

## Formation and evolution of the non-traditional security discourse

**Abstract.** Promoting security has a broad definition of ensuring functional integrity and preserving the independent identity of states and societies. The bipolar era dominated the conventional military-political approach to ensuring the security of nations. Since the end of the Cold War, non-traditional threats have taken an important place in the political agenda of the world. Many issues with non-traditional security threats are considered the results of global trends, where globalization is an objective process that makes the world more interconnected and interdependent. Nowadays most national and global security agendas contain vast areas of sustainable development. They cover various non-traditional matters in political, economic, social, and environmental spheres, such as climate change, energy security, freedom of speech, human rights, rule of law, government regulatory quality, trade and economic stability, research, and development, and so on. This paper explores major definitions and gives a broad introduction to non-traditional security and introduction to its schools of thought within the broad political science discipline.

**Keywords:** Non-traditional security, Copenhagen school, Paris school, securitization.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32523/2616-6887/2022-138-1-117-123>

Received: 18.11.2021 / Approved: 12.01.2022

### Introduction

Being secure has been the major purpose of mankind from the beginning of its history and on the way to pursuing progress and civilization [6]. It is stated that all people require a sense of security for themselves, the lives they live, in their jobs, and in a community [9]. And non-traditional security is the concept for ensuring the well-being of an individual and a state that arise primarily out of non-military sources. The notion of non-traditional security “differs according to an actor’s status and position within the international system” and depends on specific threat perceptions of those actors [5, p. 179]. However, nowadays, challenges of non-

traditional security have become transnational and include a wide range of global political, economic, social, and environmental aspects.

In identifying a dataset of unconventional security threats, one can simplify the problem and argue that any potential threat to a state that is not traditional, i.e. military, would qualify as “non-traditional”. Since non-traditional security issues address a broad range of non-military questions, such as natural disasters, illegal migrations, climate change, resources scarcity, eradication of poverty, infectious diseases, food shortages, living standards, mortality rates, quality education for all, and so on, they led to the emergence of non-traditional security ideas, which in turn create frameworks for identifying

and solving those issues [13]. Non-traditional security discourse generally is about endorsing the institutional change in a state, which is especially necessary for developing countries with constant socio-economic security agendas. Moreover, “the non-traditional security agenda does more than designate selected issues as security threats; it tests the sovereignty of states by problematizing the idea that politics, especially security politics, are conducted along state borders” [13, p. 45]. Thus, “the successful promotion of the non-traditional security paradigm would necessitate sweeping institutional changes” [13, p. 48].

This paper aims to contribute to the literature gap on the subject matter by giving theoretical background and analysis of non-traditional security. It also focuses on two major schools of the NTS discourse and is guided by the effort to strengthen the understanding of the sphere in local academic circles.

### Research methodology

As the main objective of the paper, this part explores the effective approach to understanding the topic. The research methodology of the article is selected to explore vast theories and understandings of non-traditional security: namely, concepts, ideas, definitions, and different schools of thought. Hence, qualitative research with a historical approach is chosen to integrate different interdisciplinary scientific areas from the historical point of view.

The scientific discourse of non-traditional security is comparatively new in academic spheres. Critical interpretation of primary sources in the expansion of the sphere will help to observe the main events and developments and realize the course of the current concepts. Its purpose is to give a clearer consideration of the impacts of the past traditional security politics and current approaches in many political security agendas, also known as non-traditional security processes.

### Findings and discussion

Generally, the history of non-traditional security studies started from the end of World War II, when the bipolar rival between the USA

and USSR led to the development of not only military technologies, which raised the menace of nuclear attack [1] but also technological advances and space race. The end of the XX century and the post-Cold War era resulted in the shift of paradigms in the notion and nature of traditional security in “war studies, military, and grand strategy and geopolitics” [1].

For example, Richard Ullman in his paper “Redefining Security” which was published in 1983 stated that human poverty and diseases, natural disasters, and environmental degradations all fall into the realm of security. He has been regarded by the Western Academic Community as the first to put forward the idea of non-traditional security. Moreover, during the 1980s the agenda in the field of security have been changed and the Copenhagen School initiated the first modern version of the securitization theory. The necessity for its formulation was manifested in an understanding of research limitations related to the traditional understanding of security. The school set a task of deconstructing the concept and outlining the comprehensive new structure in security research. Thus, the very use of the concept was expanded: for example, threats can arise in various areas, military and non-military, but they must be considered as security issues according to strictly defined criteria that distinguish them from the normal state of affairs.

Copenhagen School includes such scholars as Barry Buzan, Ole Wæver, and Jaap de Wilde and considers security issues as gradually transiting from the traditional security studies towards non-military concerns. Some other authors discuss the critical junctures of traditional security issues’ transition into non-traditional security threats and explain new trends in the system of international relations that proposed to enlighten new concepts of securitization [10]. Moreover, B.Buzan, I.Galtung, O.Wever, and J. de Wilde became representatives of a new paradigm in the study of security problems (Security Studies), who paid attention to the social aspects of security, rather than the military one. An important place in Copenhagen’s «peaceful studies» was the problem of constructing

threats and their diversity. Thus, the concept of securitization arises in the Copenhagen school, where social and political process gives the status of a security problem for arising issues. As a result, the Copenhagen School's responses to such questions, as "who and what are the referent objects?", "who are the securitizing actors?", "who are desecuritizing actors?" and "how is a process of securitization completed?" [2]. The Paris School, in turn, widens the range of explanation of non-traditional security matters by expanding "security agenda and security governance", but ignoring "sociopolitical and economic dynamics" [8, p. 462].

Consequently, from the 1980s, the United Nations organization started to shift its focus to non-traditional security problems and started to elevate problems of environment, development, poverty, population, and human rights to the level of security to call people's attention to the mounting importance of those tasks. Currently, at the outset of the XXI century, the world witnesses important changes in the system of international relations. Due to globalization, the growth of non-traditional actors, and the securitization policy, non-military problems come to the forefront. Hence, solving the non-traditional security issues gain paramount importance.

Changing threats led to the restructuring of the entire concept of security: the subject (who protects), the object (whom it protects), and the methods of providing it. Moreover, economic ties and financial flows that are not restrained by closed borders and ideological barriers created a truly global space for non-traditional threats. Coverage of new security studies widens its horizon and plenty of sub-areas of non-traditional security issues turn out to be more extensive. Global and regional financial crises, energy security in combating climate change, pandemics, and other contemporary problems boost the importance of non-traditional security discourses, and "the concept of non-traditional security is now widely accepted and reliably appears on regional security agendas and in scholarly publications." [13, p. 43]. From then on, several new schools of thought in international relations, especially those theorists of international political economy

and environmental politics, had made important contributions to expanding the scope of non-traditional security studies and constructing the theoretical framework of non-traditional security [2], [3], [5], [7], [10], [11], [12], etc.

Many articles and books on non-traditional security bring broad definitions of it, as well as its directions, development perspectives, and challenges in modern society. For example, Fierke talks about the spheres of international relations and geopolitics that are more and more investigating the epistemological and ontological fundamentals [7]. Some scholars reason the emergence of new threats, such as terrorism, environmental problems, economic crises, and others that opened new avenues for "former "low politics" security issues, which in turn are continually reclassified into the "high politics" realm" [2], [12].

Generally, early debates on security were mainly concerned about whether the concept should be widened to non-traditional at all, because the "security agenda risked making both scholarship and state policy incoherent" due to the change of attention "from the state to human security" [8, p. 463]. Eventually, opinions on broadening security notions to more non-traditional aspects prevailed and according to its supporters "it simply reflects post-Cold War changes in the threat environment, particularly globalization's impact in creating new risks, threats, and vulnerabilities for states and people, to which governments must now respond" [8].

According to many scholars, cases of non-military security issues in any country should be placed on the agenda of national security [1], [2], [3]. Also, Hameiri and Jones argue that nowadays security matters are non-traditional because states themselves have become non-traditional [8]. Therefore, governance and politics of non-traditional security aspects in a country or region reflect their administration, political and socio-economic discourses, matters and ideologies, and strategies and intentions of key bodies [8]. Moreover, non-traditional security issues that are depicted as "new threats" are mainly not new, but old problems that are addressed within a new discourse [8].

Nowadays as globalization deepens, more often non-traditional security matters go beyond the traditional borders of a nation and place them in the hand of international think tanks and governments [8]. For example, scholars of the Copenhagen School “have identified and described how problems become security issues, focusing on changes in the discourse of security” [8,

p. 463]. The only drawback, according to Hameiri and Jones is that the school does not “attempt to account for why this process is happening or how security issues are governed” (pp. 463- 464). Researchers of the Paris School, in turn, claim that “the security field is not fixed, and the location of agents and their influence is shaped by the configuration of context, the nature of the issue at stake, and the power struggles between professionals” [8, p. 465]. As a result, understandings of what is the security and how it is exercised are “intrinsically related”, thus, as argue Hameiri and Jones:

“What we take from the [Copenhagen School] and its constructivist and poststructuralist critics, therefore, is the notion that security is socially constructed; that it refers to, at least potentially, existential dangers; that securitization inherently empowers some actors at the expense of others; that discourse plays some role in defining security, and that networks of experts and officials are an important aspect of security governance. However, to fully understand the rise of non-traditional security and its implications, our conception of securitization processes needs to expand to encompass broader historical and material processes of state transformation, and we need to develop conceptual tools capable of analyzing security governance that go beyond security practitioners and their networks” (p. 465).

As a result, authors discard the empiricist statement that “the rise of non-traditional security is simply a reflection of changes in the threat environment associated with globalization” [8, p. 467]. Instead, they reason that descriptions of security cannot rely only on security discourses, but that “observe shift within security needs to be conceptualized in terms of a deep-seated

historical transformation in the scale of the state’s institutions and activities” [8, p. 472]. However, another description from scholars Callabero-Anthony and Emmers [2] states that

“The redefinition and broadening of the concept of security in academic debates have been matched by the development of new conceptual tools in the security studies literature. In Asia notions of ‘comprehensive security and ‘cooperative security has become part of the evolving security lexicon. Furthermore, the idea of ‘human security, which provides an alternative approach to re-think security by highlighting the threats and insecurities of individuals and communities, has gained more resonance and credence in the light of emerging threats and uncertainties.” (p. 1).

In a word, nowadays problems of balancing positive and negative aspects of globalization from the point of view of a state’s defensive capability are exacerbated. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, many political actors, academics, and diplomats believed in an era of peace and stability through the “integrated international economic system based on the principles of the free market” [4]. However, as new threats emerge, the notion of “peace and security” also have changed. The more dramatic growth of “securitization” of global issues outside of the traditional notion of security is increased mainly due to 9/11 and “other high-profile terrorist attacks” [8].

As a result, “traditional spatial notions of security, of national stability defined purely in terms of territorial sovereignty – reflected on a larger scale by the containment doctrines of the Cold War – simply do not work in today’s more complex geostrategic environment” [4, p. 2]. And nowadays’ NTS issues are more inter-dependent between each other than at any time in history due to globalization and technological advancements, which also influence the scale and practice of non-traditional security concepts [4]. For example, despite globalization positively affects to socio-economic exchanges, easy distribution of ICT and innovations, and attracting foreign direct investments (FDI), it also makes it easier to spread local threats to regional

and international levels, as the recent events of the global COVID-19 outbreak, and its economic consequences have shown [4].

### Conclusion

To sum up, considering today's realities, the notion of security has been deepening and broadening in response to globalization challenges. As a result, in addition to the traditional security threats on a politico-military basis, new non-traditional security pressures emerged. Issues that affect the security of individuals, states, regions, and the world are combined into one concept of Non-traditional security studies. But despite the widespread opinion, non-traditional perspectives of security do not normally fall into considered traditional security claims. Mostly it is because its definition and concept have been

the object of various interpretations. Moreover, together with the re-conceptualization of non-traditional security notions, rising challenges of non-military challenges caused the growing designation of national and international threats as non-traditional security matters [2]. For example, the Copenhagen School designates five categories of "new" security concepts, such as military, environmental, economic, societal, and political. But the rising phenomenon of human security entitles all security concerns should be claimed in terms of securitization of individuals rather than national levels. In this case, any issues, and challenges at societal, national, regional, or global levels that affect people's safety necessitate to be addressed and coped with. It embraces safeguarding and escalating human vital freedoms by protecting them from pervasive threats.

### References

1. Buzan B., Hansen L. The evolution of international security studies / B. Buzan, L. Hansen. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. – 100 p.
2. Caballero-Anthony M., Emmers R. Understanding the dynamics of securitizing non-traditional security. In *Non-Traditional Security in Asia* / M. Caballero-Anthony, R. Emmers. – New York: Routledge, 2017. – 125 p.
3. Anthony M.C., Emmers R., Acharya A. Non-traditional security in Asia: dilemmas in securitization / M.C. Anthony, R. Emmers. – Farnem: Ashgate Publishing, 2006, – 110 p.
4. Chalk P. Non-military security and global order: The impact of extremism, violence, and chaos on national and international security / P. Chalk. – Springer: Ashgate Publishing, 2000. – 115 p.
5. Dosch J. The concept and management of non-traditional security in Southeast Asia. *Sicherheit und Frieden (S+ F) // Security and Peace*. – 2006. – P. 179-184.
6. Epstein, A. Government's responsibility for Economic Security. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. – 1939. – P. 81-85. Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1022422> (accessed 03.10.2021).
7. Fierke K. M. *Critical approaches to international security*. John Wiley & Sons. – 2015. – P. 8.
8. Hameiri S., Jones L. The politics and governance of non-traditional security. *International Studies Quarterly*. – 2013. – № 57(3). – P. 462-473.
9. International Labor Organization // *Economic security for a better world*. – Geneva: International Labour Office, 2004. – P. 10.
10. Masys A.J. *Exploring the Security Landscape: non-traditional security challenges*. – Springer International Publishing, 2016. – P. 55.
11. Morris P. Human resource development in East Asia: A comparative analysis // *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*. – 2016. – P. 15.
12. Yu X. The emergence of Non-traditional security issues in China and corresponding strategies. In Y. Wang // *Transformation of Foreign Affairs, and International Relations in China (1978-2008)*. – Boston: Koninklijke Brill NV. – 2011. – P. 283-332.
13. Zimmerman E. Security cooperation in the Indo-Pacific: non-traditional security as a catalyst. *Journal of the Indian Ocean Region*. – 2012. – No.10(2). – P.150-165.

Д. Тоимбек

Астана IT университеті, Нұр-Сұлтан, Қазақстан

### Дәстүрлі емес қауіпсіздік дискурсының қалыптасуы мен эволюциясы

**Аңдатпа.** Қауіпсіздік тақырыптарына қолдау көрсету кең мағынада мемлекеттер мен қоғамдардың функционалдық тұтастығын қамтамасыз ету және тәуелсіз бірегейлігін сақтау ретінде анықталады. Биполярлық дәуірде мемлекеттердің қауіпсіздігін қамтамасыз етуде дәстүрлі әскери көзқарас саяси аренада басым орын алды. Қырғи-қабақ соғыс аяқталғаннан кейін, қауіпсіздіктің дәстүрлі емес мәселелері әлемдік саясатта маңызды орын ала бастады. Дәстүрлі емес қауіпсіздіктің көпшілігі жаһандық үрдістердің нәтижесі ретінде қарастырылады. Бұл жерде, жаһандану – объективті процесс ретінде әлемді өзара байланыстырады және өзара тәуелді етеді.

Ұлттық және әлемдік қауіпсіздік бағдарламаларының көпшілігі тұрақты дамудың ауқымды бағыттарын қамтиды. Атап айтқанда, саяси, экономикалық, әлеуметтік және экологиялық салалардағы әртүрлі дәстүрлі емес, мысалы: климаттың өзгеруі, энергетикалық қауіпсіздік, сөз бостандығы, адам құқықтары, заңның үстемдігі, мемлекеттік реттеудің сапасы, сауда-экономикалық тұрақтылық және т.б. мәселелерді қамтиды. Мақала саясаттану пәнінің кең шеңберіндегі дәстүрлі емес қауіпсіздік дискурсына негізгі анықтамалары мен ой мектептерін зерттей отыра, жалпы кіріспе береді.

**Түйін сөздер:** дәстүрлі емес қауіпсіздік, Копенгаген мектебі, Париж мектебі, секьюритизация.

Д. Тоимбек

Астана IT университет, Нур-Султан, Казахстан

### Формирование и эволюция дискурса нетрадиционной безопасности

**Аннотация.** Поддержание безопасности имеет широкое определение в обеспечении функциональной целостности и сохранения независимой идентичности государств и обществ. В биполярную эпоху на политической арене доминировал традиционный военный подход обеспечения безопасности стран. После окончания «Холодной войны» большое место в мировой политической повестке начали занимать вопросы нетрадиционной безопасности. Многие проблемы с нетрадиционными угрозами безопасности рассматриваются как результат глобальных тенденций, где глобализация как объективный процесс делает мир более взаимосвязанным и взаимозависимым.

На сегодняшний день большинство повесток дня национальной и глобальной безопасности содержит обширные области устойчивого развития. Они охватывают различные широкие нетрадиционные понятия в политической, экономической, социальной и экологической сферах, такие как изменение климата, энергетическая безопасность, свобода слова, права человека, верховенство закона, качество государственного регулирования, торгово-экономическая стабильность, исследования и разработки и т.д. В этой статье дается общее представление о нетрадиционной безопасности, рассматриваются основные определения и школы нетрадиционного дискурса безопасности в рамках политических наук.

**Ключевые слова:** нетрадиционная безопасность, Копенгагенская школа, Парижская школа, секьюритизация.

### References

1. Buzan B., Hansen L. The evolution of international security studies (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2009, 100 p.).
2. Caballero-Anthony M., Emmers R. Understanding the dynamics of securitizing non-traditional security. In Non-Traditional Security in Asia (Routledge, New York, 2017, 25 p.).
3. Anthony M.C., Emmers R., Acharya A. Non-traditional security in Asia: dilemmas in securitization (Ashgate Publishing, Farnem, 2006, 110 p.).

4. Chalk P. Non-military security and global order: The impact of extremism, violence, and chaos on national and international security (Ashgate Publishing, Springer, 2000, 115 p.).
5. Dosch J. The concept and management of non-traditional security in Southeast Asia. Sicherheit und Frieden (S+ F). Security and Peace. 2006. P. 179-184.
6. Epstein, A. Government's responsibility for Economic Security. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 1939. P.81-85. Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1022422> (accessed 03.10.2021).
7. Fierke K. M. Critical approaches to international security. John Wiley & Sons. 2015. P. 8.
8. Hameiri S., Jones L. The politics and governance of non-traditional security. International Studies Quarterly. 2013. No. 57(3). P. 462-473.
9. International Labor Organization. Economic security for a better world. Geneva: International Labour Office, 2004. P. 10.
10. Masys A.J. Exploring the Security Landscape: non-traditional security challenges. Springer International Publishing, 2016. P. 55.
11. Morris P. Human resource development in East Asia: A comparative analysis. Asia Pacific Journal of Education. 2016. P. 15.
12. Yu X. The emergence of Non-traditional security issues in China and corresponding strategies. In Y. Wang. Transformation of Foreign Affairs, and International Relations in China (1978-2008). Boston: Koninklijke Brill NV. 2011. P. 283-332.
13. Zimmerman E. Security cooperation in the Indo-Pacific: non-traditional security as a catalyst. Journal of the Indian Ocean Region. 2012. No.10(2). P.150-165.

**Information about the author:**

*Diana Toimbek* – Ph.D. in Political Science, Associate Professor, Astana IT University, Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan.

*Диана Тоимбек* – саяси ғылымдар докторы, доцент, Астана IT университеті, Нұр-Сұлтан, Қазақстан.