Importance of the redefinition of security discourse from a state centric to huma...

Law, Security

Security is of supreme significance in any civilization. The concept is diverse and focuses on traditional security understanding in military terms, the classical national security idea, until the most contemporary ideas on comprehensive security. In broader terms, security is centered on the political, social, environmental and cultural dimensions.

Security studies in international peace and security are often conducted within a theoretical framework which refers to the intended objective of security, threats to that purpose, and the means by which the object attempts to prevent and protect itself from threats of which for traditionalists, the intended object is the state, the main threat is other states that have the capability and intention to use force to achieve their goals. Meaning to oppose such threats is military deterrence and if need be, the use of force if an attack seems forthcoming, (Ibid). Theorists disagree the idea of human security being important. Authors like Buzan, are skeptical about the focus on state security as the intended objective, which should be replaced or supplemented by human security. His argument is that the referent object of human security cannot eagerly be either the individual or all the people.

Several theorists apply the belief of human security to clarify the origins and impact of insecurity at individual and state level. Human security as a new concept is obtained on the premise that changes from state to people centered security, enabling theorists rethink the ideology on human security dynamically. In Girmay and Gebreslassie's essay " Discoursing the Concept of Human Security", indicates that human security has finally led to two lines

of thought being the narrow and broader views. Similarly, uncertain and positive arguments amass predominantly on the effectiveness of individual safety.

On the contrary, the growing debates and thoughts on human security can be grouped as narrow versus broader views. Normally, advocates of the narrow thought see human security to have given up nonviolent threats for strategic value, while the broader school of thoughts interpret human security to be an all-inclusive perception and strategic. Nevertheless, the competing examinations made through the two lines of conceptualization reflect the ongoing idea and progress of human security. Furthermore, Kettemann (2006) states that the competing debates created on human security are an investigation of future developments far both the narrow and broader schools and are active in making the concept more effective and realistic in handling contemporary security and threats.

Scholars that sustain the narrow school of thought have forfeited nonviolent threats for strategic value as cause to focus on precise and potential aggressive threats. The narrow scholars do little to preserve people who die from nonviolent and avoidable human security harms and threats such as corruption, environmental hazards, economic inequality, political discrimination and structural injustice (Ibid). In addition, the narrow school of thought criticizes the broader view in that it's all encompassing and difficult to analyze threats of insecurity.

The broader school of thought sees human security as a concern with human vulnerability and encompasses all sorts of threats. Further, human security should be viewed broadly than safety from violent threats, providing equal access to social services, political plurality and human rights protection. Others perceive human security as a foundation concept, a paradigm and organizing concept. However, the challenging discussion on human security assures a growing model of referent on security from state to individual centric belief.

Human security is a protective concept to both individual and nation at large, it supposes that people are vulnerable, caused by events beyond the control of the state such as drought, terrorism and climate change. Human security as a worry has incredible procedure implications on national and international agendas. Fukunda-Parr and Messineo (2012) stresses the need for the usefulness of human security as a regional effort to reorganize and redefine common security policy analysis.

Additionally, the practice of changing the security scenery from state centric to a people centric perspective has potential or contemporary security policymakers. Importantly, the general and protective natures of human security are forceful values that permit a deterrent and constructive concept. It turns out into an idea whose realization would allow a more preventive and effective response to the threats people and communities encounter. In addition, Fuetes and Aravena (2005) identify the effectiveness of human security by pointing out humanistic nature of human security which first and foremost centers on people than nation state and complexity that human

precautions needs to administer equally nonviolent and aggressive threats to security.

As it has been hinted earlier, the skeptic arguments and justifications made against the usefulness of human security are basically rooted on its conceptual all-inclusivity and ambiguity. Some of the skeptics, as presented by Girmay and Gebreslassie (2016) argue that the concept of human security is too ambiguous, so that it is hardly operationalized and less of use for academician and practitioners. It's disputed that human security has been unsuccessful in determining the order of security issues such as military and non-military threats.

It touches everything and so would have the potential to be nothing that ultimately undermines its effectiveness. Furthermore, it is noted that human security makes the task of policy formulation nearly impossible as it does not have any definite boundaries, and takes everything as a risk to people security.

David (2011), in his paper sited Chandler (2008) as having said that in spite of the widespread use of human security as a concept in international security policy analysis, human security has had little impact on policy outcomes since it labels all potential harms as threats to security. Making causal analysis and subsequent prioritizing actions for intervention remain difficult because security policy makers could hardly prioritize human security's issues and form a clear agenda of feasible and measurable objectives (Paris, 2001). Furthermore, in putting human security into

practical use, especially on the need to move beyond encompassing exhortations and to focus on specific solutions to specific threats, such as violent conflicts, climate change, poverty and many human problems, policymakers face a number of challenges.

In conclusion, from the security discourse it has been learnt that the normative dimension of human security does not only include visionary interpretations of human destiny it also prescribes some empirical features for that vision. Besides, the shift ' from the state to the individual' enhances the ' quality of life' of people. Even though Human security has a negative and positive, in that it consequently refers to freedom from want, hunger, attack, torture, unfair imprisonment and injustice. And in a more beneficial way, it means freedom to the capacity and opportunity that allows each human being to enjoy life to the fullest without imposing constraints upon others engaged in the same pursuit. Putting the two together, human security refers to the quality of life of the people of a society or polity. These critical security and strongly normative arguments in the international security literature inform much, but not all, of the current human-centric critique of the traditional state-centric approach. Utilitarian and consequential normative arguments are the best known critiques, derived from the development and humanitarian literatures.