

Critically the human
being centrality in the
security



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Critically analyse the following proposition: ' security is an ' essentially contested concept'. Introduction: For most people, the term " security" basically suggests a common meaning and carries a similar notion. However, after the World War II, scholars and researches spilled much ink about security and its divergent and versatile definitions. In 1947, the United States passed its National Security Act and from then on, the concept " security" has spread widely, (Leffler, 1994).

Nevertheless, the concept of security has not taken one fixed form, but kept on changing depending on the dynamic nature of threats. For instance, the new challenges such as poverty, unemployment, civil wars, diseases and violations of people's rights and freedoms are all threats that have led to expanding the concept of security (Hough, 2014). The variation of threats is clearly linked to the risk factors in the economic, political, social and environmental spheres.

Nowadays, the concept of security is broader and more comprehensive than its traditional definition, which was mainly concerned and revolved around overcoming military threats. However, no one can deny or ignore the traditional interpretation of the security term since many countries still adhere to it until today. (Smith, 2005). After the Cold War, internal threats have emerged besides the existence of the external threats arising from globalization, (Beeson & Bellamy, 2003).

Consequently, the security term was no longer confined to the state or revolves around the state but has expanded to include other dimensions. Some scholars and schools have even argued against the state centrality

and advocated the human being centrality in the security realm. Moreover, the dynamic nature of global events and the different interests and problems the various nations of the world have make it difficult to agree on one consistent definition. Furthermore, the failure to reach consensus on a standard definition of security still lingers until today. Concepts such as terrorism, peace, happiness, democracy, freedom, and most importantly security, are inherently difficult to define neutrally (Gallie, 1955). Hundreds of different arguments and interpretations about the concept of security have emerged due to the impossibility of circulating one suitable understanding of the definition for everyone. Scholars like Smith (2005) have formulated the concept of security as a disputed one, while others like Baldwin (1997) argued in contrast that security is not essentially a contested concept. This essay argues that it is best to understand the security concept as an essentially contested concept.

To draw a conclusion of the argument that security is an essentially contested concept, this essay will first attempt to demonstrate what is meant by an “ essentially contested concept”. Second, it will show how security is an essentially contested concept by shedding light on the different definitions and interpretations of the term by multiple scholars. Third, lights will be shed on literature opposing that security was an essentially contested concept but at the same time failed to come up with a standard definition of security that would have prevailed over other definitions.

Fourth, this essay will present the different theories of the traditional school (Realism), which believes that security is confined to the state and the <https://assignbuster.com/critically-the-human-being-centrality-in-the-security/>

military approach; the (Copenhagen school), which broadened the concept to include other dimensions alongside the state and military-based security. The last school this essay will examine is the Welsh School, which is considered as the non-traditional school in interpreting the term "security" based on its own classification and understanding of the threats and their focus on the human being. First, what is meant by an "Essentially Contested Concept"? When a concept is believed to be the best by many different theorists and in its nature provoke conflicts over its meaning, it is said to be an essentially contested concept as has been stated by Gallies in 1956. Originally, the "essentially contested concept" meaning is inherently an issue of dispute as it does not have a neutral meaning. The phrase "essentially contested concept" was produced by Walter Bryce Gallie in 1956 to outline an understanding of the interpretations that are used in many domains, such as the political domain. The essentially contested concept does not only lie down in the political field but also in many other domains and fields of arts, ethics, and aesthetics, (Sulovic, 2010). This theory of Gallie's is derived from his observations of the debate over the various theories.

Furthermore, it has been noted by Waldron (2011) that the issue in the essentially contested concept is not only the conflict about finding hard cases for the concept's application, rather than the core dispute of the concept itself. The existence of the term security is universally accepted by everyone, but the issue underlies in the universal disagreement over its definition. For instance, "books" are "books" and no one would ever imagine books as food, it has a universally shared meaning, unlike many

political terms, such as the terms terrorism, justice, emancipation, power, and many other social terms, (Smith, 2005). The dispute is about how the concept should be used in a proper way, everyone believes that the concept is only being correctly used by them; hence no amounts of shreds of evidence can lead to a universal agreement on one standard definition (Smith, 2002). Second, the multi-faceted definitions of security as an essentially contested concept.

There are multiple definitions of the term security. However, it is beyond the scope of this essay to mention them all. This section of the essay will shed light on some of these definitions in order to exhibit the variation of the definition from one another and the fact that there is no agreement on one version for standard use. Everyone believes his definition is the best to consider in the political world.