DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY:
Many Theories, One World

By
Fabian Estrada Quero

Abstract

Development and security have historically fashioned distinct discourses. More recently, they have been inevitably linked both in discourse and policy, having as a consequence the so-called development–security nexus. The goal of this paper is to examine the construction of notions and the establishment and consolidation of the discourses that the main theories that shape the field of Development Studies and International Security have created across time. In so doing, the first part of this paper will try to explain how theories that explain development and underdevelopment understand International Security. The second part introduces the term Human Security. Consequently, this work will discuss if the theories that explain development and underdevelopment have been important to the improvement of the Human Security paradigm.

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION

Months ago on the first page of one daily newspaper, I found out that Berlusconi was going to face trials and the wrath of Italy's women. Lately, newspaper headlines refer to the problems that the British government is facing together with the economic problems that some countries of the Euro-zone are having, and a few pages later, I discovered that 'Microsoft Posts a 30% Increase in Profit, but Sales of Windows Are Weak'[1]. I also learned that there is a new invisible helmet for bikers and it is more secure than the regular ones, and after I leafed through the rest of the paper, I realized that newspaper headings like Economy, Politics and Science and Technology remain in place as if there is nothing out of the ordinary going on in a world where a single filament links the most esoteric sciences to the most sordid politic, in a world where some developed countries delight in the adventures of merely narcissistic behaviour by making love to their own ego, in a world where Third World countries, NGOs, or ecologists add their contributions and talk about international treaties, the rights of future generations and the right to development.

In the end, I became conscious that after reading newspapers and articles related to international politics for several years, I learned that the smallest things that happen in some parts of the world can be significant to others, and after the whole reading and comparing, I came across something that has been bothering me since the beginning of my studies in the area of Development Studies, and that is the relation between Development Studies and International Security.

Development and security have historically fashioned distinct discourses. More recently, they have been inevitable linked both in discourse and policy, having as a consequence the so-called development – security nexus (Hettne 2010: 31).

On the one hand, reviewing the field of Development Studies over the past sixty years, the classical discourse of Development considered global poverty and 'underdevelopment' as a threat to the liberal world order in the context of the emerging Cold War (Hettne 2008: 9). Yes, it was a hierarchical world order shaped by centres and peripheries, which together with bipolarity fashioned the general pattern of conflict. But none of the classical theories that constitute the aforementioned ideas proved to be of much instrumental

---

[1] http://www.nytimes.com/2011/07/22/technology/microsoft-posts-mixed-results-in-4th-quarter.html?_r=1&ref=technology

value for development in the poor countries (Hettne 2008: 9). On the other hand, when it comes to the issue of International Security the conventional view of security arises from the position of the individual nation-state in an anarchic international system and basically concerns the survival of the state per se, that is to say, the preservation of its sovereignty (Hettne 2010: 33). However, threats to International Security can come from widely different sources: foreign states, own governments, environmental scarcity or migration. Consequently, the principle of what it is that is to be secured remains a site of contestation. For instance, the UNDP's *Human Development Report 1994* suggests clear evidence of this shift in the world of policy, raising the question of human security and expressed a miserable contrast between the people's and the state's need for security (Hettne 2010: 34).

We can see this focus on 'human' as part of a paradigm shift, giving rise to a post-national logic. The frequent use of the concept 'human' in different constellations suggests a transnational assumption of responsibility, as if one could no longer rely on states to fulfil their duty towards their citizens (Hettne 2010: 34). To put it bluntly, Development Studies has been focused on the progress in human well-being, and it used to be associated with economic growth, but this is a very inadequate characterization in view of the fact that well-being is not only about economic growth but also about health, education and people's security. In this sense we can ask ourselves: what could be the meaning of development in a world where nations that shaped the International System are abandoning the idea that it brings stability, where global inequalities are increasing, where the possibility of new wars arise and the poverty problem is increasing?

It cannot be denied that violent conflict carries heavy developmental costs in the same way as development can somehow contribute to the prevention of conflict (Hettne 2010: 34). In this sense, it should thus be an understandable exercise for theory to explain in a deeper sense in what ways Development Studies and International Security can be causally related and how the two may influence each other. The first goal of this paper is therefore to examine the construction of notions and the establishment and consolidation of the discourses that the main theories that shape the field of Development Studies and International Security have created across time. Secondly, another principal aim of this paper is to illustrate how the most established theories of development understand International Security and to what extent the theories of development could influence the idea of Human Security.

Thus, the main questions of this paper will be:

- *How do the main theories within the field of Development Studies assimilate the idea of International Security?*

- *To what extent do these theories influence on the development of the Human Security paradigm?*

This paper starts with the introduction, which includes the research question. Chapter two focuses on the methodological issues. Chapter three is part of the historical explanation of development and how it became a part of the discipline of Political and Social Science. The fourth chapter focuses on theories that explain development and underdevelopment by introducing what we considered the main theories within the field, that is, modernization theory, dependency theory, post-development theory, and Amartya Sen's capability approach. Chapter five will have the aim to explain the concept of security at the international level, and how it is understood from different theoretical viewpoints within international politics (realism, neo-realism, and liberalism). The sixth chapter also contains a discussion of what we call Critical Security approaches (The Copenhagen School, The Aberystwyth School, and the Paris School). Chapter seven focuses on the contextualization of the idea of Human Security, followed by the eighth chapter, which explains how the theories of development understand international security. The chapter nine seeks to analyze the theories explained in previous chapters in order to answer the research questions. Finally, the conclusion will summarize the results of the present paper.

2. (DECONSTRUCTIVE) DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Modernists/anti-modernists, developed/underdeveloped, secure/insecure; these venerable disciplinary labels always add a qualifier: of science and technology, science studies, or science, technology, and society. Whatever label we use, we are always attempting to retie the Gordian knot by crisscrossing, as often as we have to, the division that separates exact knowledge and the exercise of power (Latour1991: 3). Hence, if we are not talking about things per se or about humans among themselves, then we must be talking just about discourses, representation, language, text, and rhetoric. This is an general conception, because it is true that those who bracket off the external referent, the nature of things, and the speaker, the theory or social space can talk only about meaning effects and languages game (Latour 1991: 5). Thus, there can be a horde of explanations to what development means and what security is, and some scholars (mostly those who belong to the critical side of each field), hold that the only substance that sustain any concept within the discipline of political and social science are without discussion tied to the ideological matter. It may well be the case that ideologies are an important factor when it comes to explain terms that are significant in the real world, but, is it the only one? Or there is something else beyond the ideological matter?

In this paper language becomes an important point to be considered. In view of that, if we ask ourselves how much language matters in Political Science, we can argue that the analysis of language-power has the possibility to demonstrate that power is an important concept within the field of Political Science. For that reason, language is important at the theoretical level.

2.1 The constructive effects of discourse

When we think about terms, we are to some extent captives of a picture, a picture imposed by scholars inside a discipline that defines the boundaries of the possible in terms of victory and defeat, or, inside and outside, in discursive forms (Fierke 2003: 70).

A common definition of a discourse is by the etymological origins from the Latin *discurrere* (to run to and fro), or from the normalization *discursus* ('running apart' in the transferred sense of indulging in something or 'giving information about something') (Vass in Titscher et al. 2000: 25). Consequently, from the critical standpoint this paper takes

on, we can presuppose that the notion of discourse, in both the popular and the philosophical use of the term, amalgamates a whole variety of meanings that frequently give the impression of being contradictory (Titscher et al. 2000: 25).

Discourses can persuade; they can change people's minds about what goals are valuable and about the roles they play or should play in social life. When a discourse has these effects, it is doing significant social construction work, producing new understandings and new social facts that reshape politics (Finnemore & Sikknik 2001: 402). A recurrent theme in discourse theory is that discourses have the possibility to produce and reproduce the common sense or senses of societies. In the present study this would mean "limiting possible resistance among a broader public to a given course of action, legitimating the states as a political unit, and creating reasonable and warranted relations of domination" (Ashley in Milliken 1999: 237).

Explanations of the production of discourse have largely been concerned with how dominating discourses of politics produce the social reality that they define. Therefore, discourses are seen as constructive as they do not simply describe the social world, but are the mode through which the world of reality emerges (Parker in Macleod 2002: 6), they contain subjects and construct objects as well as knowledge and truth (Ramazanoglu in Macleod 2002: 6).

Discourses allow us to focus on things that are not really there, but once these have been circumscribed by discourses it is difficult not to refer to them as if they were real (Macleod 2002: 7). This paper will therefore distinguish between three aspects of the effects of discourse, in which the construction of subject positions or types of self, social and political relationships, and systems of knowledge and belief will be taken into account (Fairclough in Macleod 2002: 7). This view would give emphasis to the debate between concepts of meaning and reality. For that reason, this paper will consider discourses as constructive, but also as productive and restrictive. In this sense, it can be argued that discourses are productive of the social realities they define, given the fact that they construct legitimate speakers and authorized practices as well as common sense (Pouliot 2007 371), and restrictive, because discourses have the possibility to establish what can be known, said or experienced at any particular socio-historical moment (Macleod 2002: 8).

The study of structures of signification is basic to all discursive approaches, in which the first commitment is to accept that discourses are structures of signification that have the possibility to construct social realities (Milliken 1999: 229).

The conceptualisation of discourse is linked to theoretical issues, and thus is in a constant state of re-evaluation and reworking (Macleod 2002: 2). Therefore, the theoretical commitment of discourse productivity point us in the direction of studying dominating or hegemonic discourses, and their structuring of meaning as connected to implementing practices and ways of making these intelligible and legitimate (Milliken 1999: 230). In this way, language helps to emphasize the importance of reconstructive work and is concerned with the normativity of spoken words. In this manner, history shows that scientific concepts are just that: concepts, not reality (Pouliot 2007: 363).

Taking into consideration the abovementioned, it can be gathered that one answer at least loosely shared in the critical stance of Development and International Security literature is that discourses operate as background capacities for people to differentiate and identify things by giving them taken-for-granted qualities and attributes, and relating them to other objects (Milliken 1999: 231). In this way, it can be argued that discourses do not exist 'out there' in the world; rather, they are structures that are actualized in their regular use by people of a discursively ordered relationship in 'ready-at-hand-language practices' or other modes of signification (Shapiro in Milliken 1999: 231). Bluntly put, discourses are at the outset systems of significations, which construct social realities. Hence, the notion of discourse on which this paper is based is that discourses embrace not only language but all social phenomena (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002: 33).

Political Science is not simply full of discourses; rather, the discipline is itself a discursive microcosm with linguistic limitations, in which certain political processes and interpretations can be privileged to damage or harm others (Debrix 2003: xi).

In order to analyze things from a critical stance, there is a need to be sceptic about reality, neither assuming it nor denying it. Therefore, to know if social reality is real makes no analytical difference, in view of the fact that "the whole point is to observe whether agents take it to be real and to draw the social and political implications that result" (Pouliot 2004: 330).

It should be stressed that this paper will not use the term observation in any positivist meaning. Eventually, it is clear that observation is interpretation, wherein social reality is a web of intersubjective meanings, and meanings cannot be studied in any objective way (Pouliot 2004: 329, 330).

The view of a discourse as a structure of meaning in use implies that discursive studies must empirically analyse language practice (or their equivalents), in order to draw out

a more general structure of relational peculiarities and hierarchies that instruct people's knowledge about the things defined by the discourse (Milliken 1999: 231). In this manner, meanings are never fixed or static but always part of a dialectical process between knowledge and reality. Subsequently, meanings do not belong to a subject anymore; they become truly intersubjective. That being said, objectifying meanings in their context produces a fairly static form of knowledge (Pouliot 2007: 372).

The analysis of a discourse is concerned with significative practises and the knowledge systems underlying them, it is not enough to study only the way a discourse constitutes background capabilities for people to understand their social world (Milliken 1999: 236). Therefore, the introduction of power into the analysis of discourse will allow me to become deconstructive, since discourse analysis uncovers particular, local, irregular and unbalanced operations of power relations (Macleod 2002: 20).

2.2 Deconstruction

Derrida's (1976, 1978) process of deconstruction turns oppositions into supplements, highlighting the absent, undermining the stability of the text and allowing for alternative readings.

In this work the term deconstruction alludes to a complementary way of studying discourse to that of theory. Deconstruction in this sense is an approach to discourse that attempts to destabilize it. It aims neither at destroying the term nor assessing it as to its authentic value. Instead, it questions discourses by exploring (deconstructing) them in terms of their claims of presence, and their dependence on absences (Dant in Macleod 2002: 16). In this manner, deconstruction focuses on *dominance, contradiction* and *differences* (Milliken 1999: 243). In doing so, it enables us to envisage ways of disrupting the dominant discourse, and to construct positions of resistance. Deconstruction highlights interpretation all the way down, which leads us to the idea that the possible nature of a discourse is revealed all the way through textual analyses, and this would give the possibility to show how within the text, there are forms of oppositions that are privileged, that is, 'realities' that can be reserved and displaced.

This paper will take into consideration different criteria. First, discourses support and validate certain institutional discursive practices while marginalizing others.

Second, discourses reproduce power relations, e.g. which categories of people would gain and which would lose from appealing to a particular discourse, or, who would want to promote the use of the discourse and who would want to discourage it (Parker 1992 in Macleod 2002: 28). Third, extending the meaning of the term or terms, to include what we commonly label the antagonist e.g. developed/underdeveloped, rich/poor, or, secure/insecure. Fourth, discourses are ideological; hence, discourses have ideological effects.

Writing about something implicates processes of reading in which people come in some fashion to take up discursive constructions as representing reality for them (Milliken 1999: 238). In the present paper I will use types of text that are 'ready-made', articles and books that are fully related to the fields of Development Studies and International Security. On the one hand, within the field of International Security, I am using theories that have been prevailing within the disciplines of realism, neo-realism, and liberal institutionalism. This paper will also make use of the critical stands of the former theories, that is, Critical Security. By Critical Security, we refer to the positions that criticize the established ideas of security. In regarding the Critical Security material, this paper will use material written by well recognised authors within the field of Critical Security (e.g. Barry Buzan, Richard Ullman, Keith Krause, Roland Paris, Ken Booth, to mention a few), and different schools (e.g. The Copenhagen School, The Aberystwyth School, and the Paris School). The reason that this paper makes use of this material is because, first, there is plenty of material available and second, because the idea of security in accordance to their stand point is well related to matters concerning development, something which will help me to tackle one of the questions at issue.

On the other hand, concerning the subject matter of development, this paper will consider three different standpoints that have been dominating the field of Development Studies that is modernization theory, dependency theory, post-development theory, and Amartya Sen's capability approach, together with some historical aspects that have being shaping the discipline of Development Studies.

This paper will not exclude theories that are different to the aforementioned; to a certain extent, it will include material that is available and theories that are well considered within each field, but that does not mean that other theories are ineffective and therefore need to be discarded.

3. WHAT IS DEVELOPMENT?

'Development' seems to be a difficult term to describe. We can find several definitions of development, in which the distinction between development as the means of flexible action or as the means of a stiff end of action is blurred by a difference between state policy of development and the attempt to empower people independently of the state.

Development in social and political science is seen as a process of increasing people's choices, of enhancing participatory democratic processes, "and the ability of people to have a say in the decisions that shape their lives, of providing human beings with the opportunity to develop their maximum potential, of enabling the poor, women, and free independent peasants to organize themselves and work together" (Cowen & Shenton 1996: 3).

In addition to what has been said, however, development is also defined as the means to fulfil a nation's development goals and the endorsement of economic growth, equity and national self-sufficiency (Cowen & Shenton 1996: 3). But even though the former concepts can be explained and related to each other, it is still little wonder that we are particularly confused by development studies texts as to what development means, or where the idea comes from (Cowen & Shenton 1996: 3).

Development occupies the centre of an incredible powerful semantic configuration. There is nothing in modern mentality similar to it as a force guiding thought and behaviour. At the same time, very few words are as incapable of giving substance and meaning to thought and behaviour.

In general terms, 'development' describes a process through which the capacities of an object or organism are fulfilled, a specified state of growth, until it reaches its natural, complete, and consummate form (Esteva 2010: 3). For instance, the development or evolutions of living beings, in biology, refers to "the process through which organisms achieved their genetic potential" (Esteva 2010: 3). On the other hand, there is a possibility that the development of a biological body can be frustrated. In such case of breakdown, growth cannot be considered as development but rather as a deficiency (Esteva 2010: 3, 4).

The transfer of the biological image to the social sphere occurred in the last quarter of the eighteenth century. Justus Moser (1768) used the word *Entwicklung* in order to refer to the steady process of social change (Esteva 2010: 4). When Moser introduced the idea of transformation of some political situations, he illustrated them almost as a natural process.

In this manner, historical development was the furtherance of natural development. Later on, the term 'development' became the central category of Saint-Simonians, who focused on the idea that industrial growth and scientific innovations would cause deep changes within society (Cohen & Shenton 1996: 25). Consequently, both the Hegelian concept of history and the Darwinist concept of evolution were parts of the concept of development, something which was also strengthened with the scientific characteristic of Marx. This transformed history into a programme: "a necessary and inevitable destiny. The industrial mode of production, which was more than one, among many, forms of social life, became the definition of the terminal stage of a unilinear way of social evolution" (Esteva 2010: 4).

The disjointed descriptions used during the eighteenth century began to become part of the ordinary language in the nineteenth century, with the word 'development' gathering a whole assortment of suggestions and implications (Esteva 2010: 5), in which the progressive transformation of society began to assume a modern from in the writings of social science discipline (Cowen & Shenton 1996: 6). In that manner, sociology developed and created 'development', as "a science which could bring about order in this suddenly changing and confusing world" (Cowen & Shenton 1996: 6). The term always implies a favourable change, from the simple to the complex, for the inferior to the superior, from worse to better (Esteva 2010: 6). Therefore, it can be argued that concepts such as progress began to be well related with the term development, which consequently became primarily an ideological distinction because of the principles of the Enlightenment (Shanin 2008: 69).

3.1 The Development/Progress Dichotomy

The way of seeing human progress as stages in the course of history, what later became the early liberal doctrine of progress associated with the principles of Enlightenment, was the result of an attempt to resolve the Hobbesian problem of how social and consequently political order might be attained (Cowen & Shenton 1996: 13). For some scholars, development was seen as an intentional set of distinctions of the norms of progress in order to highlight the significance of development as the representation of innovative changes in production and consumption or preceding events (Cowen & Shenton 1996: 409). In this sense, the idea of progress was understood as the adaptation as well as disciplined evolution of improvement and more advanced conditions, having as its opposite the habitual, the non-developed (Cowen & Shenton 1996: 409).

The idea of progress in modern history is in a straight line related to economics, in view of the fact that the enhancing of poor countries was thus seen from the beginning as depending on plenty of goods/capital to improve infrastructure, industrialization, and overall modernization of society (Escobar 1995: 40). The faith in science and technology, in this sense, became an imperative feature for those who were interested in the understanding and explaining of the idea of progress. Consequently, science and technology were encouraged by the dominant Western European transition to industrial capitalism (Escobar 1995: 35).

An induction for the analysis of development as discourse and its nature is based on its fundamental premises as they were formulated in the 1940s and 1950s. The systematized premise was "the belief in the role of progress and modernization as the only force capable of destroying archaic superstitions and relations, at whatever social, cultural, and political cost" (Escobar 1995: 39). In the long run, the concept of the transfer of technology would become an important constituent of developmental projects. It was never realized that such a transfer would depend not merely on technical elements but on social and cultural factors as well. Thus, progress and development were seen as neutral and unavoidably beneficial attributes (García de la Huerta in Escobar 1995: 36).

The foundations of many modern disciplines were closely related to the Enlightenment, in which the concept of progress and the idea of development were fashioned in the course of the application of rational and empirically based knowledge (Power 2008: 73).

3.2 The Creation of Development in Political Science

As mentioned above, two and a half centuries ago, the world developed political economies, particularly in a purposeful industrialization, fundamentally in the Western world (Kohli 2004: 1). Since then, countries that did not follow that pattern needed to reach industrialization. In this manner, the primary idea of development is based on the political commitment of industrialization in what theorist have labelled countries with a variety of terms such as 'Third World', 'Non developed' countries, 'Sub-developed' countries, 'The South' and so on, driven by the state in order to reach industrialization and economic growth (Kohli 2004: 2-3).

By the end of 1948 the United States' foreign policy was on its way to face a major change taking place over the whole world. At this time, the presidential speech writer

was trying to define a few clear points that could structure the inaugural speech that President Truman was due to make on 20 of January 1949 (Rist 20008: 70). Within the discursive character of this episode, point four of the speech held by the President of the United States is considered to have inaugurated the development age:

> More than half the people of the world are living in conditions approaching misery. Their food is inadequate. They are victims of disease. Their economic life is primitive and stagnant. Their poverty is a handicap and a threat both to them and to more prosperous areas. For the first time in history, humanity possesses the knowledge and skill to relieve the suffering of these people. […] I believe that we should make available to peace-loving people the benefits of our store of technical knowledge in order to help them realize their aspirations for a better life. […]What we envisage is a program of development based on the concepts of democratic fair-dealing […] Greater production is the key to prosperity and peace. And the key to greater production is a wider and more vigorous application of the modern scientific and technical knowledge (In Escobar 1995: 3).

> (To see the entire quotation see the appendix)

When it comes to the field of Development Studies, it is implicit that we are talking about analyzing the idea of development (understood to a large extent as change) (Sumner & Tribe 2008: 1). But how are we to understand the tragedy, the massive and swelling poverty that plagues the Third World, side by side with the unprecedented prosperity of the industrial countries? Social scientists have suggested some answers to these questions, but their answers are not simple and in some respects, they are contradictory (Isbister 2006: 30), as we shall see below.

4. TALES OF GROWTH: DEVELOPMENT, ITS' CLASSICAL EXPLANATIONS AND ITS OPPOSITE

A main attribute of the multi and interdisciplinary field of Development Studies since its making/construction in the 1940s has been a series of changes in thinking about the process of development itself (Potter 2008: 67). Development has the possibility to cover both theory and practice; to be precise, it can be expected to explain ideas about how development should or might occur, and the possibility to create real-world efforts to put various aspects of development into practice; in this manner, development theories can be understood as sets of apparently logical positions, which aim to explain how development has occurred in the past, and /or how it should occur in the future. Development theories, therefore, can be considered as normative, since they can generalize about what should or could be the case in an ideal world, or as positive, in the connotation of dealing with what generally has been the case in the past (Potter 2008: 67).

4.1 Modernization Theory

In the beginning of nineteenth century European modernity, there was a sense of difference from other parts of the world (e.g. Africa, Latin America or Asia), which shaped the ways in which they were viewed as distant, uncivilized and immature stages in the progress of humanity (Power 2008: 73). Based on the these postulations, modernist reasoning was dependent on the 'othering' of societies that were not informed by this reason and social norms, and were thus banished to the lower echelons of humanity, defined as 'backward', 'underdeveloped' or uncivilized (Power 2008: 73). The emergence of new ideas about social, political, and economic development was therefore bound up with these pressures to conform to particular notions of knowledge, reason and progress, and with the making of a Third world as the alter ego of a developed one, best known as the West.

Modernization theory is the field of philosophy of social scientific knowledge that has as an imperative endeavour the understanding of the origins of poverty and underdevelopment. Their standpoint focuses on the "deficiencies in the poor countries – the absence of democratic institutions, of capital, of technology, of initiative – and then hypothesizes about ways to repair these deficiencies" (Isbister 2006: 31). Thus, modernization

theory maintains that capitalism was a response to political freedom as it was for the wealth of the developed countries (Cowen & Shenton 1996: 13).

Modernization theory is the dominant school for analyzing poverty and economic, social, and political development in the countries of the Third World. A significant idea of this school is the conception of the traditional society. They believed that contemporary Third World societies have been largely traditional. Thus, modernization theory maintains that "the essence of traditional society [...] is that it is stagnant and unchanging. Its values are spiritual, not grounded in individual self-betterment. Its rhythms of life are circular, not linear and progressive; one always returns to the same place" (Isbister 2006: 32). The image of traditional society envisioned by the modernization theory is not a negative one, but from an economic point of view, by contrast, it is a poor life, a life without hope for accumulation, income, or wealth (Isbister 2006: 33). Therefore, economy is an important feature when it comes to developmental matters, since capital is a means of production, given that, capital within the modernization school is considered as something that is used in the production of other things (Cowen & Shenton1996: 461). Modernizationists argue that innovation and technological growth became self sufficient in Europe because they were ingrained in the capitalist system. Consequently, growth became the essential principle, the only constant (Isbister 2006: 35).

In the contemporary world the sweeping majority of the population that lived in developing countries did not experience the economic prosperity and its influence, as did the huge majority of people in developed countries (Balaam & Veseth 2005: 231).

There are not many things that the states and people from the less developed countries have in common with the developed countries. This fact can be the continuing of poverty and shows the necessity to confront what the experts call the two faces of economic development (Balaam and Veseth 2005: 232).

According to the principles of the modernization theory, poverty is an imperative question in the global economic development; therefore, the abolition of poverty gives the possibility to improve the odds of decent health, longer life and human dignity for those affected. In that sense, poverty can be understood as a perceived phenomenon, in which the modern world is progressive thanks to the promise of growth and improvement. For that reason, modernization theory holds that the mission of the underdeveloped countries is to transform themselves from tradition to modernity, that is to say, to follow the track of the now developed countries (Isbister 2006: 36, 37). There is a possibility, say the modernists, that the world's poor countries can succeed in this transformation from the traditional to the modern,

because they have the advantage that Europeans did not have, and that is historical experience (Isbister 2006: 37). Simply put, the poor countries can avoid some of the false starts that postponed the progress of the pioneers. In addition, the rich countries can act as helpers towards the poor, by offering them technology, markets, capital, and encouragement.

In all probabilities, the best known of the economic contributions within the tradition of modernization theory was stressed by Walt Rostow, who envisioned development as a number of 'stages' by relating a state of tradition with what Rostow called 'maturity'. This development was analyzed first and foremost as a domestic process of economic growth (Hettne 1990: 63). There were five stages through which all developing societies had to pass:

- The traditional society.
- The pre-takeoff society.
- Takeoff
- The road to maturity
- The mass consumption society

The economic requirement for a takeoff was shaped during the second stage (pre-takeoff society), having as a result that many of the characteristics of the traditional society were eliminated (Hettne 1990: 63). Consequently, a society develops a new mentality, together with a new class (the entrepreneurs). The takeoff stage, according to Rostow, was the most decisive; "It is during this period, covering a few decades that the last obstacles to economic development are removed" (Hettne 1990: 63). The most distinguished indication of the takeoff stage was "the share of net investment and saving in national income rises from the five per cent to the ten per cent or more, resulting in a process of industrialization, where certain sectors assume a leading role" (Hettne 1990: 63). Consequently, modern technology was circulated from the leading sectors at the same time as the economy moved towards the stages of maturity and mass consumption.

Modernization theory has been attacked as a discipline. Its critics argue that modernization theory was created in order to impose the Western model, disregarding obstacles resulting from the actual world order. It became popular to dismiss modernization theory as antithetical to a concrete social science analysis without bothering to mention any serious efforts to apply it systematically or the fact that, even under attack, many took for granted the lingering value of the theory as a framework for understanding modern development. A half century after the theory became part of the academic sphere, social and political scientists are still considering the pros and cons of the principle ideas of the theory. Consequently, anti-modernizationists

maintain that political reforms need to be considered in order to improve the capacity of the state and the responsiveness of the developed countries in issues related to economic integration, whereby the global integration of labour, the breakdown of social barriers and knowledge orientation have to be considered. Modernization theory, claim critics, embraces notions of individualism, in which democratic politics and the limited control of the state are imposed. Thus, such ideas cannot be taken for granted as natural belongings, but rather, they are created in order to impose an ideology, by the hegemonic part of the world when it comes to economics that is the West (Shanin 1997: 69).

4.2 Dependency Theory

The modernization paradigm has been subject to strong criticism from social scientists in the 'Third World', particularly in Latin America. An influential essay written by the Mexican sociologist Rodolfo Stavenhagen (1966) "Seven Erroneous Thesis on Latin America" became an important criticism of the principles of the Modernization Theory. One of the points stressed by Stavenhagen was that Latin American countries were dualistic, consisting on the traditional agrarian society on the one hand, and the modern urbanized society on the other (Hettne 1990: 69). According to Stavenhagen, the only historical transition that made sense within the modernization theoretical framework was the transition from feudalism to capitalism in European history (Hettne 1990: 67). Stavenhagen and other Latin Americans provided a fresh departure in Development Studies: the dependency theory.

Dependency theorists criticise the foundation on which modernization theory rests; they claim that the growth of today's developed nations has made the Third World insolvent and therefore poor, while the international capitalism system still blocks its progress (Isbister 2006: 41).

Beyond the ideas of Stavenhagen, much of the central ideas of dependency theory are defined in Raúl Prebisch's writing. Raúl Prebisch, an Argentinean economist who was secretary of the United Nation's Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA) in the 1950s and of its Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) in the 1960s (Isbister 2006: 42), focused on what he believed was the declining "terms of trade" for the Third World. He saw that the relative prices of Third World exports were falling over time and the prices of the imports from the industrialized countries kept rising (Isbister 2006: 46).

Other scholars within the sphere of the dependency theory like Osvaldo Sunkel claimed that the general analysis of development was based on conservative and predictable

theories that consider the fully grown capitalist economy as the goal of all development efforts. Consequently, the underdeveloped countries were analyzed in terms of a previous and flawed stage on the way to development. Sunkel sought to replace this idealized vision with a more historical method, in which the result would be a better appreciation of the real nature of underdeveloped nations' structures (Hettne 1990: 70). To put it bluntly, dependency theory sought to show that the features of underdevelopment should be digested as result rather than as a condition. This is why dependency theorists maintain that the era of the formal colonial empires was replaced by the neo-colonial capitalism in which the Third World social structures consequently continued to be dependent on the industrial world (Isbister 2006: 43).

Taking into consideration the historical process the dependency theory claimed in order to analyse development/underdevelopment the results will be a new global geography: a European First World "center" and the non-European Third World "peripheries" (Wallerstein 2004: 12).

For Brazilian geographer Teontonio Dos Santos (1970), the relation between the centre and the peripheries is one way of understanding dependency, in which some countries (the dominant) achieve self-sustaining economic growth while others (the dominated and dependent) grow only as a reflection of changes in the dominant countries:

> [Dependency is]... an historical condition which shapes a certain structure of the world economy such that it favours some countries to the determinant of others and it limits the development possibilities of the subordinate economies [...]a situation in which the economy of a certain group of countries is conditioned by the development and expansion of other economy, to which their own is subjected.
>
> (Dos Santos in Peet & Hartwick 2009: 166, 167)

To the modernization theorists, underdevelopment is a condition and for the majority of them it is a synonymous with tradition. But for those representing the dependency theory, underdevelopment is not just the failure to develop is an active process of impoverishment.

In this context it is difficult to pay no attention to André Gunder Frank, since he showed that the modernization perspective was empirically untenable, theoretically insufficient, and practically unable to stimulate a process of development in the Third World (Hettne 1990: 71). According to Gunder Frank, it was difficult to find Rostow's stages in the real world, for the reason that underdevelopment was not an original stage, but rather a created circumstance, or a result; therefore the biggest problem in Rostow's analysis "was the fact that not all of the countries, which according to him were ready for takeoff, could manage

the final jump" (Hettne 1990: 71). In terms of development policy the approach was gravely compromised because of Rostow's political affiliations:

> As to the efficacy of the policy recommended by Rostow, it speaks for itself: no country, once underdeveloped, ever managed to develop by Rostow's stages. Is that why Rostow is now trying to help the people of Vietnam, the Congo, the Dominican Republic, and other underdeveloped countries to overcome the empirical, theoretical, and policy shortcomings of his manifestly non-communist intellectual aid to economic development and cultural change by bombs, napalm, chemical and biological weapons, and military occupation?
>
> (Frank in Hettne 1990: 71)

Thus, Gunder Frank used 'underdevelop' as a transitive verb, as in 'I underdevelop you' (Isbister 2006: 42).

Modernization theorists are by and large liberal and pro-capitalist, whereas dependency theorists are socialist and frequently revolutionary (Isbister 2006: 47). But not all responses are anticapitalist. One view of the dependency theory is that the best thing to do for the Third World is to fight fire with fire, to transform capitalism into its saviour. That is, no matter what the damage that international capitalism might have caused, the Third World countries, that is, the periphery and semi-periphery in the word of Wallerstein (Wallerstein 2004:30), should make use of capitalism in order to end their dependency towards rich countries (Isbister 2006: 48).

4.3 Post-development Assumptions

Many theorists maintain that within the development theories and academic writing, the centre-left views may be more popular than classical and neoclassical formulations. In the area of practical development strategies, however, the implementation of neoliberal interpretations of classical theory have been more applied, stressing the liberalization of trade along with public-sector cutbacks as a part of structural modification programmes, with the intention of reducing the involvement of the state in the economics (Potter 2008: 70). Consequently, as we have seen, early perspectives on development were almost exclusively concerned with promoting economic growth (Potter 2008: 68). Development came to the front in the 'Third World' after 1945 as an influential amalgamation of policy, action, and understanding (Sidaway 2008: 16), which is shifting together with globalization, posing analytical and practical challenges.

Post-development is a theory which is precisely against all the aforementioned definitions; hence post-development maintains that the entire concept and practice of development is not a natural concept but rather evidence and a manifestation of the Western hegemony over the rest of the world. Most of all, post-development criticizes the standard statements in relation to progress.

For Arturo Escobar the discourse and ideology of development fashioned its reverse: "massive underdevelopment and impoverishment, untold exploitation and oppression […], debt crisis, famine, increasing poverty, malnutrition, and violence are only the most pathetic signs of the failure of forty years of development" (Escobar 1995: 4). Gustavo Esteva brusquely asserts that "you must be either very dumb or very rich if you fail to notice that development stinks" (Esteva in Keyli 1999: 34). In this way, post-development can be considered as a radical reaction to the dilemmas of development.

According to post-development theorists, 'development' has to be discarded for the reason that it "is the 'new religion of the West' […] is the imposition of science as power […] it does not work […] it means cultural westernization and homogenization […] and it brings environmental destruction." (Sidaway 2008: 16).

During the 1960s, Ivan Illich took the position in which the idea of development was challenged. Illich believed that development was a threat to people's autonomy, but his comments were perceived by many as a complete provocation (Rahnema 1997: ix) According to the post-development standpoint, the core of the concept and its derivations have been accepted because of ideological interest (Shanin 1997: 65). Therefore concepts such as poverty and progress are well linked to Development Theory. The idea of progress was created as result of modernization; consequently it became for the most part an ideological distinction because of the principles of the Enlightenment (Shanin 1997: 69).

The main beliefs of the development theories are supposed to be about people, but for the most part it continues to be a top-down approach, ethnocentric and technocratic, in which culture and people are treated as a non-figurative entities, in which statistical figures take the place of the culture and people, and can be placed and moved up and down as a graphic representation of what progress means (Escobar 1997: 91). Development in this sense can not separate itself from the words from which it was created, that is, evolution, growth, maturation. Simply put, post-development theory maintains that those who now exploit the idea of development "can not free themselves from a web of meanings that impart a specific blindness to their language, thought and action" (Esteva 2010: 6).

The ideology of development, post-developmentalists stress, is not a fairy tale as its supporters would have it, it is not the correct answer, it is not as beautiful as it sounds, but rather, it is an ideology that is provoking a dangerous counter-action in the coming years (Esteva 2010: 6). Rich nations, according to the post-development point of view, are now benevolent trying to impose modernization in places where it may not be needed or where people living there may not want it. Nevertheless, international agreements call this development (Illich 1997; 95). In other words, patriarchy and ethnocentrism influenced the discourse of development: "[i]ndigenous population had to be modernized, where modernization meant the adoption of the right values" (Escobar 1997: 89).

Post-development theorists maintain that humanity is witnessing the birth of a new social division of labour, a new relationship between ideas and practical life (Berman 1997: 75). Because a normal course for those who make development policies is to define development and to set its goals in ways with which they are familiar in order to satisfy their own needs, and which permit them to work through the institutions over which they have power or control (Illich 1997: 100). Thus, the positive meaning of the word 'development' is still profoundly rooted after two centuries of its social construction and is a reminder of an undesirable and undignified condition (Esteva 2010: 6). Therefore, "[i]t is not the failure of development which has to be feared, but its success" (Sachs in Sidaway 2008: 16).

As we have noticed, the post-development theory is sort of a radical theory, and we as students of development have to accept that it helped to 'develop' the meaning of development since development was based only on economic aspects. Now development has broadened its field and takes into account other issues such as gender, security, and environmental scarcity, to mention some of them.

4.4 Amartya Sen's Capability Approach

Established by Amartya Sen and improved by Martha Nussbaum, the capability approach has its intellectual roots in the ideas of a range of previous thinkers, from Aristotle to Adam Smith. The approach focuses on the dominant contemporary approaches in liberal philosophy and politics and how their actual interest in human beings has faded (Srinivasan 2007: 459). Part of Sen's argument is that national income and growth measures cannot be sufficient measurements for understanding how the underprivileged or people in disadvantage are doing (Srinivasan 2007: 459).

In his book *Development as Freedom (1999)*, Sen reaffirms an apprehension for 'basic freedoms' like political participation, literacy and elementary capabilities including protection against primary deprivations such as starvation or malnutrition (Sen 1999a: 36). In this way, Sen emphasizes the importance of a pluralistic political system for famine protection[2]. Therefore, access to food is not merely reduced to an economic question; instead, it "depends on the legal, political, economic, and social characteristics of the society in question and the person's position in it" (Sen 1981: 46).

Regardless of Sen's apprehension that society chooses its values, capabilities and standards of justice for itself, the very point of each and individual participating effectively in such choice is not only a determined or 'positive' freedom of essential values, but a condition for critical public ways of thinking and decision-making procedures as well (Srinivasan 2007: 464). It is why Amartya Sen defines development not in classical economic terms such as economic growth, but in terms of the realization of forceful active freedoms. Sen point out that freedom is fundamental in developmental processes for two different reasons: *The evaluating reason* in which the "assessments of progress has to be done in terms of whether the freedoms that people have are enhanced" (Sen 1999a: 4), and *the effectiveness reason* in which the "achievement of development is thoroughly dependent on the free agency of people (Sen 1999a: 4). These processes will increase the real freedom of people and will eliminate the conditions that are the cause for the absence of these freedoms.

Sen offers ideas of what freedom should really be about in all societies, and offers a subtle appreciation of justice and the significance of democracy (Srinivasan 2007: 458). Subsequently, he recognizes five different types of freedom what he calls 'real freedoms': freedom of economic opportunities, political freedom, social opportunities, transparency and protective security (Ndi 2011: 178).

Democracy, from Sen's point of view, symbolizes participation and public reasoning; therefore, it is central to his concern for individual organization and social choice within societies (Srinivasan 2007: 458). He argues that liberal democracy and human rights (including gender) matter to ordinary people around the globe, since true economic enhancement would benefit society in its entirety rather than just a 'privileged elite'. Sen takes into consideration not only an assortment of components of freedom but also their

---

[2] Amartya Sen developed a proposition which can be referred as the *democracy thesis*. The thesis was inspired by India's success in combating major famines after the formation of a pluralistic political system following independence in 1947 (Rubin 2009: 279).

connection to capitalism with regards to the processes, opportunities, and interrelated effects they allow to run free, like for instance economic facilities, political choice, free exchange of goods and services, or social opportunities (Ndi 2011: 178).

It is hard to think that focusing on democracy and political liberty is a luxury that poor countries cannot afford (Sen 1999a: 147). When it comes to the achievements of democracy, however, Sen argues that it depends not only on the rules and procedures that are implemented; it is about the way and the opportunities that are used by the citizens as well. Because of this the implementation of democracy depends on three different qualities or virtues: its essential importance, its instrumental contributions and its constructive role in the creation of values and norms (Sen 1999a: 157).

Democracy is a major source of social opportunity (Sen 1999a: 158). Therefore it has been successful in preventing disasters such as famine in Third World countries (Sen 1999a: 154). Accordingly, ''a country,'' Sen concludes, ''does not have to be deemed fit for democracy; rather, it has to become fit through democracy'' (Sen 1999b: 9).

At the end, Sen argues that free expression and social/political involvement are fundamental factors for well-being; inasmuch as they are important and necessary for freedom (Srinivasan 2007: 463). For that reason, liberal behaviour is understood as respect for plurality of individual views which are directly related to freedom, where the human being can be able to choose what to be and what to do in addition to influence social arrangements, that is, institutions, policies and/or cultural values (Srinivasan 2007: 463).

5. TALES OF BEING SECURE: INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AND ITS CLASSICAL EXPLANATIONS

Security matters. It is impossible to understand world politics with the absence of it. Every day, people somewhere in the world are killed, starved, tortured, tormented, raped, impoverished, incarcerated, or deprived of education in the name of security (Williams 2008: 1). International Security covers contemporary societies all around the world: it encompasses the speeches of politicians and experts, news papers columns, and images of security and insecurity fill the media (Williams 2008: 1). All this makes security a mesmerizing, often repulsive, but always significant and vital topic.

The security issue has existed since the dawn of man. Religion, philosophy and the sciences have tried to explain it, but even if the former disciplines have made some advances within the term 'security', at the international level the concept faces the same problems as concepts such as 'democracy' and 'terrorism', and can have a number of different meanings. It can refer to a wide variety of things and can be used to justify particular positions and/or arguments.

For some, security is like beauty: a subjective and elastic term, meaning exactly what the subject in questions says it means, neither more nor less (Williams 2008: 1).
At its most obvious, the modernist bequest in International Relations (IR) is represented in a way that the discipline has read and interpreted its history and framed its philosophical stances (George 1994: 70).

IR has been characterized by relying on a crude essentialism inspired by what Jim George calls "a cast of caricatured historical figures" (George 1994: 71). Thus, Thomas Hobbes, Nicolai Machiavelli and Immanuel Kant have been construed by dominant scholars over the years.

Most recently, the winding down of the Cold War appeared as a big surprise to a majority of the researchers within the area of International Security Studies; nevertheless, International Security during and after the Cold war has been an important issue to discuss and develop within the discipline of International politics in the Post-Cold War era.

For much of the past twenty years, the dominant discussions in the field of International Security were about how the international system is built. Consequently, questions such as why bipolarity has declined have emerged lately, having as an alternative

the nature of its replacement, a unipolar system, or a direction on the way to multipolarity (Smith, Hadfield, & Dunne 2008: 2). In this way, the classical approaches within the discipline of IR (Realism, Neo-realism and Liberal Institutionalism) have agreed on the idea that the international system is anarchic, but they disagree about whether institutions markedly affect the prospects for international stability.

5.1 The Realist and Neo-realist Approach

Classical Realism in International Relations is the theory that maintains that the essence of the state is to pursue power politics in giving special attention to the security dilemma. From the Realist stand point, war is understood as a natural behaviour as a consequence of power politics, where anarchy, egoism and self-interest are the core concepts holding the international system together, which eventually is reflected in the political behaviour (Wohlforth 2008: 32).

Classical Realism is normally dated from 1939, and the publications of Eduard Hallett Carr's *Twenty Years Crisis*. In addition to Carr, other works written by Frederick Shuman (1933), George F. Kennan (1951) or Herbert Butterfield (1943) to mention a few, were considered as the Realist canon. However, it was Hans Morgenthau's (1948) *Politics Among Nations: The Straggle of Power and Peace* which became the undisputed standard holder for political Realism (Elman 2008: 17).

When it comes to security, Realism's view is that a country's behaviour is based on the impact of the distribution of capabilities in which most of the attention has been focused on the differences between bipolar and multipolar orders (Carlsnaes 2008: 92). Cooperation between states is therefore an important matter, since this is more difficult to achieve when states are familiar with the relative-gains instead of absolute-gains. As Mearsheimer states:

> Because states concerned about absolute-gains need only make sure that the pie is expanding and that they are getting at least some portion of the increase, while states that worry about relative-gains must care also about how the pie is divided, which complicates cooperative efforts.
>
> (Mearsheimer 1994:12)

If states cannot cheat each other they will fear each other, and even if the cheating issue can be solved, states will still be preoccupied with relative gains. According to that, the relative

gains made by states are not limited to the economic sphere but could also be taken further as a military and security advantage that could be used for domination, which in turn could lead towards hostility between states (Mearsheimer 1994:20). These ideas are inspired by the writings of Thomas Hobbes in *Leviathan*, in which the Social Contract Theory argues that without social contract there will be 'war of all against all' an anarchic world (Navari 2008: 31). It is therefore that Realism understands the rules and practices of the International System as being arbitrarily decided by the hegemony, that is the most powerful state(s) (Elman 2008: 24).

Neo-realism, on the other hand, is a theory of International Relations, explained by Kenneth Waltz in 1979 in his book *Theory of International Politics*. For Neo-realists, the state is the main actor in the International System because it is the main unit of sovereign political authority. In the same way as the Realists, Neo-realists maintain that the structure of the International System is anarchic, for the reason that national interest forces states to compete with one another for limited amounts of resources (Balaam & Veseth 2005: 29).

When it comes to the issue of internationalization, Neo-realists maintain that it is a by-product of the unipolar system. After the end of the Second World War, the United States initiated a multilateral economic order which created an impulse towards liberalization of international economy (Held, McGrew, Goldblatt & Perraton 1999: 452). Consequently, a skepticism about globalization and global governance is strongly held by Neo-realists. They argue that globalization is a myth which hides the reality of an international economy which actually consists of states acting in their own narrow self-interest. They do not believe that institutions can be a form of global governance, and for that reason, cooperation between states has its limits as they are constrained by the dominating, logic of security competition (Mearsheimer 1994: 9).

Classical realism gives roughly equal emphasis to anarchy and egoism, while Neo-realism attempts to highlight three aspects in particular. The first is the impact of anarchy; the second is the distributions of capabilities (Carlsnaes 2008: 92); and the third is the balance of power in order to determine the survival of the state. To apply Classical Realism and Neo-realism to international security "one has to bridge the gap that divides highly general, 'Top-down', theory from the 'inside-out' analysis of specific cases" (Wohlforth 2008: 32), in which theorists are required to have a clear understanding of anarchy in order to build a reasoned theory of what international politics in an anarchical setting look like (Wohlforth 2008: 45).

On the other hand, critics of this position hold that "anarchy in the real world is a variable, not a constant" (Wohlforth 2008: 45).

5.2 The Liberal Institutionalist Approach

In contrast with the assumptions of Realism and Neo-realism, the Liberal Institutionalist suggestion is clear: their challenge is to extend the legitimacy of domestic political arrangements found within democratic states to the relationships between states that depend on the capitalist system (Silander 2009: 19). In this way, the high division of labour in the international economy is going to amplify interdependence between states that shape the international system and that counteract the anarchy of the international system. That brings us to the idea of democracy and peace which is imperative within the liberal standpoint. The historical record of liberal international relations includes incentives for a separate zone of peace among liberal states, but also, "for imprudent aggression against non-liberal and for complaisance in vital matters of security and economic cooperation" (Doyle 2008: 51). Taking the democratic peace thesis to its roots, we can find Kant's ideas as a catapult, in which according to Kant the only reasonable form of governments was republican governments (Doyle 2008: 52), because the legal foundations of the republican state built on law minimize the anarchic behaviour in the international system, for the reason that democracy and economy go hand in hand, and the spread of both ideas may spill over from one nation to other (Silander 2009: 21). That can be understood as if all countries that conform the International System are under the sphere of democracy and the capitalist system, the possibility of violent actions will be almost null, since liberal democracies do not fight other liberal democracies (Silander 2009: 19).

It can be understood that the idea of democratic peace should mean "rejecting the realist balance of power as a general strategy by refusing the balance against the capabilities of fellow democratic liberals, and trusting the liberal community" (Doyle 2008: 62).

Liberal institutionalism holds that world politics is no longer an exclusive arena for states as it was for the first three hundred years after the emergence of the Westphalian states system (Buzan & Little 2000: 336). While sharing the Neo-realist view on the centrality of the states in the international system, liberal institutionalists argue that the states are not the only

significant actor. They emphasize the role and the growing importance of non-state actors like Non- Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and Trans National Corporations (TNCs). Besides highlighting the emergence of these new actors, liberal institutionalists also focus on new and emerging patterns of interaction in the international system such as interdependence and integration between and among states (Keohane and Martin 1995: 38).

They further broadly accept the realist position on the structural condition of anarchy in the International System; on the other hand, their accounts diverge on the prospects for achieving sustained patterns of cooperation under anarchy. The prevailing structure of anarchy in the international system according to liberal institutionalists does not mean that cooperation between states is not possible. Rather, they believe that where common interests exist, cooperation is easy to achieve. Liberal institutionalists like Robert Keohane and Lisa Martin argue that "states are rational egoists operating in a world in which agreements cannot be hierarchically enforced… interstate cooperation occurs if states have significant common interest" (Keohane and Martin 1995: 39).

Liberal institutionalists consider states as rational or instrumental actors that are always seeking to maximize their interests and utility, and as rational actors states see value in cooperation. They argue that cooperation between states can and should be organized and formalized through sets of rules which govern state behaviour in specific areas; in other words they emphasize the importance of institutions. Liberal institutionalists believe that regimes and institutional cooperation that bring more regularity and predictability to international relations can and does mitigate anarchy in the international system.

In the end, it seems that realist and neo-realists on the one hand and liberal institutionalists on the other disagree about whether institutions markedly affect the prospects for international stability. Realist and neo-realists say no; liberal institutionalists say yes (Mearsheimer, 1994: 7). Neo-realists maintain that institutions are basically a reflection of the distribution of power in the world, they focus on the system structure (unipolar, bipolar, or multipolar) and the state homogeneity (rational, material, and unitary actor). Institutions, therefore, "have no independent effect on state behaviour" (Mearsheimer, 1994:7) and are much focused on the possibility and likelihood of 'cheating'.

Liberal institutionalists, on the other hand, point towards the constraints imposed on state behaviour by regimes and institutions which formalize the expectations of each state to an agreement where there is a shared interest. "Institutions then assume the role of encouraging cooperative habits, monitoring compliance and sanctioning defectors."

(Burchill, 2005: 65). As stated before, democracy plays an important role for liberal institutionalists, since, if all countries were democratic, there would be less war (Silander 2009: 19). Consequently, the modern liberal state invokes a political and economic system and usually takes a positive view of the human nature (Doyle 2008: 59).

After mentioning the cheating, the fear, the interdependence, the anarchy, the unipolarity, bipolarity or multipolarity of the International System, the democracy, the market, the capabilities, the institutions, the yes and the no, where are humans considered in these approaches? Does the security of the state bring security to the inhabitants of the state? Have the former approaches the potentiality to bring development or bring peace without affecting development? We do not believe so. We believe that classical realism, neo-realism and liberal institutionalism give exaggerated attention to the State. Although when we talk about International Security we must logically relay on the idea of the state, but we still cannot ignore the fact that states are populated by people, and the former approaches take for granted results that come from an inadequate equation.

6. CHANGING THE IDEA OF SECURITY

It is necessary to recognize that security may be defined not merely as a global but as a consequence – this means that we may not realize what it is or how important it is until we are valorized by the threats which challenge it.

(Ullman 1983: 133)

The social space of the professionals of security has to be considered as a field of domination. Consequently, the field of security must be considered as a transversal field, where the label 'critical' is part of it (CASE Collective 2006: 458).

Thinking about security is never a neutral intellectual pursuit; theories reflect particular values and interests, which are given priority over alternative values. This perspective leads in turn to a choice about 'whom' or 'what' should be privileged (Sheehan 2005: 157). In this paper, the term 'critical' comes in many forms (Sylvester, 2007: 556). That means, we will call the theories that do not accept the classical conceptions of security (discussed in the previous chapter) *Critical Security*.

The end of Cold War, as a historical event, was the catalyst for an intellectual crisis related to the conventional approaches to security (Booth 1997: 86–87). Security was considered as something "natural," and yet who was secured, from what, and by what means, were considered as irrelevant questions. Thus, Critical Security began with the acknowledgment that the traditional approaches to security veiled what was going in the real world and that brought the questions of exclusion (Mutimer 2009: 9, 10).

An article written by Richard Ullman, "Redefining Security" (1983), became an important critique of traditional security. In analysing the classical conception of security, this work was considered the "new concept of security that would transcend the narrow notions of military defence and look more towards the logic of broader independence" (Sheehan 2005: 43). According to Ullman, the balancing of factors between liberty and security is one of the critical issues after the Cold War (Ullman 1983: 130). Thus, defining security in military terms was obstructive, because of the low appreciation of security threats and because it contributed to the idea of the militarization of the international order (Sheehan 2005: 46). In other words, the thinking of National and International Security in terms of military threats arising from outside the borders of one's own country was not all right, since this thinking drew attention away from the non-military threats that promised to undermine the stability of

many nations during the coming years (Ullman 1983: 133). In fact, every society (e.g. individuals and groups) searches for "security against the state, just as they ask the state to protect them against harm from other states" (Ullman 1983: 131).

Ullman's article did challenge the prevailing military centred conception of security by calling for attention to other issues, not only the military and political ones (Sheehan 2005: 45); thus, other factors can be as important as political and military ones.

But what does security mean? The answer from this critical standpoint clearly depends on the object to which the condition refers. In the case of the state, to be secure is conventionally thought to refer to threats that originate from the outside of the broader of the state and, if fulfilled, could undermine the stability and integrity of the state. Yet it is clear on reflection that such threats can also originate from within the borders of the state, in the form of deliberate subversion or even the destabilizing of social arrangements as a result of dissemination of new ideas, practices and technologies (Crawford & Lipschutz 1997: 151).

Broadening the term of security in the international order was required in order to understand how the realities in the world were changing. In this conception states were seen as the key focus for security, because in the absence of world government "they are both the framework of order and the highest sources of government authority" (Buzan 1991a: 22-23)

As mentioned before, critics of the orthodox ideas of security like Richard Ullman helped to develop a broader idea of security, but the contribution of Barry Buzan's book *People, States and Fear* (1983), can also be considered as an important piece, since from there different approaches emerge, having as a common denominator the disagreement with the classical conceptions of security.

The Aberystwyth School, the Copenhagen School, and the Paris School are the approaches this paper will consider as Critical Security. These perspectives are involved the political narrative of modernity (George 1994: 75, 76). On the one hand, the evolution within the Aberystwyth and Copenhagen Schools took place largely within IR and through exchanges with the existing experts in the fields of international security, strategic studies and peace research (CASE Collective 2006: 449). The works of the researchers associated with the Paris School, on the other hand, had varied disciplinary locations, including political sociology, criminology, law and IR, and interacted with experts in areas broadly covered by internal security (CASE Collective 2006: 449).

6.1 Copenhagen School

The suggestions of the Copenhagen School are the result of a uncommon theoretical amalgamation flanked by something like an 'English School constructivist realist' coming from a strategic studies background, namely Barry Buzan and a self-proclaimed 'post-structural realist' Ole Wæver (CASE Collective 2006: 452). The Copenhagen School, therefore, can be referred to as the theoretical contributions of Buzan, Wæver and others which have combined three main conceptual ideas: sectors or referent objects, securitization, and regional security complexes.

Buzan's book *People, states, and fear* was highly influential because it opened a debate about security in two dimensions (Sheehan 2005: 47). It places emphasis on the fact that "thinking about security through a national approach easily led to a perspective that only identified military issues with security, whereas in the real world of everyday human existence, people were affected by threats in the political, economy, societal, and environmental areas as well" (Buzan 1991: 15).

Securitization is an important term within the Copenhagen School. According to this School, the concept has the possibility to portray a course of actions in which the social and political speech act can label an issue (a security issue). A concern can be framed as a security issue and move from the politicized end of the spectrum through an act of securitization (Emmers 2010: 139). Securitization in this sense is the "move that takes politics beyond the established rules of the game and frames the issue either as a special kind of politics or as above politics. Securitization can thus be seen as "a more extreme version of politicization" (Buzan et al 1998: 23). Desecuritization refers to the reverse process that is an issue as no longer an existential threat, placing it from the securitize realm into the ordinary public area (Emmers 2010: 140).

Traditionally, in the process of making something a security issue, the use of force has been legitimized, and the state has been allowed to take special power. In this sense, the event or process of securitization is understood as an "event/process of *signification* – that is, an event or process of *fixing* meaning by the securitizing act" (CASE Collective 2006: 453, 454). Thus, if something is designated as a security issue, it is because a believable argument can be made that this issue is more important than other issues on the political agenda, and that this issue should therefore have absolute priority (Sheehan 2005: 53). The process of Securitization can have different referent objects, depending on the sector they belong, such

as the military, the political, the economic, the societal or the environmental sectors.

According to the Copenhagen School, the examination of the level of analysis and the relationship between individual and national security lies in identifying the complexity in which states can pose significant threats to the security of individuals (Sheehan 2005: 49). Thus this complex represents a group of states whose interests are interconnected in such a way that each state's security cannot be understood except in relation to the other states within the complex (Sheehan 2005: 49). However, the purpose of broadening the concept of security beyond traditional military threats was to address security issues without necessarily triggering a traditional military-type response (Sheehan 2005: 62). Consequently, the patterns of security contained within the levels of analysis on the security matter can operate trough a broad range of sectors:

- Military Security - concerns the two-level interplay of the armed offensive and defensive capabilities - of states and state's perceptions of each other's intentions.
- Political Security - concerns the organizational stability of states, systems of governments and ideologies that give them legitimacy.
- Economic Security - concerns access to the resources, finance, and markets necessary to sustain acceptable - levels of welfare and state power.
- Societal Security - concerns the sustainability, within acceptable conditions for evolution, of traditional patterns of language, culture and religious and national identity and custom.
- Environmental Security - concerns the maintenance of the local planetary biosphere as the essential support system on which all other human enterprises depend.

(Buzan 1991: 19-20).

From critical approaches viewpoint, civilization can be partly responsible for part of its own structural environmental conditions, which limit its development options and influence incentives for cooperation and conflict (Buzan & Waever, 1998:77). Thus, from the current appearance of the Copenhagen School's five different sectors, as a politicized set of values, we may suppose this process to be comparatively strong in every sector.

In order to determine the different security dynamics of different regions in the world, the Copenhagen School puts special attention on the global, interregional, regional and

domestic levels (CASE Collective 2006: 454). Consequently, the concept of security complex is ample, since it incorporates not only security communities but a more reasonable view of conflict creation that happen in different parts of the world.

6.2 The Aberystwyth School

The Aberystwyth School's literature is linked to scholars such as Keith Krause, Michael Williams, Ken Booth and Richard Wyn Jones. The notion of Critical Theory in IR initially flourished by Robert Cox together with the analytical inspirations of the Frankfurt School and the post-positivist movement in IR theory (CASE Collective 2006: 448). The Aberystwyth School wanted to make clear the military oriented postulations of traditional security studies, therefore, it opened the field to a greater theoretical scrutiny and debate; which in turn allowed them to address a broader range of security issues

Ken Booth is perhaps the most important figure in the Aberystwyth School; and his 2007 text *Theory of World Security* is considered one of the most comprehensive explanations when it comes to questions of security, theory, and world politics (Mutimer 2009: 11). The principal aim of this work was to "explain and advance a case for a particular theoretical framework with which to explore and engage with the security of real people in real places" (Booth, 2007: xii).

Security is about protecting people, although the classical idea that the state is the principal actor in providing that protection, and the only thing that could intimidate and menace the state is external military power. The aforementioned statement can easily make us forget people and focus on the security of the state from military threats. As Krause and Williams stressed in their first book *Critical Security Studies*, "[t]he [conventional] vision of security effectively makes it synonymous with citizenship. Security comes from being a citizen, and insecurity from citizens of other states" (Krause & Williams, 1997b: 43).

The Aberystwyth School defines normativity as security, since security is a 'powerful political concept [….] that energizes opinion and moves material power' (Booth, 2005b: 23) and that can be mobilized to emancipatory ends (CASE Collective 2006: 456). Security in this sense needs to be seen as somehow related to dangers to humanity that are of a life-threatening nature. The danger itself emerges not from the natural environment of the natural process of life, but from the calculated activities and policies of other human beings, which may lead to such things as global warming, starvation, the cross border movement of

people, water pollution, and so on. In this way, the critical concept of security within the Aberystwyth School embraces ideas that are related to human emancipation. This notion of emancipation helps us to understand that emancipatory interest is related to "security freedom from unacknowledged constrains, relations of domination and conditions of distorted communication and understanding that deny humans the capacity to make their future through full will and consciousness" (Devetak 2005: 145).

Emancipation, in compliance with the Aberystwyth School, should be a standard engagement with normal politics. As Kent Booth point out, emancipation should be a priority beyond concerns related to power and politics, since 'emancipation, not power or order, produces true security. Therefore, emancipation theoretically, is security' (Booth 1991: 319).

This understanding of security has guided the Aberystwyth School's critical project in the direction of the 'realities of security' that have been made invisible because of "the traditional mindset of those who have dominated or disciplined International Relations" (Booth, 2004: 8). In conclusion, it can be argued that, by uncovering the realities of security, the Aberystwyth School claims the location of human rights abuses, the oppression of minorities, the powerlessness of the poor and violence against women in the international security matrix (Booth 2004: 7). By doing so, security and power can be displaced by security and emancipation, with emancipation "disentangling security from power and achieving a fuller and more inclusive realization of security" (CASE Collective 2006: 456).

6.3 The Paris School

France, and specially Paris, has been the main location of a distinctive theoretical improvement, largely inspired by Bourdieu and other sociologists, with additions of the ideas of Foucault with well established methodical commitment, empirical investigations of actual practices by different groups and processes different from those studying official discourses (Wæver 2004: 9).

Didier Bigo is the principal representative scholar of this movement, better known as the Paris School (Wæver 2004: 9). For the Paris School, security is not the antagonist of insecurity. The problem lies on the understanding of security, and how security is defined, since, depending on the definition of security, the results will identify and therefore describe insecurities such as risk or threats. It is therefore, that according to the principles of the Paris School, "Policing insecurity is then a mode of governmentality, drawing the lines of fear and unease at both the individual and the collective level" (CASE Collective 2006:457).

Another point that the Paris School argues is the appearance and materialization of what they refer to as 'professional networks'' of security agencies that "try to monopolize the truth about danger and unease through the power–knowledge nexus" (CASE Collective 2006: 457).

The Paris School believes that insecurity is by and large a creation of security discourses and security policies. That is a significant advantage of this approach, for the reason that it includes routine practices and even deviation from official policy. Knowledge is therefore not free from values judgements, and the claim for objectivity that classical positivist and some ISS traditionalists espouse can thus be problematised (Buzan & Hansen 2010: 143).

Instead of analyzing security as an indispensable concept, the Paris School proposes to treat security as a 'technique of government'. Subsequently, it puts special attention on the effects of power games (Jabri 2010: 238), and instead of focusing on speech acts, the Paris School accentuates practices, contexts and audiences that limits the creation of specific forms of governmentality (CASE Collective 2006: 457). To see security and/or peace as discourse, a modification from an objective conception of security was craved, where threats could be considered in retrospection to a practice through which subjects were represented (Buzan & Hansen: 2010: 142, 143), this implied a significant twist in security thinking for the reason that, actors and/or identities were no longer stable and given entities to which security theorists could refer.

From this viewpoint, security is about legitimacy and covers politics and the legitimization of dominant actors. The definition of what security is in relation to insecurity is a political struggle between the actors that have the ability and capability to declare with authority "whose security is important, whose security can be sacrificed, and why their won violence may be reads as a form of protection when the violence of others is seen as from of aggression and sign of insecurity" (Bigo 2008: 123).

The merging of internal and external security offers distinctive views from the classical conceptions of security. For instance, some security agencies that were considered as non-crucial (e.g. border guards and immigration officers) are now consider as important within the security field, for the reason that their productive power have the possibilities to improve contemporary challenges (CASE Collective 2006: 459).

The Paris School argues that when it comes to securitization the procedures are linked to "a field of security constituted by groups and institutions that authorize themselves and that are authorized to state what security *is*" (Bigo 2000: 195). Threats themselves are therefore discursive, since, "to constitute something as threatening is to invoke 'discourse of danger',

and to situate that 'something' as of particular importance to the threatened self" (Dillon in Buzan & Hansen 2010: 143).

The Paris School has managed to circumscribe the problem initiated by the Copenhagen School, whereby the emergence of speech acts was underspecified and their effects too broad, in comparison with other practices of power. However, the Paris School's strategy is not free from criticisms, since pinpointing problems within a field can have as a consequence the avoiding of interest of those who could be labelled as, what Ken Booth calls 'professionals of nothing', those who "at this minute, are being starved, oppressed, or shot" (Booth, 1997: 114). Consequently, several terms that identify and characterize the discourses of professionals are not scientific concepts, but common and ordinary terms such as democracy, freedom or equality (CASE Collective 2006: 459).

7. CONTEXTUALIZING HUMAN SECURITY

Human Security is one of the most recent neologisms within the field of International Security Studies. It includes global security, cooperative security, and comprehensive security. It is considered as dual term, for the reason that it incites policymakers and scholars to think about International Security as something more than the military defence of state interest (Paris 204: 249). Bluntly put, the concept questions the prevailing state centric conception of security, were the state is considered the referent object, the one who needs to be secured (Kerr 2010: 122).

The first major statement concerning the Human Security appeared in the 1994 *Human Development Report* (HDR), an annual publication of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The concept of security, the report stressed, has been inadequately if not poorly defined, "as security for territory from external aggression, or as protection of national interest in foreign policy or as a global security from the threat of nuclear holocaust […] Forgotten where the legitimate concerns of ordinary people who sought security in their daily lives" (UNDP 1994: 22).

The principal purpose of the report was to change the referent object from the nation/state towards people, by focusing on "how people live and breathe in a society, how freely they exercise their many choices, how much access they have to a market and social opportunities – and whether they live in conflict or peace" (UNDP 1994: 23). It is here that the 1994 HDR scrutinizes both the national and the global matters of human security and establishes seven categories of Human Security: Economic Security (e.g. freedom from poverty), Food Security (e.g. access to food), Health Security (e.g. acess to health and protection for diseases), Environmental Security (e.g. Protection from environmental pollution and depletion), Personal Security (e.g. physical safety from war, criminal attacks, drug use, or domestic violence), Community Security (e.g. survival of traditional cultures, and ethnic groups), and Political Security (e.g. enjoyment of civil and political rights and freedom from political oppression) (Paris 2004: 252).

Some scholars argue that Human Security is a condition of existence where basic material needs are met, where dignity, including meaningful participation in the life of the community, can be met (Thomas 2001: 161). Therefore, it defines security as the freedom from fear and freedom from want.

From a normative perspective, the concept serves to emphasize the importance of better global norms. Human Security is a fundamental incentive for the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), and the International Criminal Court (ICC) (Kerr 2010: 123). Human Security has the potential to function as an umbrella norm for a variety of treaties and conventions associated with the protection of vulnerable groups or people from persecuting actors; it has the potentiality to improve the state and above all, it can help us to understand, in a better way, the whole idea of International Security. It is therefore that the definition of Human Security by the UNDP represents the "most authoritative" (Paris 2004: 252) meaning of the term. In spite of that, country members of the human security coalition (e.g. Canada, Norway, and Japan) have adapted the definition of the meaning of Human Security in their own way (Buzan & Hansen 2010: 204). The concept of Human Security is therefore essentially inspirational. It stipulates what ought to be the contents of security for human beings in their daily lives. It insists, further, on switching the viewpoint to seeing security from nation-state to human being perspectives. That is to say, it announces that military security is no longer generally regarded as valid for Human Security (Okuno 2007: 5).

8. THEORIES OF DEVELOPMENT, UNDERDEVELOPMENT AND THEIR UNDERSTANDING OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

8.1 Modernization Theory and International Security

As we have seen, the prevailing position within the modernization theory presents an optimistic explanation of the modern world and its successes. It stands for modernity in terms of comparison with earlier periods, branded by myths and superstition, in which the lives of individuals were suffocated under the homogeneity and inflexibility linked with the traditional objects of their world. Modernity, in this sense, is contrasted "with traditional societies marked by an absence of democracy, individuality, and scientific orientation" (George 1994: 41) Modernity, from this perspective, is seen as a progression from the mythical to the scientific, from the barbaric to the rational, from the 'backward' archaic human behaviour to the 'forward' utilitarian individual free to choose. For instance, Rostow's stages were in essence a result of a demarcation between 'tradition' and 'modernity'. Consequently, it cannot be denied that this sophisticated version is produce by simplistic forms of transformation and renovation (Hettne 1990: 65).

It is about this picture of modernity that Western philosophy and contemporary social theory have reacted to the perpetual questions of human social life, "of the relationship between subjects and objects and between human kind and the natural world, of the dilemmas of the past and present, and of the possibilities of the future" (George 1994: 42). The result is a narrative of modern subjects defined in terms of their distance from traditional societies. It is here where the year 1949 appears to be important, when the president of the United States, Harry Truman announced his concept of a "fair deal" and "underdevelopment" for the entire world.

In these terms, knowledge, history, and social development are interpreted as part of a chronological activities (e.g., states of growth) in which an increasingly distanced subject confronts the problems of the natural and social worlds and wherein the correct application of rationality prevails over them (George 1994: 43).

Taking into consideration the abovementioned, modernization theory can be linked to the principles of liberal institutionalism when it comes to security matters, for the reason that both theories make similar claims.

According to modernization theory, if a non-developed country wishes to reach development, they need to fulfil certain conditions and requisites: they need to be democratic and their system must be based on capitalism; they have to accept technological assistance; they need to cooperate; and above all, they must allude to institutions. Similarly, liberal institutionalists stress that International Security depends on the legitimacy of domestic political arrangements within democratic states and their relationship dependent on the capitalist system (Silander 2009: 19). It seems that modernization theory (when it comes to International Security) takes things for granted in the same way as liberal institutionalists do. Simply put, terms such as global governance, democracy, capitalism, cooperation, interdependence, institutions, legitimacy, arrangements and liberal states are imperative conditions in order to reach security. It is because of this that we can conclude that both theories are linked. It may be because their epistemological roots lie within the philosophy of science, that is, their scientific method, but there is always the possibility that ideology is involved, and that, at the theoretical level, is problematic, for the reason that ideologies contain certain ideas about what is considered the best form of governments and democracy is a form of government which is not natural in the same way as ideologies are.

8.2 Dependency Theory and Security

Dependency theory emerged from the structural conflict between the North and the South. It originated from Latin America and manifested the subordinate economic situation of the non-Europeans areas of the world. This according to dependency theory is a result that comes from the limited political sovereignty presupposed for the bipolar domination in the International System.

Dependency theory is a theory that explains the reasons of underdevelopment. According to their principles, the size and power of the rich countries are enough reasons to dominate a whole host of Third World countries through "bargaining from a position of strength for concessions, distorting the structure of the domestic economy, creating vast income gaps, and imposing its own priorities – to such an extent that the country is rendered

incapable of genuine development" (Isbister 2006: 45). All in all, exploitation creates poverty, and that allows more exploitation, and the circle goes around (Isbister 2006: 46).

The existing form of dependency is because some countries (the dominant) achieved self-sustaining economic growth while others (the dominated and dependent) grew only as a reflection of changes in the dominant countries. Accordingly, dependency is an historical process shaped by the structures that shape the economic world. Afterwards, underdevelopment is not just a failure to develop, but an active process of impoverishment created by the lawless and chaotic behaviour of the developed countries; the hegemon(s). This can be understood as an anarchic behaviour (actions), where only the First World is the one that becomes secure and the Third World insecure.

At this point, the idea that the International System is anarchic and countries can do whatever they want in order to fulfil their needs, is a tricky assertion. For instance, if we evaluate the principles of classical realism and neo-realism and how they digest International Security, they give emphasis to anarchy and egoism roughly in the same way as dependency theorists do. Anarchy in this sense is understood as power, since power is a defined feature, where the states that shape the International System focus on states motives, and those motives must prevail after all (Glaser 2010: 20). Here, we are not trying to argue that dependency theory on the one hand, and classical realism and neo-realism on the other, understand the world in the same way, because they do not.

Dependency theory has its roots in neo-marxism and stresses that the difficulties (including security) that Third World countries have and are still experiencing have been created by capitalist development in the First World, and have as a consequence the underdevelopment and impoverishment of Third World (Isbister 2006: 47). They see the rich countries as the responsible of an underdeveloped world. They see international investors destabilizing currencies with incredible rapidity. They blame the World Bank (WB), the International Monetary Found (IMF), and the World Trade Organization (WTO), for favouring rich world countries by imposing policies in the Third World (Isbister 2006: 45).

Classical realism and neo-realism, on the other hand, have their roots in positivist science, and in order to apply both theories to international security "one has to bridge the gap that divides highly general, 'Top-down', theory from the 'inside-out' analysis of specific cases" (Wohlforth 2008: 32). They claim to have a clear understanding of anarchy, and were therefore able to construct a "reasoned" theory of what international politics in an anarchical setting look like (Wohlforth 2008: 45). They believe that anarchy in the real world is a constant, in which the distribution of capabilities is an imperative for absolute gains.

Scepticism about globalization and global governance is strongly held by realists and neo-realists. According to their ideas, globalization is a myth that hides the reality of an international economy that consists of states acting in their own narrow self-interest (Mearsheimer 1994: 9).

However, even if dependency theory and realism/neo-realism emanate from different schools of thought, there are some resemblances. For instance, as mentioned in chapter four, not all responses are anti-capitalist for dependency theory. One position of the dependency theory is that the best thing to do for the Third World is to fight fire with fire, to transform capitalism into its saviour. Since, no matter what the damage that international capitalism might has caused, the Third World countries, that is, the periphery and semi-periphery in the words of Wallerstein (Wallerstein 2006:30), should make use of capitalism in order to end their dependency upon rich countries (Isbister 2006: 48). The question here is how the countries that constitute the periphery and semi-periphery will behave when they reach their independency from the rich countries? How will they become independent? What are the odds that semi-peripheral countries will not act towards peripheral countries in the same way as developed countries did in the pass?

Anarchy in this sense can surpass the idea of hierarchy to which the dependency theorists allude constantly, with the difference that, within dependency theory, anarchy is an action, and within realist and neo-realist theories, it is a constant. Bluntly put, to dependency theorists the insecurity that Third World countries face in the contemporary world is the result of the anarchical actions of developed countries within the International System, but for realists and neo-realists, security depends of the economic and military capabilities that each country has within an anarchical International System.

8.3 Post-development Theory & Security

Post-development has been criticized for not been able to translate the inefficiency and ineffectiveness of development into a constructive position. Consequently, critics of this approach ask, what is the purpose of declaring development as a false project without proposing an alternative? Post-development theory, however, maintain that their goal is not to undermine the assumptions and motives of development, since they reject of the entire notion of development.

Post-development theory maintains that concepts such as poverty and progress are well linked to the idea of development and they were created as result of modernization, which became for the most part an ideological aspect (Shanin 1997: 69). The positive meaning of the word 'development', post-developmentalists argue, is still profoundly rooted after two centuries of its social construction and is a reminder of an undesirable and undignified condition (Esteva 2010: 6).

Post-developmentalists argue that the idea of development is a failure, a malfunction of its own top-down projects, and the results of those failures are the unbelievable social and ecological problems that the world is facing nowadays. The approach pays special attention to the issue of sovereignty and the take-it-for-granted discussion, and in contrast with other theories of development (e.g., modernization theory and dependency theory) they take into consideration the inclusion of women in policy projects and the demands of environmental responsibility and conservation (Lehmann 1997: 573).

According to the post-development standpoint, the social and ecological problems that the world is facing in at the present time have been created across time by discourse biases; thus, for the most part post-development thinking focuses on showing the deficiencies of Development Studies by applying a method from the field of literacy and cultural analysis (Lehmann 1997: 573). All in all, post-development emphasises the discursive nature of the ideology of development, in which the signification of nature as resources, the construction of poverty 'as lack of development', peasants as food producers, hunger as a consequence of bad planning rural development; and the representation of capital and technology as agents of transformation are stressed (Escobar 1995: 130).

Taking in consideration the abovementioned, they (post-development scholars) argue that discourses do not replace each other; they build upon each other. For instance, the poor are now accused, judged and punished for their irrationality and lack of environmental consciousness (Escobar 1995: 195). In this sense, we can take the example of sustainable development. The sustainable development initiative pinpoints that in order to accomplish the whole initiative, countries are required to fulfil basic needs, populations resources, technology, institutional cooperation and/or industrialism in the same way as the Bruntland report does, but that is only a simple reconfiguration of the primary ideology of development (Escobar 1995: 195). The report, Escobar argues, covers ecological concerns, by adopting the term 'sustainable development': "It focuses less on the negative consequences of economic growth on the environment than on the effects of environmental degradation on growth and potential for growth" (Escobar 1995: 195). But the only truth here, according to Escobar, is

that it is growth and not environment that has to be sustained. The solution is therefore the rejection of development and the discursive creation of new ways of thinking of the Third World (Escobar 1995: 130).

Post-development pays special attention to discourse analysis, and when it comes to the idea of development in the international community, they hold that the whole idea has been executed not only for geo-political purposes but also as a structure of expert hegemony where "the poor of the world are turned into laboratory specimens, endlessly classified, catalogued and manipulated by a supremely arrogant and power hungry professional community" (Lehmann 1997: 573).

The Post-development contribution to International Security is considered as an alternative way of understanding and articulating reality: it focuses on intertextuality and sociolinguistic practices rather than monological literacy, that is, positivist objectivism (George 2004: 191, 192). Whatever else this approach achieves, it problematizes the dominant modernist commitment to a world of given subjects and objects and all other separated givens. In this manner, it reformulates basic questions of modernist understanding in emphasizing not the sovereign subject (e.g., author/independent state) or the object (e.g., independent world/text) but instead the historical, cultural and linguistic practices in which subjects and objects are constructed (George 2004: 192).

For post-developmentalists, the problem lies in the definition of development and consequently its understanding. For this reason, this paper began with the idea that post-development theory constitutes the idea of International Security in the same way as the Paris School does.

Both theories suggest that policing is a form of governmentality. Both theories argue that the materialization of professional network monopolize the truth, therefore, their aim is to repudiate the readings that are based on positivist approaches, for the reason that the positivist status is derived not from any correspondence with a real meaning but from a discursive strategy intrinsically connected to the dominant form of knowledge and power (George 2004: 192). In this sense, it can be argued that post-development understanding of security focuses on how security is defined. Consequently, insecurity from this point of view is the result that stems from the definition of security, in the same way as underdevelopment is the result that emerges from the definition of development. Knowledge is therefore not free from values judgements and the claim for objectivity that classical modernist and positivist approaches adopt is problematized (Buzan & Hansen 2010: 143).

Instead of analyzing security as an essential concept, both approaches offer to treat security as a way of government. For that reason, it places special attention on the effects of power games (Jabri 2010: 238).

8.4 Capability Approach & International Security

Amartya Sen's capability approach (see chapter four), concerns itself with the dominant contemporary approaches in liberal philosophy and politics and how their actual interest in human has beings languished (Srinivasan 2007: 459). Sen claims that national income and growth measures are not sufficient measurements for assessing how the poor people are doing, and it reflects concerns about basic freedoms like political participation, literacy and elementary capabilities, including protection against primary deprivations such as starvation or malnutrition (Sen 1999a: 36). It claims the urgency of democracy as a necessary part of the system in order to fulfil development. Democracy in Sen's terms needs to be based on public discussion and deliberation, rather than seen as a mechanical condition based merely on elections and voting. In general, democracy for Sen symbolises participation and public reasoning, and therefore, it is central to his anxiety for individual organization and social choice within societies (Srinivasan 2007: 458).

From this perspective, liberal behaviour is understood as respect for plurality of individual views of the good life and is directly related to freedom, where human being can be able to choose what to be and what to do in addition to influence social arrangements, that is, institutions, policies and/or cultural values. It is therefore, that "[t]he opportunity of democracy opens up has to be positively grabbed in order to achieve the desired effect" (Sen 1999a: 154, 155). Democracy in these terms includes the idea of political freedom and liberties, since both conditions are tolerant advantages and their success would depend on how they are employed (Sen, 1999a: 154).

In the same way as the modernization theory, the capability approach has its roots in liberal moral and political philosophy, with a Kantian highlighting on individual autonomy with the firm conviction of equality and concerns with freedom (Srinivasan 2007: 462). Consequently, the capability approach (when it comes to International Security) understands International Security in the same way as liberal institutionalism, since terms such as democracy, freedom, individual organization, social arrangements, institutions, and/or cooperation are highlighted in both assumptions. However, insertions, like for instance the inclusion of gender into the discussion and archetypes of famine are conditions that make the

capability approach stronger that the other theories that emerge from the liberal school of thought.

The idea of democracy in Sen's arguments emphasizes the importance of a pluralistic political system in order to avoid problems or circumstances that some Third World Countries are still facing (e.g., famine) (Rubin 2009: 279). Therefore, access to food is not merely reduced to an economic question; instead, it "depends on the legal, political, economic, and social characteristics of the society in question and the person's position in it" (Sen 1981: 46).

When Sen alludes to democracy in relation to the issue of famine, he maintains that democracy is not just about regulated elections, but also about the government behaviour during the administration, in which mass media has to be considered as an important factor. As Sen points out, "democracy and uncensored press can spread the penalties of famine from the destitute to those in authority" (Sen in Rubin 2009: 281). All in all, the freedom of speech is an important feature when it comes to democracy. The question now is: can democracy help with insecurity matters? Can democracy really shun archetypes of famine?

9. THE BROADENING OF HUMAN SECURITY: UNTIL WHAT EXTENT DO THE THEORIES OF DEVELOPMENT INFLUENCE ON THE IDEA OF HUMAN SECURITY?

The world has always been thrown into the middle of a fight, in a quarrel where there are winners and losers, developed and non-developed, or ancients and Moderns; but what about security? A series of alternative goals have been put forward. The UNDP's Human Development Report and the introduction of the term Human Security (see chapter seven) are considered as the results of a series of unconformities with the classical ideas of International Security. But this critique needs to be directed towards the theories of development/underdevelopment as well, since Human Security includes conditions that were not included within the classical theories of Development Studies when it comes to security.

At this point, this paper recognizes that scientific facts are indeed constructed, and the development paradigm is twice constructed, since the agent of this double construction (science with society and society with science) emerges out of a set of practices. Consequently, poverty, hunger and diseases are too social and too narrated to be truly natural (Latour1991: 6). It is here, where we argue that conditions such as global crime, spread of disease, job insecurity, human trafficking, and internal conflicts are authoritative and eloquent settings that are not entirely considered in some theories of development/underdevelopment.

As we have seen in the previous chapter, modernization theory and dependency theory understand International Security in such way that the importance of Human Security is not considered fully.

On the one hand, modernization theory argues that in terms of knowledge, history, social development is interpreted as part of chronological activities (e.g., states of growth) where the increasingly distanced between the subjects confronts the problems of the natural and social world (George 1994: 43). All in all, if a non-developed country wishes to reach development, they need to accomplish some conditions or requisites. In this sense, security relies upon the legitimacy of domestic, political, and international arrangements based on the capitalist system, where global governance, democracy, capitalism, cooperation, interdependence, institutions, legitimacy, liberal states, and/or arrangements are considered as imperative features in order to reach security.

In this manner, the current fashion of development wants to end the disorder that still exists in the International System, and that implies a general warlord with influence and external forms of authority (Hettne 2010: 44), delivering security in many different ways.[3]

On the other hand, dependency theory maintains that dependency is an historical process with roots in the structure that shapes the economic order. Underdevelopment is therefore, according to this standpoint, not just a failure to develop, but an active and dynamic process of impoverishment created by lawless and chaotic performances of the developed countries. The solution the developed countries offered is for the developing countries to make use of capitalism in order to end their dependency towards rich countries (Isbister 2006: 48). But if Third World countries make use of this proposition, then they will place themselves in the position they criticised from the beginning, by stressing patterns of structure, dependency, competition and, consequently, fear and cheating.

Whenever 'development' is employed as a vector for Human Security, this paper argues that it must be done in a self-reflexive way, since development cannot separate itself from the words from which it was created (evolution, growth, and maturation). It is in this context, post-development attempts to dismiss and underestimate the classical conceptions of development and, consequently, the classical conceptions of international security. Post-development puts special attention on issues related to theory, practice, and knowledge as power (George 2004: 229). It criticises the foundations of development by questioning circumstances of power politics (e.g., the national interest, the new world order, state security, and/or common sense) (George 2004: 229).

According to post-developmentalists, policing is a form of governmentality. They argue that development as a field of social and political science monopolize the truth. Their aim is to disclaim the readings that are based on positivist approaches, since the positivist status comes from a discursive strategy directly connected to the dominant form of knowledge and power (George 2004: 192).

---

[3] During the 1990s a qualitatively new discourse on liberal intervention called 'humanitarian intervention' (by others 'military humanism', 'liberal imperialism' or 'humanitarian imperialism') implied a coercive involvement by external powers in domestic crisis with the purpose of preventing anarchy by punishing human rights abuses and promoting democracy and good governance (Hettne 2010: 44). For instance, in March 1999, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) decided to initiate a bomb-raid alongside Serbia as a humanitarian intervention guided by the United States decision making (Silander 20009:54). The Balkan conflict at the beginning of the 1990's revealed the European military incapacity (Kagan 2004: 22), and needed the assistance of the United States and its military capabilities to solve the 'humanitarian' conflict. As a result, the 'proliferation of democracy' in non-democratic states was (and maybe still) understood in military actions.

The idea of development is already well amalgamated, and for that reason post-development claims the need to enhance the agenda of global politics. The voices and ambitions of the non-elite, the non-white, and the non-Western need to be listened to and encouraged to political participation where individuals and societies can be able to choose their destinies (Esteva 2010: 6).

Post-developmentalists maintain that the current generation, as the major representatives to modernity's triumph, stands at a historical moment of great danger, to which the narratives and political practices of development have contributed. Therefore, we must be reconnected to the unspoken, unwritten, un-reflected narratives of the evicted and silenced (George 2004: 231).

Post-development challenges the assumptions that have become "facts". It questions the modernists' statements which have become reality by challenging the traditional and disciplinary foundations that have been the major leadings of development and, consequently, International Security discourses since the end of World War II (George 2004: 226). In this context, this paper argues that post-development has something to offer to the paradigm of Human Security, since insecurity from this point of view is the result that sprouts from the definition of security, in the same way as underdevelopment is the result that emerges from the definition of development. Knowledge, therefore, is not free from value judgements, and the claim for objectivity, that the classical modernists assume, is not accepted (Buzan & Hansen 2010: 143).

An interesting theory is Amartya Sen's capability approach. This is a current approach when it comes to the idea of development, and it focuses on one of the most important dilemmas of security: democracy.

The ideas of democracy and freedom in Sen's capability approach are quite vaguely invoked in debates concerning solutions for problems in developing countries and threats to international security (Srinivasan 2007: 458). The capability approach argues that democracy and the consideration of women are seen as important tolls to prevent, for example, famine. In this way, Amartya Sen's democratic hypothesis should mean that the pluralistic political system for famine protection (Rubin 2009: 279) has the possibility to deal with food problems without affecting the economy of the country at issue (Sen 1981: 46). Here, Sen's weakness lays on specifying and defending the preconditions for individuals, where the substantive (democratic freedom) renders his arguments for democracy in order to

cure everything. But democracy ''is hard to love'' (Young 2000: 16), and it is always difficult to explain, even though the term is understood universally (Srinivasan 2007: 466). When Sen alludes to democracy in relation to the issue of famine, Sen maintains that democracy is not just about regulated elections, but also about the governmental behaviour during the administration, during which mass media is considered an important factor. All in all, "[d]emocracy and uncensored press can spread the penalties of famine from the destitute to those in authority" (Sen in Rubin 2009: 281). Consequently, the supposed reality of the capability approach is that democracy is able to avoid disgraces through happiness and individualism. In this sense, Thomas C. Tsai argues that the new government has the possibility to present different perspectives on how to deal with food crises by "calling for international aid and publishing data on the scope of the problem resulting in a much more open approach" (Tsai 2010: 1152).

Amartya Sen claims that "there has never been a famine in functioning multi-party democracy" (Sen 1999:178). But recent famines in Niger[4] appear to violate Sen's ideas of democracy and famine. A possible explanation can be that some nations need to be considered as young democracies (Devereux 2009: 31), but then it needs to be specified that democracy exists at many levels.

In conclusion, Sen's capability approach includes some important points that make the approach stronger than other theories that emerge from the liberal school of thought. The approach, however, is still relaying on modernist thought and that obstructs the possibilities to influence on the critical thinking of Human Security.

As discussed in the paragraphs above, not all the theories that explain development and underdevelopment have been helpful to the foundations and enhancement of the Human Security paradigm. Thus, we can argue that, with the exception of post-development theory and some points of Amartya Sen's capability approach, the theories of development/underdevelopment analyzed in this paper have not done enough to contribute to something that is of vital importance to the discipline of Development Studies. These theories can defend themselves by saying that the term Human Security is a broad concept that shifts attention from security of the state towards security of the individual, and it embraces

---

[4] Niger food crisis in 2010 happened under a "pluralistic political rule with a liberal constitution" (Rubin 2009: 291). This constitution guaranteed free expression and an independent judiciary (Rubin 2009: 291).
In an announcement to foreign aid agencies Mahamadou Danda, (Prime Minister of the 9-month transitional government), stressed: "To the national and international community, I want to launch an emergency appeal for massive support to the enormous efforts Niger is making to cope with famine" (Tsai 2010: 1151).

situations and conditions that cannot be entirely contested. But the fact is that Human Security is the result of thorough methodological research based on different level of analysis, where the problems that are related to security are analysed from within. It is a concept that has been broadened by considering other aspects, not only the state or the created anarchic system they all allude to, but rather in the sense that humans are the principal actor to be considered and that development is directly connected with it. Bluntly put, Human Security is closely related to what this paper calls Critical Security approaches (e.g., Copenhagen school, Aberystwyth School, and the Paris School), since they contribute to the view that human beings should be the primary referent object of security, by including issues of poverty, underdevelopment, hunger and other assaults of human potential and integrity (Buzan & Hansen 2010: 36).

As stressed in chapter six, security is in one way or another related to dangers to humanity that is of a life-threatening nature. The danger itself emerges not from the natural environment of the natural process of life, but from the calculated activities and policies of other human beings, which may lead to such things as global warming, starvation, the cross border movement of people, water pollution, and so on.

It is here, where the Critical Security approaches become essential to the security-development nexus: physical safety, liberty, military/non-military security, political security, economic security, societal (identity) security, and environmental security are considered as an essential situation within both Development Studies and International Security Studies.

10. CONCLUSIONS

This paper had the commitment to show the connections between development and International Security and until what extent these theories influence to the improvement of the Human Security paradigm. (Deconstructive) discourse analysis has been the tool that helped us to open the box in order to analyze the theories that constructed the discourse of Development and International Security respectively.

We have suggested that some theories of development still take things for granted when it comes to their understanding of International Security. In this sense, we have shown that modernization theory, in the same way as liberal institutionalists do, take for granted terms such as global governance, democracy, capitalism, cooperation, interdependence, institutions, legitimacy, arrangements and liberal states are imperative conditions in order to reach security. Consequently, their involvement into the Human Security paradigm is minimal, and that may be because of ideological implications.

Within the dependency theory, we have suggested that they understand international security in an old fashioned way, where anarchy is an imperative behaviour. Therefore, within the security matter, we relate the theory to the ideas of realism and neo-realism, with the difference that anarchy from the dependency theory is an action and for the realist and neo-realist is a constant. Consequently, as in the case of modernization theory, dependency theory has nothing to offer to the Human Security paradigm.

Amartya Sen's capability approach brings discussions that are important when it comes to the issue of international security, but more significantly to the Human Security paradigm. The theory alludes to democracy in relation to the issue of famine. This is an important feature, but the fact is that the capability approach is still too liberal and even though the approach consider things that are not considered within the modernization theory, it is still emphasizing that democracy is an imperative factor if a country wants to reach their goals (e.g., development and/or security). This is a disadvantage of this theory, since democracy is a problematic term for the reason that ideologies contain certain ideas about what is considered the best form of governments and democracy is a form of government an therefore is not natural.

The post-development perspective, we believe, has the most to offer in the space of International Security. Its understanding of security focuses on how security is defined, in the same way as the Paris School does. Both theories affirm that insecurity is the result that stems from the definition of security, in the same way as underdevelopment is the result that emerges from the definition of development. Knowledge is therefore not free from value judgements and the claim for objectivity that classical modernist and positivist approaches adopt is problematized (Buzan & Hansen 2010: 143).

We conclude that not all the theories that explain development and underdevelopment have been helpful to the foundations and enhancement of the Human Security paradigm. Thus, we can state that with the exception of post-development theory and some points of Amartya Sen's capability approach, the theories of development/underdevelopment analyzed in this paper have not done enough to contribute to something that is of vital importance within the discipline of Development Studies. Consequently, this paper argues that Human Security is closely related to what this paper calls Critical Security approaches (e.g., Copenhagen School, Aberystwyth School, and the Paris School), since they contribute to the view that humans beings should be the primary referent object of security, by including issues of poverty, underdevelopment, hunger and other assaults of human potential and integrity (Buzan & Hansen 2010: 36).

At last, we need to stress our concern for the discipline of Development Studies, since the theories of development and underdevelopment date from 50 years ago, and the idea of Human Security paradigm arose in 1994. We are in the middle of 2011 and the intersection between Development Studies and the idea of Human Security is almost inexistent. For that reason, we are wondering why there are many theories one world and just few junctions between these two.

11. REFERENCES

Alvesson, Mats and Skoldberg, Kaj, (2000*) Reflexive Methodology - New Vistas for Qualitative Research*, London: Sage Publications

Balaam, David N and Veseth, Michael (2005) *Introduction to International Political Economy,* New Jersey: Pearson Education International.

Berman, Marshall (1997) "Faust, the Fist Developer" p.p. 73-84. In Rahnema, Majid & Bawtree, Victoria (Eds) *The Post-Development Reader,* London: Zed

Bigo, Didier, (2000). 'When Two Become One: Internal and External Securitisations in Europe' p.p. 171-205. In Kelsturp, Morten & Williams, C. Michael (Eds), *International Relations Theory and the Politics of European Integration, Power, Security and Community.* London: Routledge

Bigo, Didier (2008) "International Political Sociology" p.p. 116-128. In Williams, D. Paul (2008) *Security Studies An Introduction,* Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge

Bigo, Didier., Carrera, Sergio., Guild, Elspeth & Walker, R.J.D. (2010)*Europe's 21st Century Challenge: Delivering Liberty*, Farnham, England:Ashgate

Booth, Ken (1991) "Security and Emancipation", *Review of International Relations 17(4): 313-326*

Booth, Ken (1997) "Security and Self: Reflections of a Fallen Realist" p.p. 83-120. In Krause, Keith & Williams, C. Michael (Eds). (1997). *Critical Security Studies. Concepts and Cases*, London: UCL Press.

Booth, Ken (2004) "Realities of Security: Editor's Introduction", International Relations 18(1): 5-8

Booth, Ken., (Ed)., (2005a) *Critical Security Studies and World Politics,* London: Lynne Reinner.

Booth, Ken (2005b) "Security" p.p. 21-25. In Booth, Ken., (Ed)., (2005a) *Critical Security Studies and World Politics,* London: Lynne Reinner

Booth, Ken (2007) *Theory of World Security, Cambridge:* Cambridge University Press.

Brown, Michael E., Owen R. Coté Jr., Sean M. Lynn-Jones and Steven E. Miller (2004). *New Global Dangers – Changing Dimensions of International Security – An Agenda for Change,* Cambridge, Ma. & London: MIT press.

Burchill, Scott., Linklater, Richard Devetak, Jack Donnelly, Matthew Paterson, Christian Reus-Smit and Jacqui True (2005) *Theories of international relations – Third edition,* Whales & New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Burchill, Scott (2005) "Liberalism" p.p. 55-83. In Burchill, Scott., Linklater, Richard Devetak, Jack Donnelly, Matthew Paterson, Christian Reus-Smit and Jacqui True (2005) *Theories of international relations – Third edition,* Whales & New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Buzan, Barry (1991). *PEOPLE, STATES, AND FEAR. An Agenda for International Security Studies in The Post-Cold War Era* - Second Edition, London: Harvester Wheastheaf.

Buzan, Barry (1991a) "New patterns of global security in the twenty-first century", *International Affairs*, vol. 67, no. 3, pp. 431-451.

Buzan, Barry., Ole Waever, & Jaap de Wilde (1998). *SECURITY: A New Framework for Analysis*, Colorado, US & London UK: Lynne Reinner Publishers, Inc.

Buzan, Barry & Little, Richard (2000) *INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM IN WORLD HISTORY. Reaking the Study of International Relations*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Buzan, Barry & Hansen, Lene (2010) *The Evolution of International Security Studies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Carlsnaes, Walter. (2008). "Actors, Structures, and Foreign Policy Analysis" p.p. 85-100. In Smith, Steve, Hadfield, Amelia., Dunne.(2008) *Foreign Policy. Theories-Actors-Cases.* Oxford: Oxford University Press Inc.

CASE collective (2006). "Critical Approaches to Security in Europe: A Network Manifesto". *Security Dialogue, 37(4): 443 – 487;* SAGE Publications.

Checkel, T. Jeffrey (2008) "Constructivism and Foreign Policy" p.p. 71-82. In Smith, Steve., Hadfield, Amelia., Dunne.(2008) *Foreign Policy. Theories-Actors-Cases,* Oxford: Oxford University Press Inc.

Collins, Alan (2010) *Contemporary Security Studies –* Second Edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Cowen, M.P., & Shenton, R.W. (1996) *Doctrines of Development.* London and New York: Routledge

Crawford, Beverly & Lipschutz, D. Ronnie (1997) "Discourse of War: Security and the Case of Yugoslavia" p.p. 149-185. In Krause, Keith & Williams, C. Michael (1997). *Critical Security Studies. Concepts and Cases*, London: UCL Press.

Debrix, François (2003) *Language, Agency, and Politics in a Constructed World.* Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe,

Derrida, J. (1976). *Of Grammatology*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Derrida, J. (1978). *Writing and difference*. London & Henly: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Desai, Vandana & Potter, Robert. B. (2008) *The Companion to Development Studies* - Second Edition, London: U.K. Hodde Education.

Devereux, Stephen (2009) "Why does famine persist in Africa?". *Food Security*. 1: 25-35.

Devetak, Richard (2005) "Critical Theory" p.p. 137-160. In Burchill, Scott., Linklater, Richard Devetak, Jack Donnelly, Matthew Paterson, Christian Reus-Smit and Jacqui True (2005) *Theories of international relations – Third edition,* Whales & New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Elman, Colin (2008) "Realism" p.p. 15-28. In Williams, D. Paul (2008) *Security Studies An Introduction,* Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Emmers, Ralf (2010) "Securitization" p.p. 136-151. In Collins, Alan (2010) *Contemporary Security Studies* – Second Edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Escobar, Arturo (1995) *ENCOUNTERING DEVELOPMENT. The Making and Unmaking of The Third World*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press

Escobar, Arturo (1997) "The Making and Unmaking of the Third World Trough Development" p.p. 85-93. In Rahnema, Majid & Bawtree, Victoria (Eds) *The Post-Development Reader,* London: Zed

Esteva, Gustavo (2010) "Development" p.p. 1-23. In Sachs, Wolfgang *The Development Dictionary* - Second Edition, London and New York: Zed Books.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fierke, M.K. "Breaking the Silence: Language and Method in International Relations" p.p. 66-86. In Debrix, François (2003) *Language, Agency, and Politics in a Constructed World,* Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe,

Finnemore, Martha and Sikkink, Kathryn (2001) "TAKING STOCK: The Constructivist Research Program in International Relations and Comparative Politics" Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci. pp.391–416. Copyright by Annual Reviews.

George, Jim, 1994. *Discourses of Global Politics: A Critical (Re)Introduction to International Relations,* Boulder, CO: Lynne Reinner

Glaser, L. Charles (2010)"Realism" p.p. 15-33. In Collins, Alan (2010) *Contemporary Security Studies* – Second Edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Held, David., McGrew, Anthony., Goldblatt, David & Perraton, Jonathan (1999) *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics, and Cultur,*. Stanford: Stanford University Press

Hettne, Björn. (2008) "Current Trends and Future Options in Development Studies" pp. 8-11. Desai, Vandana & Potter, Robert. B. (2008) *The Companion to Development Studies* - Second Edition, London: U.K. Hodde Education.

Hettne, Björn (2010) "Development and Security: Origins and Future". *Security Dialogue, 41(1): 31 – 52;* SAGE Publications

Illich, Ivan (1997) "Development as Planned Poverty" p.p. 94-101. In Rahnema, Majid & Bawtree, Victoria (Eds) *The Post-Development Reader,* London: Zed

Isbister, John (2006) *PROMISES NOT KEPT. Poverty and the Betrayal of Third World Development -* Seventh Edition, Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press, Inc

Jabri, Vivienne (2010) "Violence and Exceptionalism in Contemporary Politics: War, Liberty, Security" p.p. 237-250. In, Bigo, Didier., Carrera, Sergio., Guild, Elspeth & Walker, R.J.D. (2010)*Europe's 21st Century Challenge: Delivering Liberty*, Farnham, England:Ashgate

Jørgensen, Marianne & Phillips, Louise. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*, London: Sage

Kelsturp, Morten & Williams, C. Michael (Eds) (2000), *International Relations Theory and the Politics of European Integration, Power, Security and Community.* London: Routledge

Keohane, Robert O & Martin, Lisa L, (1995) "The Promise of Institutionalist Theory", *International Security,* Vol. 20, No.1 (JSTOR)

Kerr, Pauline (2010) "Human Security" p.p. 121- 135. In Collins, Alan (2010) *Contemporary Security Studies* – Second Edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Kohli, Atul (2004) *State-Directed Development. Political Power and Industrialization in the global Periphery*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Krause, Keith & Williams, C. Michael (Eds). (1997a). *Critical Security Studies. Concepts and Cases*, London: UCL Press.

Krause, K., & Williams, M.C. (1997b) "From Strategy Security: Foundations of Critical Security Studies" p.p. 33-59. In Krause, Keith & Williams, C. Michael (Eds). (1997). *Critical Security Studies. Concepts and Cases*, London: UCL Press.

Krause, K., & Williams, M.C. (1997c) "Preface: Towards Critical Security Studies" p.p. vii-xxi. In Krause, Keith & Williams, C. Michael (Eds). (1997). *Critical Security Studies. Concepts and Cases*, London: UCL Press.

Kyeil, Ray (June 1999) "The Last Refuge of the Nohle Savage? A Critical Assessment of Post-Development Theory" European Journal of Development Research, v. 11, iss. 1, pp. 30-55

Macleod, Catronia. (2002) "Deconstructive discourse analysis: extending the methodological conversation". South African Journal of Psychology, 32 (1). pp. 17-25

Mearsheimer, John J, "The False Promise of International Institutions," *International Security*, Vol. 19, No. 3 (Winter 1994/1995), pp. 5-49.

Milliken, Jennifer (1999) "The Study of Discourse in International Relations: A Critique of Research and Methods". European Journal of International Relations. SAGE Publications, London, Thousand Oaks, CA and New Deli Vol. 5(2): 225-254

Munck, Ronaldo & O'Hearn, Denis (1999) *Critical Development Theory. Contributions to a new paradigm*, London: Zed Books.

Mutimer, David (2009) "My Critique is Bigger than Yours: Constituting Exclusions in Critical Stides" *Studies in Social Justice, 3(1): 9 – 22*

Navari, Cornelia (2008) "Liberalism" p.p. 29-43. In Williams, D. Paul (2008) *Security Studies An Introduction,* Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge

Ndi, Alfred (2011) "Why Liberal Capitalism Failed to Stimulate a Democratic Culture in Africa: Rethinking Amartya Sen's Theory about Development as Freedom" Journal of Developing Societies 27:2, 177-200 SAGE Publications

Newman, Edward (2001) "Human Security and Constructivism," *International Studies Perspectives* 2:3, 239-251

Nussbaum, M.C. (2003) "Capabilities as fundamental entitlements: Sen and Social justice", *Feminist Economics*, 9, pp. 33–59.

Okuno, Shiro (2007) ""Freedom from Fear and Want" and "the Right to Live in Peace", and "Human Security"" *Ritsumeikan International Affairs* Vol. 5, 1-15

Paris, Roland (2004) " HUMAN SECURITY: Paradigm shift or Hot Air?" p.p. 249-264. In Brown, Michael E., Owen R. Coté Jr., Sean M. Lynn-Jones and Steven E. Miller (2004). *New Global Dangers – Changing Dimensions of International Security – An Agenda for Change,* Cambridge, Ma. & London: MIT press

Parker, I. (1992). *Discourse dynamics: critical analysis for social and individual psychology*, London & New York: Routledge.

Peet, Richard. & Hartwick, Elaine. (2009). *Theories of Development. Contentions, Arguments, Alternatives* - Second edition, New York & London: The Guildford Press.

Potter, B. Robert (2008) "Theories, Strategies and Ideologies of Development" p.p. 67-70. In Desai, Vandana & Potter, B. Robert (2008) *The Companion to Development Studies* - Second Edition, London U.K.: Hodder Education.

Pouliot, Vincent. (2004) "The essence of constructivism" Journal of International Relations and Development", Macmillan Ltd: pp. 319–336

Pouliot, Vincent (2007) ''Sobjectivism'': Toward a Constructivist Methodology University of Toronto. International Studies Quarterly (2007) 51, 359–384

Power, Marcus (2008) "Enlightenment and the Era of Modernity" p.p. 71-74. In Desai, Vandana & Potter, Robert. B. (2008) *The Companion to Development Studies*. Second Edition, Hodde Education, London, U.K.

Rahnema, Majid & Bawtree, Victoria (Eds) (1997) *The Post-Development Reader,* London: Zed.

Richard H. Ullman. "Redefining Security": International Security, (JSTOR), Vol. 8, No. 1, (Summer, 1983), pp. 129-153

Rist, Gilbert (2008) *The History of Development. From Western Origins to Global Faith*, London: Zed Books.

Rubin, Oliver, 2009: "The Niger Famine: A Collapse of Entitlements and Democratic Responsiveness" *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, vol. 44, no. 3

Sachs, Wolfgang (2010) *THE DEVELOPMENT DICTIONARY – A Guide to Knowledge as Power* - Second Edition, London & New York: Zed Books.

Scott, Burchill et al (2005) *Theories of international relations* - Third edition, Whales: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sen, Amartya Kunar (1981) *Poverty and famines: an essay on entitlement and deprivation* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Sen, Amartya Kunar (1999a) *Development as Freedom*, Anchor Books, New York.

Sen, Amartya Kunar (1999b) "Democracy as a universal value", *Journal of Democracy*, 10(3), 3–17.

Sheehan, M., (2005) *International Security An Analytical Survey,* Colorado, US: Lynne Reinner Publishers Inc

Sidaway, D. James (2008) "Post-development" p.p. 16-19. In Desai, Vandana & Potter, B. Robert (2008) *The Companion to Development Studies* - Second Edition. London: Hodder Education.

Smith, Steve., Hadfield, Amelia., Dunne.(2008) *Foreign Policy. Theories-Actors-Cases,* Oxford: Oxford University Press Inc.

Srinivasan, Sharath (2008) "No Democracy without Justice: Political freedom in Amartya Sen's Capability Approach" *Journal of Human Development*, 8:3, 457-580. Routledge

Stewrat, F., & Deneuling, S. (2002) "Amartya Sen's Contribution to Development Thinking" *Studies in Comparative International Development,* 37(2), 61-70

Sumner, Andy & Tribe, Michael (2008) *Inyernational Development Studies: Theories and Methods in Research and Practice,* London: Sague

Sylvester, Christine (2007) "Anatomy of a Footnote" *Security Dialogue, 38(1), 457 – 558;* SAGUE Publications

Thomas, Caroline (2001) "Global Governance, Development and Human Security: Exploring the Links" Third *World Quarterly* 22(2), 159-175.

Titscher, Stefan. Meyer, Michael. Wodak, Ruth & Vetter, Eva (2000). *Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis,* Los Angeles: Sage Publications

Tsai, C. Thomas (2010). "Food crisis no longer taboo in Niger". *The Lancet*. vol 37 no. 9721: 1151-1152.

Tucker, Vincent (1999) "The Myth of Development: A Critique of a Eurocentric Discourse" p.p. 1-26. In Munck & O'Hearn (Eds). *Critical Development Theory. Contributions to a new paradigm*, London: Zed Books.

UNDP (1994) *Human Development Report 1994*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wallerstein, Immanuel (2004) *WORLD – SYSTEMS ANALYSIS. An Introduction,* Durham and London: Duke University Press

Williams, D. Paul (2008) *Security Studies An Introduction,* Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge

Wohlforth, William C. (2008). "Realism and Foreign Policy" p.p. 31-46 in Smith, Steve., Hadfield, Amelia., Dunne.(2008)., *Foreign Policy. Theories-Actors-Cases.* Oxford: Oxford University Press Inc.

Wæver, Ole (2004) "Aberystwyth, Paris, Copenhagen: 'Schools' in Security Theory and Their Origins Between Core and Periphery" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the *International Studies Association,* Montreal, March 17-20

Young, I.M. (2000) *Inclusion and Democracy,* Oxford: Oxford University Press

APPENDIX

We must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits for improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas.

More than half the people of the world are living in conditions approaching misery. Their food is inadequate. They are victims of disease. Their economic life is primitive and stagnant. Their poverty is a handicap and a threat both to them and to more prosperous areas.

For the first time in history, humanity possesses the knowledge and skill to relieve the suffering of these people.

The United States is pre-eminent among nations in the development of industrial and scientific techniques. The material resources which we can afford to use for assistance of other people is limited. But our imponderable resources in technical knowledge are constantly growing and are inexhaustible.

I believe that we should make available to peace-loving people the benefits of our store of technical knowledge in order to help them realize their aspirations for a better life.

And, in cooperation with other nations, we should foster capital investment in areas needing development.

Our main aim should be to help the free peoples of the world, through their own efforts, to produce more food, more clothing, more materials for housing, and ore mechanical power to lighten their burdens.

We invite other countries to pool their technological resources in this undertaking. Their contribution will be warmly welcomed. This should be a cooperative enterprise in which all nations work together through the United Nations and its specialized agencies whenever practicable. It must be a worldwide effort for the achievement of peace, plenty, and freedom.

With the cooperation of business, private capital, agriculture, and labour in this country, this program can greatly increase the industrial activity in other nations and can raise substantially their standards of living.

Such new economic developments must be devised and controlled to the benefit of the peoples of the areas in which they are established. Guarantees to the investor must be balanced by guarantees in the interest of the people whose resources and whose labour go into these developments.

The old imperialism – exploitation for foreign profit – has no place in our plans. What we envisage is a program of development based on the concepts of democratic fair-dealing.

All countries included our own, will greatly benefit from a constant program for the better use of the world's human and natural resources. Experience shows that our commerce with other countries expands as they progress industrially and economically.

Greater production is the key to prosperity and peace. And the key to greater production is a wider and more vigorous application of the modern scientific and technical knowledge.

Only b y helping the least fortunate of its members to help themselves can the human family achieve the decent, satisfying life that is the right of all people.

Democracy alone can supply the vitalizing force to stir the peoples of the world into triumphal action, not only against the human oppressor, but also against their ancient enemies – hunger, misery, and despair.

On the basis of these four major courses we hope to help create the conditions that will lead eventually to personal freedom and happiness for all mankind

(Harry S. Truman (1949) In Rist 2008: 71)