecuritisation enabling legitimation of practices and interconnectedness between internal and external. Put differently, agencies and professionals in the security field maintain their relevance and ensure their survival through management and creation of insecurity. The best example, perhaps, is the securitization of migration.

The result, when the external and internal security converges security field automatically starts to globalize (Sezal, 2019, p. 98). In other words, the convergence of external and security field through institutions and professionals and their international cooperation has engendered a process of globalization of insecurity, especially under the "Global War on Terror" label (Bigo, (2005).). Security specialists including scholars, reproduce discourses of hardliners as well

as security professionals in that security is accepted as an explanation instead of a discourse to be challenged (Bigo, 2002).

In summary security in Paris School or securitisation results from struggle inside and between institutions for the production of 'legitimate truth', as opposed to naiveté of CS where individuals creating new frames and new roles ((Bigo, 2002, p. 74).

The mainstream understanding of security is not a concept but the result of a process of (in)securitisation (Sezal, 2019, p. 99). According to Balzacq, (2005) this brings about three layers of security: firstly as a dispositif emanating from a specific field of professionals ; secondly as understanding practices; and thirdly as a sociological binding of dispositif, the field, and the habitus. Therefore, in eyes of Paris School security needs to have another meaning "independent from the interest of the politicians and professionals of unease" (Bigo, 2002, p. 84). Security, when taken out from the field of professionals actually means "protection of the weakest against injustice, exploitation, and marginalisation" as well as the judicial guarantee against discrimination, respect of presumption of innocence and of human rights (Bigo, 2006, p. 402). In this light Paris School comes closer to championing the concept of emancipation like the Welsh School.

Within the Paris School also we can see deepening of security studies also. Huysmans (2014), provides a deepening sense of Paris School through a detailed analysis of 'diffuse securitizing' and its relationship with limits of democracy. He depicts two techniques of securitising (or securitisation): 'exceptionalist' which is the classical CS understanding and 'diffuse' which based on the modality of surveillance and governing uncertainty and risks à la Paris School (Huysmans, 2014, p. 9). The problem with this end is that that 'uncertainty' has become the main security problem and in such condition, anything can be accepted as a security question (Huysmans, 2014, p. 78). Therefore, the real security governmentality comes through multiple referent objects being associated together and therefore diffused into everyday practice (Huysmans, 2014, p. 86).

Although both Welsh and Paris Schools have the same concept of emancipation, there seems to be an essential difference in their objectives (Sezal, 2019, p. 100). While the former calls for emancipation that is equated with 'security', the latter shies away from the concept of emancipation and calls for challenging the field of security (Sezal, 2019). The differences seem actually more semantic than philosophical as Welsh School's call for 'politicisation' is not essentially different from desecuritisations of both Paris and Copenhagen schools (Sezal, 2019, p. 100).
Sezal (2019, p. 101), summarizes that the Paris School of critical security studies as a collaboration of scholars with post-positivist commitments around the journal Cultures & Conflicts that focuses on the internal and external dimensions of security practices with an emphasis on the process of insecuritisation. Thus, the PS is also a reflectivist school with a praxis-oriented ontology while heavily based on post-structuralist and critical epistemology represented by Michel Foucault and Pierre Bourdieu with strong deconstructionist elements from Jacques Derrida. Methodologically it uses discourse analysis through texts, interviews, and other potential manifestations of praxis (Sezal, 2019).

4. FEMINIST SECURITY STUDIES

Feminist security studies is a sub discipline of security studies that draws attention to gendered dimensions of security. Feminist security studies (FSS) is the study of the various forms and implications of security through a gendered lens.

Securitization theory has been blamed for not considering the gender issues in its project (Hansen, 2000). Gender issues has been securitized. A good work on this is that of Natalie (2009) article that sheds light on these questions by analysing women and the issue of gender equality as it has been securitized by UN Security Council Resolution 1325. Using the securitization theory put forth by Buzan, Weaver and Wilde (1998), the article empirically explores the benefits and drawbacks of this process within the context of women's activism in the UN both in terms of political efficacy and normative implications.

United Nations SCR 1325 and the broader WPS agenda is an instructive case for exploring an alternative discourse—and the actors and arenas that go along with that discourse—aimed at protecting and promoting the rights of women in conflict-affected countries around the world (Hudson, 2015). The resolution officially acknowledges women's right to participate in all aspects of conflict prevention and resolution, peacekeeping, and peacebuilding and to be included in decision-making bodies at all levels of governance. It recognizes the special protection needs of women and girls, particularly in conflict-affected countries. Such protections are not just limited to situations of sexual and gender-based violence, but also involve measures to protect the human rights of women and girls, especially as they relate to the constitution, the electoral system, the police, and the judiciary (Hudson, 2015).

From the discussion above we can highlight key issues in securitization of gender or women issues in security studies. These are participation in conflict prevention and resolution, peacekeeping and peace building. Including decision making at all levels of governance. Also there is protection of needs of women and girls in conflict affected areas.

Gender Based Violence has also been securitized- rape, physical abuse against women. The idea behind securitization of gender issues especially issues relating to women and girls is for survival of the gender in a male dominated social, cultural, economic and political contexts.

5. SECURITIZATION IN CONTEMPORARY WORLD:

- Immigration and refugee- immigration during the tenure of Donald Trump, Immigration in Europe.
- Health COVID 19- The global response to COVID-19 contains all the critical elements of securitization: referent object(s), threat, audiences, securitizing acts and actors, and emergency measures. However, the politics of securitization is neither simple nor unproblematic. The analysis here points to three political dilemmas behind the securitization of COVID-19, which involve the referent object(s), securitizing acts, and emergency measures.

   On the one hand, the pandemic is framed as a common threat to the "citizens of the world", which requires international cooperation between governments and global coordination of policy responses. For instance, United Nations Secretary-General, António Guterres, has stated that "all of us face a common threat" and that "no one country can address it alone."

   On the other hand, the pandemic is framed as a threat to "national security", whereby nation-states seek to protect their citizens and institutions. Notably, U.S. President, Donald J. Trump, has declared COVID-19 a "national emergency" and threat to "national security" by Executive Order, and employed the metaphor of the United Stated being "at war" and himself as a "war-time president". Importantly, national security generally perceives other countries as the sources of threat, which is reflected in the language that describes COVID-19 as the "Chinese Virus" (or "Wuhan Virus"), and the practice of unilaterally closing borders to other countries.

6. CRITIQUE OF SECURITIZATION THEORY:

The Securitization theory in security studies is applauded because of its widening concept of security analysis from the traditional military and positivist approach that security is real and we need real methodologies to deal with it. But besides its strengths in security studies it has found some serious criticism both in its function as a paradigm for analysing security processes and in overcoming the normative dilemma of analysing contemporary global security.

The approach to securitization has often been criticized for being too limited, too focused upon the speech act and thus not serving a useful purpose in the study of real world situations (Balzacq, 2005; Stritzel, 2007; McDonald, 2008). It therefore falls short of referring to non-speech acts and practices (i.e. body language, visual representations in media) in the process of securitization.

The main criticism is that of being a Eurocentric approach to security. For example, Wilkinson (2007), describes the case of Kyrgyzstan to show that the securitization theory is unable to sufficiently account for developments beyond the West for two reasons: First, she says, the theory takes it for granted 'that European understandings of society and the state are universal'. Wilkinson sates that theorists within the Copenhagen School must explicitly question normative concepts such as state and society. Second, the theory's emphasis on the speech act may be unsuited to non-Western contexts where limitations to speech exist, and where securitization may take place through other means, including action.

Realists have also argued that the securitization theory widening of the security agenda risks giving the discipline of security studies "intellectual incoherence". For any paradigm to retain its theoretical precision and utility, and having in mind not everything can be defined as a security issue, as well as to remain engaged with the existing contentious definition of what is security, Wæver discusses the apprehension towards redefining security until the concept becomes meaningless and the analyst is no longer able to discuss operations of security working within a specific field (Wæver, 1995, pp. 48-49, 56; Buzan, Weaver, & Wilde, 1998, p. 24). The point is that the securitization theory is too broad in definition of security and actually as scholars we end up not being sure not differentiating security, human development and sustainable development.

The other problem of the securitization theory is the assumption of a normal state of politics that can be distinguished from exceptional measures, especially separation of politics and society. Holbraad and Pedersen (2012), argues that revolutionary Cuba provides a case of a non-liberal non-Western state where the liberal assumptions underpinning Copenhagen School cannot explain fully the separation of the two- politics and society. They posit that the liberal distinction between the state and society collapses in a revolutionary ontology, with revolutionary states assuming themselves to be the people. Thus, rules and exceptions cease to exist for a revolutionary state because the state is society (Holbraad & Pederson, 2012).

The Securitization theory assumes a basic level of stability and cannot therefore be applied to exceptional situations where there is no such thing as normal politics. A good example is the work of Greenwood and Weaver

(2013), who test the paradigm in the context of Egypt during the Arab Spring. They point out that the Arab Uprisings separated regimes from societies in a number of states, toppling previously embedded authoritarian regimes in Tunisia, Egypt, Libya and Yemen. In other states, regimes framed protesting groups as existential threats, reconstructing the nature of political organization amidst the conflation of domestic and regional, normative and geopolitical agendas. Finally, a leading International Relations scholar, Hansen (2000), in her article "The Little Mermaid's Silent Security Dilemma and the Absence of Gender in the Copenhagen School," published in 2000 in Millennium, has argued that the Copenhagen School fails to adequately include gender in its security scholarship.

7. CONCLUSION:

Welsh school is inspired by the Frankfurt School and the main concept is that of emancipation. According to welsh school, security is the same thing as emancipation because no human being can be secure without being fully emancipated from all kinds of constraints. It argues for the active involvement of intellectuals and emphasizes the importance of speaking truth to power (Sezal, 2019, p. 102). On the other hand, Copenhagen School is collaboration between Neorealist, self-declared Post-Structural Realist and Peace Researchers (Sezal, 2019, p. 102). But it has changed through time and contributions of emerging scholars. As discussed earlier it focuses on securitization. Regional security complexes and sectors of security. As seen earlier it approaches security at different five sectors discussed above and regional dynamics of security, where the referent objects and continuous formation of security concerns are through speech acts. The concept of securitization is a cycle. Something can be claimed to be security issue and its acceptance by audience which leads to removal of such issue from normal politics and put into emergency context or level and in end if the issue ceases to be a security emergency that is existential threat it taken back to be normal politics through de-securitization.

Lastly Paris School, is a different approach from the two. Its focus in on security practices themselves and the way security issues are governed (Sezal, 2019, p. 103). That is to say, rather than emphasizing issues, it analyses the relationship between different internal and external security agencies and professionals. How this relationship or competition plays a role in the production of truths and fears is at the core. Security, therefore, is a process of insecuritisation which evokes fear and uncertainty so that the mode of government that suits the field of a professional can be maintained (Sezal, 2019, p. 103).

The main aim throughout either securitization, emancipation or insecutirization in about survival. For the Copenhagen School is the survival of the state, through securitizing anything that have existential threat to the state. For Welsh school is the survival of an individual through emancipation from threat from the state. For the Paris school in insecuritization of relationship between different internal and external security agencies and professionals is basically for survival of each actor over the other.

This idea of labelling a threat as existential means that not only extra ordinary measures outside legal framework as a coercive necessity but also provides a moral or ontological justification for "emergency measures". The assumption here in is that if the enemy is not stopped or the threat is not contained the most precious feature of a state/society/habitat is at stake and its very existence and survival. Therefore, security is for survival of a nation/state, economy. society, ecology/environment and military power.

REFERENCES :
1. Allenby, B. (2000). Environmental Security: Concept and Implementation. *International Science Review/ Revue Internationale De Science Politique, 21*(1), 5-21.
2. Balzacq, T. (2005). "The Three Faces Of Securitization: Political Agency, Audience and Context". *European Journal of internation Relations, 11*(2), 171- 201. doi:10.1177/1354066105052960
3. Bigo, D. ((2005).). The globalization of (in) security: Reflections on the field of professionals in the management of concerns and analysis of the transnationalization of (in) security processes. *Cultures & Conflicts, 58*, 53-101. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.4000/conflicts.1813
4. Bigo, D. (2000). When Two Become One: Internal and External Securitisations in Europe. In K. M, & W. M (Eds.), *International Relations Theory and The Politics of European Integration. Power, Security and Community.* (pp. 171-204). Routlledge.
5. Bigo, D. (2002). Security and Immigration: Toward a Critique of the Governmentality of Unease. *Alternatives, 27*(1 suppl), 63-92. doi:10.1177/03043754020270S105
6. Bigo, D. (2006). Internal and External Aspects of Security, European Security. *European Seceurity, 4*, 385-404. doi:10.1080/09662830701305831
7. Booth. (1991). *New Thinking About Strategy and International Security.* (B. K, Ed.) London: HarperCollins.
8. Booth. (2007). *Theory of World Security.* (K. Booth, Ed.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

9. Booth, K. (1999). 'Three Tyrannies'. In T. D. J., *Human Rights in Global Politics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

10. Booth, K. (2005). 'Introduction to Part One'. In K. Booth (Ed.), *in Critical Security Studies and World Politics.* London: Lynne Rienner.

11. Burke, A. (2007). "What Security Makes Possible: Some Thoughts on Critical Security Studies",. *Working Paper in Australian National University, no.1, p.6.*, (p. 6).

12. Buzan, B., & Hansen, L. (2009). *The Evolution of International Security Studies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO978051181776

13. Buzan, B., & Weaver, O. (2003). *Regions and Powers: a guide to the global security order.* London: Cambdridge University Press.

14. Buzan, B., Weaver, O., & Wilde, J. d. (1998). *A new Framework for Analysis.* Boulder: Lynne Reiner PUblishers.

15. Corradetti, C. (2013, February 3). The Frankfurt School and Critical Theory. *The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2012.* Retrieved from https://ssrn.com/abstract=2211197

16. Coskun, B. (2008). Analyzing de-securitizations: prospects and problems for Isreali-Palestinnian reconciliation. *Global change, Peace and Security, 20*(3), 398-408.

17. Cox, R. W. (1981). 'Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory'. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies, 10*, 128-129.

18. Emmmers, R. (2010). "Securitization". In A. Collins (Ed.), *Contemporary Security Studies.* New York: Oxford University Press.

19. Greenwood, T. M., & Wæver, O. (2013). Copenhagen–Cairo on a roundtrip: A security theory meets the revolution. *Security Dialogue, 44*(5-6), 485-506. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010613502573

20. H.S.C. (2005). *Human Security Report 2005: War and Peace in the 21 st Century.* New York: Oxford University Press.

21. Hansen, L. (2000). The Little Mermaid's silent security dilemma and the absence of gender in the Copenhagen School. Millennium. *Journal of International Studies, 292*(2), 285-306.

22. Holbraad, M., & Pederson, M. A. (2012, July). Revolutionary Securitization: An Anthropological Extension of Securitization Theory. *International Theory, 4*(02). doi:10.1017/S1752971912000061

23. Hudson, N. F. (2015). The Social Practice of Securitizing Women's Rights and Gender Equality: 1325 Fifteen Years On. In J. R. Pruce (Ed.), *The Social Practice of Human Rights.* New York.: Palgrave Macmillan. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137503770_9

24. Huysmans, J. (1998). `Security! What Do You Mean? From Concept to Thick Signifier'. *European Journal of International Relations, 4*(2), 229-258.

25. Huysmans, J. (2014). *Security Unbound: Enacting Limits of Democracy.* Abingdon: Routledge.

26. Krause, K., & Williams, M. C. (1996). Broadening the Agenda of Security Studies: Politics and Methods. *Mershon International Studies Review,, 40*(2), 229-254. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.2307/222776

27. Lal, P. (2004, May 15). Deconstructing the National Security State: Towards a New Framework of Analysis. 10.2139/ssrn.2218669. *SSRN Electronic Journal.* Retrieved august 20, 2021, from https://ssrn.com/abstract=2218669 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2218669

28. Lapid, Y. (1989). "The Third debate: on the prospects of international theory in a post-positivist era,". *International Studies Quaterly, 33*, 235-254.

29. Lieven, A. (2020). Climate Change and the Nation State. Penguine Random House. doi:ISBN 978-0-241-39407-06

30. McDonald, M. (2008). Securitization and the Construction of Security. *European Journal of International Relations, 14*(4), 563-587. doi:10.1177/1354066108097553

31. McSweeney, B. (1996). "Identity and Security: Buzan and the Copenhagen School [Review Article]." . *Review of International Studies, 22*(1), 8193.

32. Natalie, F. H. (2009). Securitizing Women's Rights and Gender Equality. *Journal of Human Rights, 8*(1), 53-70. doi:10.1080/14754830802686526

33. Peoples, C., & Vaughan-Williams, N. (2010). *An Intruduction.* London: Routledge.

34. Roe, P. (2008, December 1). "Actor, AaUdience(s) and Emergency Measures: Securitization and the UK's Decision to Invade Iraq". *Security Dioloque*, 615-635. doi:10.1177/0967010608098212.ISSN 0967-0106

35. Sezal, M. (2019). *Origins of Differentiation in Critical Security Schools: A philosophic-genealogical search for emancipatory roots.* University of Groningen.

36. Snetkov, A. (2017). Theories, Methods and Practices- a longitudinal spatial analysis of (de)securitization of the insurgency threat in Russia. *Security Dialogue, 48*(3), 259-275. Retrieved August 4, 2021, from https://www.jstor.org/stable/26294022

37. Stritzel, H. (2007). Towards a Theory of Securitization: Copenhagen and Beyond. European Journal of International Relations. *13*(3), 357-383. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066107080128

38. Wæver, O. (1995). Securitization and desecuritization. In: Lipschutz. In R. D. Lipschutz, *ON Security* (pp. 46-86). New York: Columbia University Press.

39. Wæver, O. (2004, March 17-20). Aberystwyth, Paris, Copenhagen: New 'Schools' in Security Theory and their Origins between Core and Periphery. *The Annual of the International Studies.*

40. Weaver, O. (2004, March 17- 20). Aberystwyth, Paris Copenhagen: New 'Schools' in the Security Theory and their origins between Core and Pheriphery. *Paper Presented at the annual of the International Studies Association.*

41. Wendt, A. (1995). Constructing International Politics. *International Security, 20*(1), 71-81. doi:10.2307/2539217.

42. Wilkinson, C. (2007, March). The copenhagen school on tour in Kyrgyzstan: Is securitization theory useable outside Europe? *Security dioloque, 38*(1), 5-25. doi:10.1177/0967010607075964

43. Williams, M. C. (2003). Words, Images, Enemies, Securitization and International Politics. *International Studies Quarterly, 47*, 512.

44. Wyn, J. R. (1995). '" Message in a Bottle"? Theory and Practice in Critical Security Studies'. *Contemporary security Policy, 16*, 299-319.

45. Wyn, J. R. (2001). 'Introduction: Locating Critical International Relations Theory'. In R. W. Jones (Ed.), *Critical Theory and World Politics* (pp. 5-10). London: Lynne Reinner.