Global & Strategis

Global & Strategis

Human Security: Contending Perspectives of Liberalism, Critical Theory and Postcolonial Theory

Aryanta Nugraha dan Ludiro Madu

Universitas Pembangunan Nasional (UPN) "Veteran", Yogyakarta

ABSTRACT

Human security has increasingly become very dominant in international policy making as indicated by its integration to policy practices by many international institutions. This essay aims at providing a comparison on how the liberalism, critical theory and post-colonial theory stand in the light of human security debate, and seeks to answer to what extent human security signifies a paradigm shift in security. The primary focus of comparison is based on three fundamental questions of security: security for whom, security from what and security by what means. These three theories acknowledge that the ontological shift of security, from the state to individuals is a radical challenge toward the dominant-state-and-military based of realism and neo-realism. The three theories, however, understood the source of threats and the means to address human security differently. Finally, this essay finds that the robust debate of the human security apparently has not signified a paradigm shift in security thinking.

Keywords: *human security, liberalism, critical theory, post-colonial theory.*

Keamanan manusia menjadi isu yang semakin menonjol dalam pembuatan kebijakan internasional. Tulisan ini menjelaskan perbandingan antara teori liberalisme, teori kritis, dan teori paska-kolonial dalam perdebatan mengenai keamanan manusia. Selain itu, tulisan ini juga mengkaji sejauh mana keamanan manusia mendorong pergeseran paradigma dalam keamanan. Perhatian utama perbandingan didasarkan pada tiga pertanyaan penting mengenai keamanan, yaitu: keamanan bagi siapa, keamanan dari apa, dan keamanan dengan cara apa. Ketiga teori itu mengakui bahwa perubahan ontologi mengenai keamanan, dari negara ke individu merupakan perubahan radikal terhadap pandangan realisme dan neo-realisme yang didominasi oleh negara dan militer. Meskipun demikian, ketiga teori itu memahami sumber-sumber ancaman dan cara-cara mengusahakan keamanan manusia secara berbeda. Akhirnya, tulisan ini menemukan bahwa perdebatan mengenai keamanan manusia itu ternyata tidak bisa dimaknai sebagai perubahan paradigma dalam pemikiran mengenai keamanan.

Kata-Kata Kunci: *keamanan manusia, liberalisme, teori kritis, teori paskakolonial.*

"Human security is like "sustainable development"-everyone is for it,
But few people have a clear idea of what it means"

(Paris 2001)

Human security concept firstly brought by United Nations Development Programme's *Human Development Report 1994* spurred a wide debate in the discipline of International Relations, particularly in security studies. The debate generally represents two different strands between traditional, state-based, national interest (realism/ neo-realism perspective) and non-traditional, normative-value based and focus on individual human needs (human security, liberal, critical perspective).

The proponents of human security argue that human security represents a paradigm shift for both normative conceptual and policy making in global security from traditional state-centric security to human security (Tadjbakhsh & Chenoy 2007). This claim based on radical challenge of human security to traditional security's ontology and epistemology of security. First, unlike traditional security approach that focused on states, human security concept emphasises individuals as primary referent object of security. Second, human security concept focuses on non-military sources of insecurity that affect individuals' life as new sources of threat that may lead to global security problems.

For the opponents, the development human security concept is still far from paradigm shift. The concept lacks of precise and consensual definition. The most often cited definition of human security is based on the UNDP and The Commission on Human security. The UNDP defines human security as 'safety from the constant threats of hunger, disease, crime and repression and 'protection from the sudden and hurtful disruption to the pattern of our daily lives' (UNDP 1994, 23). The Commission on Human Security defines human security as protecting the vital core of all human lives in ways that enhance human freedom and human fulfilment (Commission on Human Security 2003, 4).

The term of human security is expansive and vague, just like a shopping list for research and policy making. Various international organisations as well as academics have different views and perspectives regarding human security, so that it has no clear-cut boundaries as well as a set of well-formulated theoretical foundation about how to achieve security for individual. Human security often seen from two different positions: broad approach and narrow approach. Broad approach focuses on the issue that undermine the life chances of majority of people such as extreme poverty, disease and underdevelopment (freedom from want and freedom from fear), while narrow approach focuses on the consequences of armed conflict to individual and group, including the

danger from repressive government and state failure phenomena (freedom from fear) (Alkire 2003; Nuruzzaman 2006). Roland Paris (2001, 25) cynically comments that, 'if human security means almost everything, then it effectively means nothing'.

Despite of criticisms, the emergence of human security marks the process of broadening, deepening and opening security studies. By broadening it means to include a wide range of potential non-military threats such as poverty, environmental degradation, pandemic, migration effects, and terrorism. Deepening means to consider the security of individual and its impact to global security (Krause & William 2006). Meanwhile, the opening of security means the need to open the underlying political visions of security thinking (politics of security) through analysing the ontological and epistemological (Wiber 2008).

Astonishingly, human security has become very dominant in international policy making indicated by its integration to policy practices by many international institutions and Western-middle power states such as Canada, Norway, and Japan. It signalises that human security is becoming a mainstream of global security policy framework (Chandler 2008). The adoption and adaptation of human security shows three divergence trends that represents the intersection and competition of three theoretical views in international relations studies. First, the broadening and deepening feature of human security shares the same claim with the critical theory and liberalism on the referent object of security. Second, the growing adoption of human security into mainstream policy framework of leading Western states and institutions generally reflects the liberal tendency on the needs for collective and collaborative efforts based on interdependence and interconnectedness to cope with human security threats. Finally, the global mainstreaming of human security opens the chance to reveal the politics of human security from the post-colonial theory since the locus of human security policy is in the post-colonial South.

The aim of this essay is to provide a comparison on how the liberalism, critical theory and post-colonial theory stand in the light of human security debate, and seeks to answer is human security signifying a paradigm shift in security. The primary focus of comparison is based over three fundamental questions of security; *security for whom, security from what* and *security by what means*. For that purposes, this essay is structured in three parts. The first part will engage with liberalism and human security. The second part will analyse human security from critical theory followed by analysis of human security from postcolonial theory in the third section.

Liberalism and Human Security

Liberalism is often seen as a Western political philosophy or theoretical tradition that emerges from the Enlightenment in Europe in 17th-18th century. Liberalism is often associated with philosophers such as John Locke, Jeremy Bentham, and Immanuel Kant that emphasises basic principles such as freedom, human rights, rationality, progress, constitutionalism (norm) and democracy as the most importance aspects of modern political and economic entities. Liberalism believes that if democratic societies in which civil liberties are protected and market-based economy prevail domestically, it will become the source of global peace order.

Liberalism in international relations can be identified by several characteristics; first, free individual is the primary actor in international relations. The state is basically a representative institution and transmission belt by which individual and social group preferences are translated into state policy (Moravcsik 1997, 516). From this point, liberalism rejects the view that international relations are merely relations between sovereign states. James Rosenau (1980) argues that international relations are plural and take into account the relations between people, groups and organisations belonging to different countries (transnational relations). Liberalism also believes in positive view of human nature, though are self-interested but rationality of individuals will engage them in a collaborative and cooperative action both in domestic and international level. This claim, according to liberalism, pushes forward the idea of cooperation and mutual benefits as a way to avoids conflict and war within and across states boundaries (Jackson & Sorensen 2007, 98-9).

Second, liberalism argues that the behavior of states can be explained from the internal politics configuration (Burchill et al. 2005, 56-7). This thinking based on Immanuel Kant thesis on *Perpetual Peace* that republican (democratic) states are more peaceful each other. In recent thinking Michael Doyle and Francis Fukuyama also point out that liberal democracies are rarely to use for (war) since all nations recognize one another legitimacy (Burchill et al. 2005, 56-7). The state-individuals (societal) linkages of liberalism thinking set up an 'inside-looking out' approach to international relations that framed in the famous democratic peace theory.

Third, liberalism also underlines the importance of economic interdependence among states in hindering conflict and war. The spirit of commerce and free trade is a more peaceful means to achieve national wealth and unite them in a common and peaceful enterprise. The claim

on causal impact of economic interdependence and peace formed the basis of commercial liberal thinking.

Fourth, liberalism believes that cooperation between states can and should be organised in a formalised institutions. It can be traced back from argument proposed by Kant that 'republican constitutions', commercial exchange that embodied in cosmopolitan law would provide a basis for sustained peace (Dunne et al. 2007, 96). Institutions mean sets of rules which govern state behavior in certain policy area. Through institutionalization of international affairs whether it forms international organisations, regime or negotiated order, anarchy could be managed.

In the security studies debate, liberalism shares many ontological and epistemological elements with human security that questioning the traditional state-centric in the post Cold War world. Obviously, the idea of human security is rooted in the reform liberalism that mixing normative values and policy orientation regarding the prevailing notions of development and security. This can be trace back from several endeavours from the report of the Club of Rome in 1970s that ended up with the concept of sustainable development, followed by the effort two independent commissions, Independent Commission on International Development (Brandt Commission) and Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues (Palme Commission) in the 1980s. When the Cold War ended efforts from two organizations, Stockholm Initiative on Global Security and Governance, and Commission on Global Governance were the precursor of human security thinking, before it formally adopted by the UNDP in 1994 (Baipai 2003). In answering the questions of *security for whom* and *security of which values*, human security's shift toward the individual as the referent object of security conforms to the basic idea of liberalism. According to liberalism, the demise of the Cold War leads the way to move away from an exclusionary state-centered notion of security toward a notion of security that concern with the fate of individual human being. Human security soon legitimizes the liberal idea on the primacy of individual in international affairs.

Regarding the questions of *security from what threats* and *security by what means*, liberalism argues that human security should be maintain as a catch-all concept that encompass a broad non-conventional issues such as economic security, food security, health security, environmental security, physical/personal security, community security and political security (Nuruzzaman 2006, 292-3; Paris 2001, 89-90). Maintaining a broad definition of human security related to the effort to to spread the liberal values and widen the zone of peace as the foundation of a lasting peace. Liberalism celebrated the end of the Cold War as the triumph of liberal democracy and capitalism and believes that liberal democracy is

the final form of "ideological evolution" and 'human government' (Fukuyama 1992, x-xii). More importantly since liberal states is proven act peacefully towards one another, the next agenda is defending and extending the liberal zone of peace towards non-liberal states and to convert them. Michael Doyle suggests dual track approach to widen the zone of peace; (1) the first track is preserving liberal community and forging alliances with other liberal states *vis a vis* non-liberal states, (2) the second track is expanding liberal views by variety means of economic and diplomatic instruments to build an inspiration (spreading hope in non-liberal states), instigation (peace building and economic restructuring) and intervention (if basic right is being violated) (Baylis & Smith 2001).

The first track approach of liberalism on human security is to bring about the mixture coalition of middle power states, development agencies and NGOs under the same umbrella to address global security threats and to build liberal human security norms at global level. One of the most important coalitions is Human Security Network that includes Canada, Japan, Norway and other middle power states. There also various International NGOs that involve in it. Human security can be employed as a unifying concept for the coalition because it encompasses the various perspectives and objectives of all the coalition members. More importantly, the coalition becomes a strong political power in articulating human security as global norms in different aspects of international affairs. For instance, the action taken by the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) to publish its report, *The Responsibility to Protect* (R2P) and persuaded states to endorse and adopt it. ICSS is an independent panel funded by the Canadian Government. According to R2P the fundamental responsibility for protecting individuals rest in the host state and the intervention from outside only is possible if the host proved unwilling or unable to fulfil its responsibility. The R2P then adopted at the 2005 World Summit and appear in paragraph 138 and 139 of the Summit's document and become an international norm of humanitarian intervention (Bellamy 2006). Thus, human security becomes a legitimate means to spread liberal democratic governance to improve the world order to maintain peace based on liberal values.

The second track approach of liberalism on human security could be identified by the promotion of liberal democratic peace idea. According to Michael Doyle (2005) there are three important pillars of this idea; republican representation, commitment to fundamental human rights and transnational independence. The mainstreaming of liberal peace idea on the human security agenda can be recognized from the securitisation process that based on liberal values such as democratisation, economic liberalisation, neo liberal development,

human rights and the rule of law (Richmond 2006). It is also generally involving multiple actors such as foreign donors, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), International Organisations, International Financial institutions and regional organisations that provide a liberal set of security needs. For some liberalism supporters, human security will be best implemented as approach to peace building project in the conflict-prone and post-conflict or the so-called failed states. The promotion of welfare, equitable human development and inclusive democratic politics will prevent the escalation of conflict and generating a durable and self-sustained peace (Futumara et al. 2010).

Critical Theory and Human Security

Critical theory in general is a distinct tradition of thought which questions modern social and political life through a method of immanent critique. Although its root that can be traced back to the Enlightenment by the work of Immanuel Kant, Frederick Hegel and Karl Marx, the recent critical theory often associated with the Frankfurt School. The fundamental work of the critical theory is the effort to understand the central aspect of contemporary society by revealing its historical and social development and contradictions. The ultimate objective of critical theory is to disclose the underlying social structure and various forms of domination in order to overcome them and engage in social transformation (Burchill 2005, 137-8). Critical theory also often labelled as neo-Marxist theory since it seeks to recover the emancipation element of Marxism thinking. Critical theory, however, rather than focusing on political economy (Marxian) emphasises on values and norms that have political implication to the existing structure of domination and oppression (Gramscian) (Hobden 2001, 214).

Critical theory challenges the ontology and epistemology of dominant theory in international relations and sparked the 'third debate' in the discipline of International Relations around the methodological approach. Using post-positivist methodology, critical theory rejects the postulate of positivism; objectivity of external reality, the separation of subject and object, and the qualify theory as a value-free (Jackson & Sorensen 2007, 292). By realising that theories are always set in social and political life, critical theory scrutinises the purpose and function performed by certain theory. As has been stated by Robert Cox that theory is always for someone and for some purpose, critical theory inquires the politic of production and reproduction of knowledge in international relations.

According to critical theory, the dominant theories of international relations, because of the influence of positivist methodology, have turned

to become problem solving theory. The problem is that problem solving theories are prone to be politicised and have tendency to legitimise the established social and political structure of world order including the ideology and the inequalities in power and wealth (Devetak 2005, 141-2). As problem solving theories is always predisposed by certain interest, critical theory must bring awareness of the interest, ideology/ values and orientation of any other theories. Based on that, critical theory argues that theory is not only a tool to analyse day to day realities but also force to transform those realities. Critical theory thus featured by emancipatory tenet. Emancipation broadly defined as freeing people from any socially constructed constraint to achieve autonomy.

In the security debate, from the outset critical theory challenges the ontology of traditional-(realism/neo-realism) arguments that emphasis on state-centric, military primacy in ahistorical anarchic environment. Critical theory also questions the epistemological elements of neo-realism on universal claim and value-free security studies. Critical theory, conversely argues that security is a contested concept and definition of security is far from neutral because it is influenced by its moral and normative commitment. Moreover security is not only a matter of material-physical variable, but also ideational (Smith 2005, 27). In contrast to other approach of security, critical theory believes that security has undergone a broadening and deepening process beyond state-military element and to include marginalised individuals, groups and communities. Thus, concerning the question *security for whom*, critical theory argues that individuals is the referent object of security, as stated by Booth that the ultimate referent object in the security is the individual physical being (Newman 2010, 85).

Relating to the questions of *security from what threats* and *by what means*, critical theory accept the broadening agenda of security such as environmental, economic, societal and political security. Nevertheless those broaden agenda also entail the understanding of values within which ideas of security are set up. This could be done through deconstructing, problematizing and unravelling the existing notion of security (Newman 2010, 83-6). Moreover, critical theory points out the importance of universal emancipation of human being as the solution of security problem. By emancipation it means as 'freeing people (as individuals and groups) from those constraints that stop them to carrying out what freely what they would freely choose to do' (Devetak 2005, 145). According to Cox, the biggest task for emancipation today to challenge the domination of neoliberal globalisation world order and ensure that the transformation of global structures of political economy takes side to the interest of the marginalised (Cox 1981). Critical theory, thus proposes alternative objectives of security that emphasis on the potential transformation of human relations.

At the surface, the ongoing discourse on human security looks like that it could be easily subsumed into the rubric of critical theory. Nevertheless, although human security and critical theory on security share the same ontology on broadening and deepening referent object of security, critical theory treats human security as 'uncritical' and 'unsophisticated' concept and categorised as problem solving theory (Newman 2010, 77).

In general there is a lack of commitment between human security and critical theory. First, from the knowledge production view, the unresolved debate between broad and narrow human security shows that it is still an underdevelop concept. Interestingly it has become a wide policy orientation and pragmatically employed as a tool to address the global security problems by many leading Western countries followed by many financial institution. In the vagueness of the definition, human security has been easily connected with development process to alleviate the threats of the individuals. Critical theory, therefore suspiciously asserts that human security has incorporated into liberal project by using the hegemonic language of liberal economic development and liberal democracy norms (Christie 2010).

Second, the broadening and deepening referent object of human security does not change fundamentally the meaning of security nor undermines the role of the state as the agent of securitisation. Conversely human security discourse tends to be pragmatic to propose the solution. The recent wave of security scholarship and policy making sponsored by the Canadian government push the way to accept and work with the state to cope with individual security threats. For example, Lloyd Axworthy, Canadian Foreign Affairs and International Trade Minister, argues that human security policy does not necessarily rule out the traditional security, so that the use of military force is tolerated (Black 2006, 53-62). Clearly, this development influenced by liberal pluralistic view that the state represents the preference of individuals, so the state is basically working in the interests of individual. Critical theory argue that human security is becoming a state-sponsored activity with accepting the role of the state without significantly questioning prevailing structures of power, injustice in political organisation and economic distribution and gender relations. Human security then becomes a bio-political by allowing the expansion of state governance in broader security agenda. This in turn becomes the biggest paradox of human security, since human security normatively calls for a re-orientation of structures that produce insecurity while its policy orientation reproduce and reinforce those structures (Newman 2010, 87-8).

Finally, critical theory also pays a closer attention to the using of human security as a new form of Western liberal hegemony. David Chandler comments that although human security is 'the dog that didn't bark' the

discourse of human security has become very central in international policy making (Chandler 2008). This can be illustrated by the adoption of controversial issue to become global norms, such as the association of human security with humanitarian intervention in the R2P norm, the changing norm of sovereignty and human rights. For critical theory this development raises concern on the use of human security as a mask for certain political objectives. From those criticisms above, critical theory proposes to go beyond problem solving approach of human security towards a Critical Human Security studies (human security based on critical theory) that aware with the internal contradiction and power bias of the human security discourse and critically analysing agent-structure relationship for policy initiatives. To cope with the individual insecurity needs to scrutinise the structural factors and the distribution of power, therefore the policy initiatives should be centres on emancipatory projects to transform the structural condition and power injustice (Newman 2010, 92-4; Christie 2010, 181-2).

Postcolonial Theory and Human Security

Postcolonial is a contested term with variety of cultural, economic and political practises. Postcolonial, at least can be understood as two important meaning; as a condition, time after colonialism and as a ethical and literary theory that dealing with issues such as identity, race, ethnicity, gender, power and knowledge that influenced by condition of colonialism (McEwan 2009,17-22). Postcolonial theory of international relations contends the deficiency of the existing global norms, values and institutions in distributing international justice, particularly towards post-colonial non-European countries. Postcolonial theory, then aspires to a new kind of international relation knowledge and practises that elude from colonial legacies such as hegemony and exploitation towards more inclusive, empathetic and deliberative by considering the significance of global South countries (Grovogui 2007, 253-4).

Postcolonial theory asserts that there is a separation or binary (between Europe/ non-Europe, strong/ weak, powerful/ powerless, the North/the South, self/ other) in the knowledge of international relations. Today, Eurocentrism dominates the system of truth, values and institutions of international order. Samir Amin defines Eurocentrism as a complex idea with the core assumption of European centrality in the human past and present (Fourny 1994). Although the concept of Europe is changed overtime both as geographical location or imagined system, Europe is envisaged as separate and distinct from the rest of the world with superiority in social, economic, political and cultural aspects. The centrality of Europe generates difficulties to find the 'truth' in

international relations since the conceptual, normative and narrative from the eye of Europe are taken for granted as universal.

Postcolonial theory also rejects the notion of universalism, cosmopolitan, humanism and rationalism derived from Eurocentrism. Those modern ideas always pose the North as civilised, ethical, humanist and progressive by ignoring the history of imperial violence and genocide in the colonies. Conversely the South states are attributed with certain category as not modern yet, disorder, fragile states or even failed states (Duffield 2009). It is clear that those categories that derived from modern North countries' history and sociological context will keep relations between the North and the South always in separation, discrete binary and unequal. The reproduction of those categories shows that there is a hierarchical relation between the North and the South without paying attention to the histories, values and point of view from the South. Postcolonial theory suspiciously contends this mode of reproduction of hegemonic knowledge becomes the continuity of preoccupation of Europe towards others. Postcolonial theory therefore seeks to involve in creation of truth by recovering the lost historical and significant voices of the South through reconstruction of knowledge production.

Security studies, from postcolonial point of view, have been preoccupied by Eurocentric character (Barkawi & Laffey 2006). It is proven from the dominant perspective that constituted the study. For postcolonial theory, realism is a theory based on great powers relations. Liberalism that seeks to regulate behaviour of the state through international institutions and norms is also clearly a product of Western great powers diplomacy. Not least, the constructivist theory and critical theory are influenced of Western-Kantian tradition. It is not surprising when the European knowledge-based security takes the South which is weak and powerless as the marginal element of security, the potential source of instability of global system, and the locus of human security policy, ultimately humanitarian intervention.

The European centrality of security studies also could be traced back from the production of knowledge. For instance, the history of the World War II was the history of imperialist countries since it never considering the history of the colonies. The self determination and the free world jargons in the aftermath of the World War II was decided by the imperialist towards their European counterpart, but had no impact to the freedom of the colonies. The history of The World War II also underlined the image that the West is the good forces in the world because it wanted to liberate other countries in Europe, while the Germany is the evil since it cause the Holocaust (Barkawi & Laffey 2006, 338-41). The dangers of Eurocentrism in security studies therefore are

discou
po!
rative

difficult to understand the nature of the empirical
he analysis through Eurocentric view is the sight from
i the imperialist that is not suitable with the weak and
l states.

n security, postcolonial theory argues that rather than
lution to South countries security problem, human
ces the binary self/other, between North-develop and
relop countries. Duffield and Waddell argue that human
security, ratior than a policy tools to secure people through welfare and
well being, it best understood as policy formation, as relational
governance on how international institutions and other actors categorise
and separate and act towards South people (Duffield & Waddell 2006).
Similarly, David Chandler (2008, 428) argues that human security
reflects the exaggeration of the new post-Cold War security threats and
locates the threats in the South countries.

Concerning to the changing referent object of human security from state
to people universally, postcolonial theory doubts it. Human security
according to Duffiled and Waddell (2006, 4-6) is a bio-political
technology of governance that intersects between sustainable
development and security. Since the target of sustainable development is
the populations from underdevelop-South countries, the real object of
human security is populations of the South. This only could be
materialised by bringing together the existing institutions, network and
practises under the new global norms-human security.

Relating to the question *security from what* and *what means*, according
to postcolonial theory, human security threats, instead of natural, is
produced by standard Eurocentric through category such as fragile
states, failed states, and 'new war' concept as the new security terrains.
By those categories, Eurocentric literature warns that in the post Cold
War era there is a changing the nature of conflict that is more internal
logic driven, particularly in the third world countries. This in turn will
become the most lethal source of global security de-stabiliser when they
decouple with other problems such as poverty, health, transnational
crimes and terrorism. Those new sources of threat clearly show
European heavy without further understanding to the nature of security
predicament in the third world countries. More badly, when human
intervention is used as a policy tools to meet the human security
problems in the third countries, once again it reinforces the image of the
North as the saviour from genocide and punisher the human rights
perpetrator, while the native is the violator (Barkawi & Laffey 2006,
341).

The human security debate, thus according to post colonial theory needs to be located in the sociological and historical context of the South countries. Barkawi and Laffey (2006, 352) for example, encourage for developing a non-European security studies. A non-European security studies also will provide an adequate understanding of the nature of security threats from the lens of the native. The studies will represent the voice of the *Melians* --- the term of Melians is metaphor for the weak countries--- and lead to a more pluralistic security studies. A strong representation of the South is a *conditio sine qua non* towards a mutual constitution of European and non-European and their collective responsibility in making history.

Conclusion

Seeing human security from liberalism, critical theory and postcolonial theory results in different pictures and understanding. The three theories acknowledge that the ontological shift of security, from the state to individuals is a radical challenge toward the dominant-state-military based of realism and neo-realism. The three theories however understood the source of threats and the means to address human security differently. Liberalism maintains that human security could become a normative and policy oriented perspective to widen the liberal democratic peace throughout the world. Liberalism thus endorses human security as a new base for global governance norm to achieve a long lasting peace. Conversely, critical theory contends that human security tends to become a hegemonic and a new orthodoxy problem solving theory without transforming the socio-political structure that underlying it. Human security therefore should move beyond liberalism toward a Critical Human Security. Away from those two European based human security, postcolonial theory disputes the Eurocentrism in human security debate without involving the South in the knowledge production of the concept. Instead of become a solution Eurocentric human security is a new idea that reinforce the binary relations between the North and the South. Postcolonial theory, thus urge for the development of non-European security studies.

The robust debate of the human security apparently has not signified that there will be a paradigm shift in security thinking. Still, human security poses an important debate in the broadening, deepening and opening of security studies. May be it is still far away for human security to become a new paradigm in security, but for sure human security has become an established category, a label, an umbrella concept or at least an avenue to the field of security studies that moved beyond traditional approach.

Bibliography

Books

Black, David R., 2006. "Mapping the Interplay of Human Security Practice and Debate: The Canadian Experience," in Sandra J. Maclean, David R. Black & Timothy M. Shaw (eds), 2006. *A Decade of Human Security, Global Governance and New Multilateralism*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Burchill, Scott, 2005. "Liberalism", in Scott Burchill (eds), 2005. *Theories of International Relations*. 3rd edition. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Commission on Human Security, 2003. *Human Security Now: Protecting and Empowering People*. Commission on Human Security. New York.

Devetak, Richard, 2005. "Critical Theory", in Scott Burchill, Andrew Linklater, Richard Davetak, Jack Donelly, Mathew Paterson, Cristian Reus-Smit & Jacqui True (eds), 2005. *Theories of International Relations*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Duffiled, Mark, 2009. "Liberal Interventionism and Fragile States", in Mark Duffield & Vernon Hewitt (eds), 2009. *Empire, Development & Colonialism; the Past in the Present*. NY: James Curry.

Dunne, Tim, 2001. "Liberalism", in John Baylis & Steve Smith (eds), *The Globalization of World Politics, An introduction to international relations*. 2nd edition, 2001. New York: Oxford University Press.

Fukuyama, Francis, 1992. *The End of History and The Last Man*. London: Hamish Hamilton.

Grovogui, Siba N., 2001. "Postcolonialism", in Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki & Steve Smith (eds), 2001. *International Relations Theories, Discipline and Diversity*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hobden, Stephen & Richard Wyn Jones, 2001. "Marxist Theory of International Relations", in John Baylis & Steve Smith (eds), 2001. *The Globalization of World Politics, An introduction to international relations*. 2nd edition. New York: Oxford University Press.

Jackson, Robert & Georg Sorensen, 2007. *Introduction to International Relations; Theories and Approaches*, 3rd edition. New York: Oxford University Press.

McEwan, Cheryl, 2009. *Postcolonialism and Development*. London: Routlegde.

Rosenau, James N., 1980. *The study of Global Interdependence: Essay on the Transnationalisation of World Affairs*. New York: Nichols.

Russett, Bruce, 2007. "Liberalism", in Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki & Steve Smith (eds), *International Relations Theories, Discipline and Diversity*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Smith, Steve, 2005. "The Contested Concept of Security", in Ken Booth (ed), 2005. *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*, Boulder Colorado: Lyenne-Rienner.

UNDP, 1994. *Human Development Report 1994: New Dimension of Human Security*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Tadjbakhsh, Shahrbanou & Anuradha M. Chenoy, 2007. *Human Security: Concepts and Implications*, London & New York: Routledge.

Journals

Alkire, Sabina, 2003. "A Conceptual Framework for Human Security", Working Paper 2, *Centre for Research on Inequality, Human Security and Ethnicity*, Queen Elizabeth House, University of Oxford.

Bajpai, Kanti, 2003. "The Idea of Human Security", *International Studies*. **43** (3): 195-228

Barkawi, Tarak & Mark Laffey, 2006. "The Postcolonial Moment in Security Studies", *Review of International Studies*, **32**: 329-352.

Bellamy, Alex J., 2006. "Whither the Responsibility to Protect? Humanitarian Intervention and the 2005 World Summit", *Ethics and International Affairs*. **20** (2): 143-169.

Chandler, David, 2008. "Human Security: The Dog That Didn't Bark", *Security Dialogue*. **39** (4): 427-438.

_____, 2008. "Human Security Paradox: How Nations States Grew to Love Cosmopolitan Ethics", International Conference on Globalization, Difference and Human Securities, *Graduate School of Human Sciences*. Osaka University. Japan.

Christie, Ryerson, 2010. "Critical Voices and Human Security: To Endure, To Engage or To Critique", *Security Dialogue*. **41** (2): 169-190.

Cox, Robert, 1981. "Social Forces, States and World Order: Beyond International Relations Theory", *Millenium*. **10**: 126-155.

Doyle, Michael, 2005. "Three Pillars of the Liberal Peace", *American Political Science Review*, **99** (3): 463-466.

Duffield, Mark & Nicholas Waddell, 2006. "Securing Humans in dangerous World", *International Politics*. **23**: 1-23.

Fourny, Jean Franscois, 1994. "Anatomy of Eurocentrism: On Samir Amin's Eurocentrism and Vasilis Lambropoulos's the Rise of Eurocentrism", *Research in African Literature*, **25** (4): 189-198.

Futumara, Madoka, Edward Newman & Shahrbanou Tadjbakhsh, 2010. "Towards a Human Security Approach to Peacebuilding", *Research Brief*. United Nations University. 2.

Krause, Keith & Michael C. William, 1996. "Broadening the Agenda of Security Studies: Politics and Methods", *Mershon International Studies Review*, **40** (2): 229-254.

Moravcsik, Andrew, 1997. "Taking Preference Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics", *International Organization*. **51** (4): 513-553.

Newman, Edward, 2010. "Critical Human Security Studies", *Review of International Studies*. **36**: 77-94.

Nuruzzaman, Mohammed, 2006. "Paradigm in Conflict; Contested Claims of Human Security, Critical Theory and Feminism", *Cooperation and Conflict: Journal of Nordic International Studies Association*, **41** (3): 285-303.

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

Richmond, Oliver P., 2006." Human Security and Liberal Peace: Tension and Contradiction", *EKEM Workshop* on International Peacekeeping and Peacemaking: Global and Regional Perspectives.

Wiber, Annick T.R., 2008. "Human Security: Toward an Opening", *Security Dialogue*, **39** (4): 455-462.