

**RE-CONCEPTUALISING NATIONAL SECURITY:
A FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS**

By

ELIZABETH MAY FERGUSON

Student Number: 28407947

A mini-dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS IN SECURITY STUDIES

In the Department of Political Sciences

Faculty of Humanities

University of Pretoria

Supervisor:

Mr Roland Henwood

Co-supervisor:

Colonel (ret) Robin M Blake

November 2019

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA

The Department of Political Sciences places great emphasis upon integrity and ethical conduct in the preparation of all written work submitted for academic evaluation.

While academic staff teach you about referencing techniques and how to avoid plagiarism, you too have a responsibility in this regard. If you are at any stage uncertain as to what is required, you should speak to your lecturer before any written work is submitted.

You are guilty of plagiarism if you copy something from another author's work (eg a book, an article or a website) without acknowledging the source and pass it off as your own. In effect you are stealing something that belongs to someone else. This is not only the case when you copy work word-for-word (verbatim), but also when you submit someone else's work in a slightly altered form (paraphrase) or use a line of argument without acknowledging it. You are not allowed to use work previously produced by another student. You are also not allowed to let anybody copy your work with the intention of passing it off as his/her work.

Students who commit plagiarism will not be given any credit for plagiarised work. The matter may also be referred to the Disciplinary Committee (Students) for a ruling. Plagiarism is regarded as a serious contravention of the University's rules and can lead to expulsion from the University.

The declaration which follows must accompany all written work submitted while you are a student of the Department of Political Sciences. No written work will be accepted unless the declaration has been completed and attached.

Full names of student: Elizabeth May Ferguson

Student number: 28407947

Topic of work: Re-Conceptualising National Security: A Framework for Analysis

Declaration

1. I understand what plagiarism is and am aware of the University's policy in this regard.
2. I declare that this mini dissertation is my own original work. Where other people's work has been used (either from a printed source, Internet or any other source), this has been properly acknowledged and referenced in accordance with departmental requirements.
3. I have not used work previously produced by another student or any other person to hand in as my own.
4. I have not allowed, and will not allow, anyone to copy my work with the intention of passing it off as his or her own work.

SIGNATURE

ETHICS STATEMENT

I hereby declare that I, Elizabeth May Ferguson (Student number: 28407947), whose name appears on the first page of this mini dissertation, has obtained, for the research described in this work, the applicable ethics approval.

I, Elizabeth May Ferguson, also hereby declare that I have observed the ethical standards required in terms of the University of Pretoria's Code of Ethics for researchers and the policy guidelines for responsible research and that the dissertation titled *Re-Conceptualising National Security: A Framework for Analysis*, has not been submitted by me at this or any other university; that it is my own work in conception and design, and that all material contained herein has been acknowledged.

ABSTRACT

National security is used as a justification for policy decisions, a pretext to erode civil liberties and rights, a rallying call for exceptionalism of the 'self' at the exclusion of the 'other', and as a validation for war. In the name of national security just about any action is justifiable, any decision rational and any consequence moral. There is a danger in this ambiguity.

This research has developed a contemporary, comprehensive and holistic framework of analysis using critical constructivism to re-conceptualise national security and to address the latent ambiguity of the concept. The critical literature review shows a comparison of the assumptions and limitations of traditional and critical security studies conceptualisations of national security. It was through this critical analysis that the researcher was able to determine that traditional security studies offers a limited and constrained conceptualisation of national security, that is necessary but insufficient. In contrast, critical security studies has failed to properly engage with the concept of national security. A reconceptualization of national security needs to draw on the strengths and address the limitations of both approaches, and critical constructivism provides the necessary theoretical infrastructure to do so.

The national security quintet has been developed and constructed as a framework of analysis for reconceptualising national security using the five inter-related, mutually constituted and socially constructed concepts of national identity, national values, national interests, national power and national will. Each concept has been highlighted for its severable and collective utility in conceptualising national security, and that together form a powerful tool of analysis. Critical constructivism was chosen as the most appropriate theoretical framework for the quintet, although this does not preclude it from being used by other theoretical approaches. The national security quintet has the potential to re-conceptualise national security in theory and practice.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank my co-supervisor Colonel (ret) Robin M Blake of the Political Sciences Department at the University of Pretoria. Safe to say that without his guidance, passion and genius this dissertation would never have been developed let alone completed. Colonel (ret) Blake supported, encouraged and inspired me through the entire process.

I would also like to thank Mr Roland Henwood, my supervisor, whose optimism and kind reminders not to lose momentum kept me going when obstacles seemed insurmountable. I am indebted to him for his valuable comments on this dissertation.

I must also express my profound gratitude to my parents, my partner, my friends and colleagues for providing me with unfailing support, continuous encouragement and constructive criticism throughout the seemingly never-ending process of researching and writing this dissertation. This accomplishment would not have been possible without them.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the inevitable spelling and grammatical errors that have somehow managed to make it through several rounds of editing and proofreading. Your tenacity inspires me.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to the academics, policy makers and security practitioners.

May we pursue a better world, together. Whatever that means.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY	i
ETHICS STATEMENT	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Identification of the research theme	1
1.2. Literature overview.....	3
1.2.1. Traditional security studies and national security	3
1.2.2. Critical security studies and national security	4
1.2.3. Constructivism and National Security	5
1.3. Formulation and demarcation of the research problem.....	7
1.4. Research question	8
1.4.1 Research sub questions	8
1.5. Research Methodology	9
1.6. Limitations.....	10
1.7. Ethical Considerations	11
1.8. Research structure.....	11
1.8.1. Chapter 1: Research Proposal	11
1.8.2. Chapter 2: Critical literature review.....	11
1.8.3. Chapter 3: National security framework.....	11
1.8.4. Chapter 4: Findings and recommendations	12
CHAPTER 2: CRITICAL LITERATURE REVIEW	13
2.1. Introduction	13
2.2. Defining national security	14
2.3. Traditional security studies and national security	15

2.3.1.	Positivism and the problem-solving approach	19
2.3.2.	The state as the primary referent of security	21
2.3.3.	The constraining influence of an anarchical international order	22
2.3.4.	The focus on the military and external dimensions of security	23
2.3.5.	Limitations	25
2.4.	Critical security studies and national security	28
2.4.1.	Critical security studies and national security: the seminal voices	28
2.4.2.	Post-positivism	32
2.4.3.	Critical theory and critical security studies	33
2.4.4.	Security as a derivative concept	35
2.4.5.	Deepening security	35
2.4.6.	Broadening security	36
2.4.7.	Limitations	37
2.5.	Conclusion	40
CHAPTER 3: NATIONAL SECURITY FRAMEWORK		43
3.1.	Introduction	43
3.2.	The national security quintet	44
3.3.	Constructivism	45
3.3.1.	The core assumptions of constructivism	46
3.3.2.	Conventional constructivism and national security	48
3.3.3.	Critical constructivism and national security	50
3.4.	National security framework	53
3.4.1.	National identity and national security	53
3.4.2.	National values and national security	58
3.4.3.	National interests and national security	60
3.4.4.	National power and national security	63
3.4.5.	National will and national security	65

3.5. Conclusion	67
CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	70
4.1. Introduction	70
4.2. From the traditional to the critical	71
4.3. The national security quintet	73
4.4. Re-conceptualising national security: A strategy	76
4.5. Avenues for further research.....	78
4.6. Conclusion	79
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	82
SUMMARY.....	90

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: A graphic representation of the national security quintet.....	45
Figure 2: A graphic representation of strategy: ‘ends’, ‘ways’ and ‘means’.	78

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1. Identification of the research theme

Security, as the adage goes, is an essentially contested concept (Buzan 2007: 29). One of the most significant contestations exists between the ontology and epistemology of traditional security studies and critical security studies¹. Traditional security studies is rooted in assumptions regarding, state centrality, the constraining influence of the anarchical international system, externalisation of threats and the military and economic dimensions of security. In contrast, critical security studies is a repositioning away from many of these assumptions, towards a broader and deeper understanding of security, that includes alternative referent objects to the state, additional sectors of security and is often associated with the more normative Critical Theory approaches. What follows below is a brief overview of the assumptions of both traditional security studies and critical security studies.

Traditional security studies is most notable for its embedded assumptions that the state is the principal referent of security (Peoples & Vaughn-Williams 2015: 4). Consequently, the biggest threat to the state is inter-state war and therefore there is a principal concern with the military dimensions of security in order to ensure national security (Peoples & Vaughn-Williams 2015: 4). In addition to this core assumption is the acceptance of the constraining influence of the inherently anarchical nature of international system; anarchic in that there is no higher authority, or indeed actor, above the state, and as such conflict between states is a fundamental and enduring feature of the international system (Peoples & Vaughn-Williams 2015: 20). Traditional security studies adopt a positivist and problem-solving approach (Brincat 2016: 565). Positivism draws on empirical and quantitative methodologies to understand international security and asserts that the world is objectivity knowable, and that all other forces and concepts are extraneous (Ben-Haim 2018: 904). Problem-solving accepts the prevailing pattern of social and political relationships and the institutions into which they are organised as the given starting point of analysis, and then determines how problems arising from these

¹ As Peoples and Vaughn-Williams (2015: 5) note, the distinction between traditional and critical security studies is not a mere dichotomy; within traditional (or “non-critical”) security studies there are several Schools of thought ranging on a spectrum from Realism, to Liberalism, to Peace Studies and more, however the common identifying feature between these is the state centric militarism understanding of security with the defence establishment as the principal actor.

structures can be resolved or ameliorated (Brincat 2016: 565). This narrow and specific conceptualisation of security results in traditional security studies approaches often not drawing a distinction between security and national security. National security is thus specifically concerned with the maintenance of sovereignty and territorial integrity, and protection against threats predominately arising from other states (Baldwin 1997: 13). Traditionally, therefore, national security is focussed on the projection of power externally, and the pursuit of national interests within the international system and is notably dismissive the domestic/ internal dimensions of national security.

Traditional security studies lacks the ability to explain the end of the Cold War, the role of identity and ideas as well as the emergence of new security problematics that go beyond the state, such as terrorism and intra state conflict (Bilgin 2008: 93-95). In challenging the traditional security constructions, critical security studies sought a reorientation of security studies by 'broadening' and 'deepening' the concept of security (Peoples & Vaughn Williams 2008: 17). The broadening of security is the conscious move away from defining security in limited military terms, to include a range of issues within other sectors (Peoples & Vaughn Williams 2008: 17). The sectors of security provide conceptual space for significant debate, however Barry Buzan's² seminal book, *People, States and Fear*, locates security within five sectors, namely; political, military, environmental, social and economic (Buzan 2007: 35). The deepening of security refers to the attempt to reposition security studies away from understandings of world politics that "...are reified and unreflective" (Wyn-Jones 1999: 82), encouraging the challenging of many of the orthodox conventions of security studies. Deepening infers a shift away from the exclusive primacy of the state as the referent object of security, and thus challenges the deep-seated assumptions about political life (Peoples & Vaughn Williams 2008: 4). This critical turn in security studies is not a monolithic or homogenous re-conceptualisation but is rather an ontological and epistemological repositioning marked by varying degrees of dissent and critique of the traditional security studies. Although, critical security studies is often associated with the repositioning of security following the end of the Cold War, it equally draws upon security approaches adopted by international

² A seminal voice in critical security studies Wyn-Jones (1999: 83) acknowledged the contribution of to the broadening of the security agenda, while critiquing that Buzan remained "grounded in a scientific objectivist epistemology and, ultimately, in a state-centric ontology".

organisations including the Non-Aligned Movement (1960s) and the New International Economic Order (1970s), which called for an understanding of global insecurities beyond the bipolar constructions of the Cold War (Bilgin 2008: 89-90). However, with the move away from the state centric approaches of traditional security studies, critical security studies has failed to provide a comprehensive understanding of national security.

Based on the aforesaid, this study theme proposes critical constructivism to address the limitations of traditional and critical security studies constructions of national security so as to propose a re-conceptualisation of national security for a framework to incorporate national values, national interests, national identity, national power and national will.

1.2. Literature overview

The literature overview identifies three conceptual themes that form the underpinning for formulating the research problem and the research question. The overarching theme of the research is rooted in determining how various approaches within the broader security studies field conceptualise and define national security. This will necessarily include an overview of the core assumptions of the prevailing perspectives, as well as a brief discussion on the limitations of each approach. The two broadly defined security studies approaches used in this research are traditional security studies and critical security studies. However, the scope of the research necessitates a level of selectivity with regards to theoretical focus. As such, this research will be focussing on classic and neorealism as the foundations of national security within traditional security studies and on the Copenhagen and Welsh Schools within critical security studies. Constructivism, specifically critical constructivism, will be investigated as a means of re-conceptualising national security in order to provide a more comprehensive framework of understanding.

1.2.1. Traditional security studies and national security

Traditional security studies is an umbrella term that covers a wide range of scholars and perspectives. The approach is by no means a homogenous construction, ranging from political realism, including classical and neorealism, to include the more liberal theoretical perspectives, it has a rich and thick history. Hans Morgenthau's *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* is a seminal realist

classic from the 1940s. By 1979 however, Kenneth Waltz's *Theory of International Politics* (1979) replaced Morgenthau as the benchmark for now neorealist political thought. Other powerful voices in the realist archetype include Arnold Wolfers (1952) and Stephen Walt (1991). Ken Booth's work *Realism and World Politics* (2011) is a powerful overview and critique of traditional security conceptions.

A common theme among these authors is an overarching focus on national power and national interests being the primary concern of national security. Morgenthau noted in 1951 that American foreign policy should follow "...but one guiding star: the National Interest", and this is further entrenched by his argument for the focus on balance of power, and the pursuit of security through power (as quoted in Wolfers 1952: 483). Waltz (2000) also draws attention to the prevailing utility of national interests and national power in understanding the pursuit of national security. As such, the limited definition of national security, as concerned with national interests, national power and a focus on external threats, espoused by traditional security studies is a useful but insufficient conception of national security.

1.2.2. Critical security studies and national security

The critical turn in security studies consists of a vast array of academics who sought to re-conceptualise security away from the traditional approaches³. In seeking to explain new security problematics, and with due cognisance of the failure of the traditional security studies to explain the ending of the Cold War as well as the intra-national dimensions of security, there was a need to move beyond the orthodox parameters of traditional security studies (Bilgin 2008: 89-90). A significant reference in critical security studies is the works of Barry Buzan (1991; 2007), most notably the book *People States and Fear*. Buzan along with his colleagues Ole Wæver and Jaap de Wilde, from the Copenhagen School, co-authored another book; *Security: A New Framework for Analysis* (2007): which is especially significant for understanding the

³ Critical security studies comprises of a vast array of theoretical dissociations away from traditional security studies, running parallel to these so called 'critical approaches' is human security which shares several of the assumptions of critical security studies broadly, including the decentralisation of the state as the exclusive referent object of security (Newman 2010: 77-78). Human security however has been dismissed by critical scholars as being inherently uncritical due to its entrenched focus on security policy and pragmatism rather than the ontology and epistemology of security (Newman 2010: 77-78). There remains significant scope beyond this research to engage with a human security approach to national security, and indeed the National Security Quintet proposed within this research as a framework for national security analysis can be utilised to conceptualise national security using a human security approach. Space constraints prevented the inclusion of human security and national security, and future research in this regard is required.

broadened and deepened framing of security. Booth (1991) is a powerful voice, particularly his renowned article *Security and Emancipation*. Booth's colleague in the Welsh School, Richard Wyn-Jones (1999), has also contributed to critical security studies, particularly in locating Critical Security Studies within the Critical Theory of Robert Cox. *Critical Security Studies*, a work authored by Peoples and Vaughn-Williams (2015) has served as an important reference in the conceptual debate underpinning the traditional and critical security studies approaches.

Critical security studies, with a broader and deeper security agenda, has made some contributions to understanding national security. An example of this is Buzan's consideration of the state as comprising of interlinked concepts of the idea of the state, the physical base of the state and institutional expression of the state, which can be viewed in isolation but when combined provide useful insights into the "...national security problematique" (Buzan 2007: 71). However, despite the more encompassing understanding of security offered by critical security studies, it fails to convincingly conceptualise national security due to its side-lining of the state as a referent object of security.

1.2.3. Constructivism and National Security

By focussing on the role of ideational⁴ factors and the intersubjective social construction of reality, constructivism links the rationalist, traditional security studies and interpretivist, critical security studies thereby providing a way to re-conceptualise national security (McDonald 2008: 60). In terms of security, several prominent scholars have used constructivism; perhaps most conspicuous is the Copenhagen School's conceptualisation of the securitisation framework in Buzan, Wæver and de Wilde's (2007) *Security: A new Framework for Analysis*. Several other notable references to the relationship between security and constructivism are found in the works of the conventional constructivists, including Peter Katzenstein (1996), Emanuel Adler (2001 and 1997) as well as Adler's work with Michael Barnett (1998), and Alexander Wendt (1999). In terms of the more critical constructivism, which systematically sought to move away from the realist associations of conventional

⁴ Ideational factors are the non-material factors that include ideas, norms, cultures and identity which are central to the intersubjective social construction of reality (McDonald 2013: 64). Traditional security studies for the most part regards ideational factors as epiphenomenal or secondary, whereas constructivists argue that both ideational and material factors are necessary in conceptualising security and national security (Jepperson, Wendt & Katzenstein 1996: 33).

constructivism, include the works of Karin Fierke (2007), and Jutta Weldes, Mark Laffey, Hugh Gusterson & Raymond Duvall (1999).

Constructivism is most notable for its focus on the relationship between norms, values and identity (Kowert 2001: 424-425). Wendt (1999) draws specific attention to the role and formation of identity, and the relationship with national interests within the international system. As such, the common theme among constructivist thinkers is an overarching focus on the role of identity in security, including the construction of national identity. In addition, constructivism acknowledges the relevance of power, but not in the narrow economic or military power of traditional security studies, but rather in terms of the strength of discursive power through ideology, language, norms, values and knowledge in addition to material power (Nugroho 2008: 92). As such, discursive power is able to construct, deconstruct and reconstruct intersubjective meaning in global politics (Nugroho 2008: 92).

Constructivism as an overarching theoretical approach is marked by three core ontological assumptions that require brief reference here. First, normative and ideational factors are considered equally if not more important than material factors in conceptualising security (Agius 2013: 88). Second, an understanding of an actor's interests and behaviour is dependent on the actor's identity (Agius 2013: 88). Third, reality is socially constructed through intersubjective meaning, and as such both agents and structures are mutually constructed and deconstructed in the global; politics and security (Agius 2013: 88). This provides the basic scaffolding for all constructivist thought, but the approach itself has several variants including critical and conventional constructivism, which is examined in detail in the third chapter of this research.

The constructivist approach is not a panacea and is marked by an inherent lack of consensus as to its nature, substance and theoretical contribution to security studies (Adler 1997: 320). Adler (1997: 319) notes that most of constructivist's ontological and epistemological foundations remain unclear, and that there is a need to develop the theory to ensure its relevance beyond meta-theoretical statements. In addition, constructivism has been critiqued for its lack of critical introspection, inherent superficiality, and unwarranted optimism (Jones & Smith 2007: 172-174). Yet despite these limitations critical constructivism provides a useful theoretical framework for re-conceptualising national security.

As can be seen from above, traditional security studies offers a necessary but insufficient understanding of the dimensions of national security, whereas critical security studies is notable for its dismissal of the concept in favour of a broader and deeper understanding of security. However, as states remain one of the primary means of political organisation it is necessary to engage with the concept of national security, beyond the overly narrow constructions provided by traditional security studies. Critical constructivism has been identified as a potential link between traditional security studies and critical security studies and may be used to provide for a more inclusive and contemporary re-conceptualisation of national security.

1.3. Formulation and demarcation of the research problem

This section is based on the aforesaid literature overview which dealt with the following key aspects: traditional security studies, critical security studies and constructivism as tools for understanding national security.

Scholars and policy makers alike conjure national security as a catch-all phrase that evokes a call to arms against real or perceived threats, a unifying dictum around which society can rally and be mobilised, and in some cases, as a justification for the primacy of the state. There exists significant scope within the literature of security studies with regards to re-conceptualising national security.

On the one hand realism, with its focus on the primacy of the state as the referent object, its use of national power to project and advance national interests, and its positivist and problem-solving approach, fails to account for the internal dynamics of a state and how this impacts on national security. On the other hand, critical security studies with its focus on broadening and deepening of the security agenda by moving away from the state-centric approach, does not provide a comprehensive understanding of national security. Constructivism, with its focus on identity, inter-subjectivity and the construction of power relations, can link traditional security studies and critical security studies approaches, thereby allowing for a more comprehensive understanding of national security.

The conceptual focus on national security is supported by the fact that it remains an inherently ambiguous concept, symbol and term. Although there has been a broadening and deepening of the constructions of security, national security remains

rooted in traditional security studies, whereas critical security studies lacks a coherent and systematic engagement with the concept of national security.

The term national security gained prominence among American and British scholars following the end of the Second World War and was associated with certain fundamental assumptions including the placing of the state at the centre of analysis, a focus on the military dimensions of security and a preoccupation with the maintenance of the status quo of the global order (Bilgin 1999: 34). Following the end of the Cold War and the repositioning away from traditional security constructions, there remains a need to conceptualise national security within a deepened and broadened security framework. Wolfers (1952: 438) noted the danger in intentionally leaving national security as an ambiguous concept:

[i]t would be an exaggeration to claim that the symbol of national security is nothing but a stimulus to semantic confusion, though closed analysis will show that if used without specifications it leaves room for more confusion than sound political counsel or scientific usage can afford.

Wolfers' seminal essay noted in the 1950s that there is a need to conceptualise national security in order for it to have theoretical and practical utility. This remains true today.

This research has identified the need to reconceptualise national security for contemporary usage given that neither traditional nor critical security studies offers an adequate engagement with the concept.

1.4. Research question

How can critical constructivism address the limitations of traditional and critical security studies in order to re-conceptualise a national security framework?

1.4.1 Research sub questions

- 1.4.1.1 How do traditional security studies and critical security studies conceptualise national security? What are the assumptions and limitations of each theoretical approach?
- 1.4.1.2 How can critical constructivism address the limitations of traditional security studies and critical security studies conceptions of national security? \

1.4.1.3 How can critical constructivism link traditional and critical security studies in order to re-conceptualise a comprehensive national security construct?

1.5. Research Methodology

This scope and method of the proposed research lends itself to a qualitative research approach, in that it seeks to describe and understand the nature of national security. Qualitative modes of enquiry are rooted in the philosophy of empiricism that follows a flexible and open approach to research (Kumar 2014: 14). The epistemological and ontological foundations of the proposed study are rooted in the interpretivist paradigm. In terms of the interpretivist ontology, "...reality is relative, multiple, socially constructed, and ungoverned by natural laws." (Given 2008: 116). A comprehensive and inclusive understanding of national security requires the flexibility and relativity associated with the interpretivist paradigm.

It is within the interpretivist paradigm that the critical constructivist theory was identified as the most appropriate lens to examine national security, and to link the traditional security studies and critical security studies concepts of national security. Within critical constructivism, security is viewed as a social construct, articulated within a specific social and historical context (McDonald 2008: 65). Moreover, non-material and ideational factors such as identity, norms and values are central components for understanding security (Buzan & Hansen 2009: 191). Furthermore, critical constructivism places emphasis on security being a site of negotiation and contestation; negotiation in terms of political elites and domestic audiences and contestation between different security actors that espouse their particular values and identity (McDonald 2008: 67). As such, critical constructivism is the most appropriate theoretical infrastructure for developing the national security framework of analysis.

The research design is a literature-based study using a critical literature review in order to conduct a comprehensive overview of the literature on the constructions of the concept of national security. The critical literature review is operationalised to analyse and evaluate national security within the literature; this is important for this research as it seeks to go beyond mere description of relevant sources of data, but rather includes an analysis and synthesis of diverse sources (Grant & Booth 2009: 93-97). The literature on both traditional and critical security studies will be used in

order to engage with the limitations of each approach's conceptualisation of national security. This will lay the foundation for identifying the lacuna and allow for the critical engagement with the literature on constructivism, particularly critical constructivism, in order to create a contemporary framework of analysis for national security.

The research method thus draws on exclusively secondary sources that include scholarly journals, books, dissertations and research papers. (Emmel 2014: 4). This was deemed appropriate given that the research is focussed on critically examining and engaging with seminal works in security studies. The critical literature review will draw from prominent journals and academics as selected for their relevance to the overarching research questions; such as *International Affairs*, *Foreign Affairs*, *Security Dialogue*, and *the European Journal of International relations*. These journals constitute a continuous reflection, critique and engagement with the theoretical and conceptual foundations of security studies, and thus will be a useful source of secondary literature with regards to understanding the perspectives of seminal academics.

This research will make use of thematic analysis in order to identify convergence across the selected texts regarding a theme and sub-themes to support a more comprehensive understanding of the principal theme, national security (Morey Hawkins 2017: 1757-1761). The sub-themes, in support of the theme, are national values, national interests, national identity, national power and national will. Thematic analysis will assist in contributing to the epistemology of security studies, locating both descriptions and understandings of national security for security studies theory development (Morey Hawkins 2017: 1762). This will be done by analysing emerging themes in both traditional and critical security studies, as well as constructivism.

1.6. Limitations

This research will be an initial attempt to re-conceptualise national security; as such it will not provide a complete or final construction of national security. Furthermore, the limited space means that this research will not be able to cover all the theoretical and conceptual constructions of national security within traditional and critical security studies and will therefore focus on the most prominent and seminal voices and approaches within traditional security studies and critical security studies.

Further, there has not been engagement with alternative theoretical approaches such as human security, feminist or postcolonial studies, which would have added several additional and diverse dimensions to the re-conceptualisation of national security. In addition, due to significant space limitations, there will be no attempt to practically apply the finding of this study to a case study. There will be significant scope for additional research in this regard.

1.7. Ethical Considerations

The literature-based design of this study means that the primary ethical consideration of this research is avoiding plagiarism through referencing and accurate attribution of sources.

1.8. Research structure

The proposed structure for this research project is the following:

1.8.1. Chapter 1: Research Proposal

This chapter will include the contextualising and formulation of the research question and the proposed methodology, including justifications for the choice of research design, methods and analysis.

1.8.2. Chapter 2: Critical literature review

This chapter include a critical review of the conceptualization of security, specifically national security, from the traditional security studies and critical security studies perspectives. An examination of how the traditional security studies and critical security studies approaches address national interests, national values, national will, national identity and national power within the. In addition, there will be a critical examination of the use of the theory of constructivism in contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of national security.

1.8.3. Chapter 3: National security framework

This chapter will include the development of a framework of analysis, underpinned by constructivism that uses the interrelated concepts of national identity, national will, national values, national power and national interests in order to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the concept of national security.

1.8.4. Chapter 4: Findings and recommendations

This chapter will include the findings and recommendations of the research, as well outline future avenues of study that have arisen as result of the research.

CHAPTER 2: CRITICAL LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

National security is often conjured as a justification for policy choices, as an excuse for the limitation of certain rights, as a rallying call for exclusivity and exclusion at the expense of the “other”. The concept of national security is consequently often kept intentionally vague by policy makers and politicians, as it can serve as a ‘catch all’ phrase that generates an emotional response often without adequate reflection. In the name of national security just about any action is justifiable, any decision rational and any consequence moral. There is a danger in this ambiguity.

In academics, security concepts ought to be examined and re-conceptualised continuously, however national security stands out as it is often accepted or rejected without much reflection. National security as a contested concept has in some ways been abandoned to the annals of history, entrenched in the definitions of traditional security studies, and in many ways remains the exclusive purview of the realists, who are deeply concerned about the sanctity of the state as the primary referent object. Security studies, however, has long expanded beyond the confines of pure traditional security studies, although it remains a popular paradigm and a comfortable theoretical space.

Critical security studies has been an intentional re-orientation of security away from the rigid confines of the traditional security studies agenda and has expanded the notion of security to include far broader and deeper understandings of security. Notably absent from these significant contributions however is a comprehensive understanding of national security.

National security is largely disregarded in the critical security studies literature, perhaps because of its realist associations. This is naive, particularly in a world in which states remain one of the primary agents of political organisation and national security is still used by politicians and policy makers. National security and its associated policies have direct implications for groups, populations, states and the international peace, security and development environment. What is required is a re-conceptualisation of national security that goes beyond the restrictive parameters of traditional security studies but gives shape and utility to the concept that critical security studies also fail to do.

The aim of this chapter is to provide a critical literature overview of the traditional security studies and the critical security studies approaches to security generally and national security specifically. The structure of this chapter is as follows: a brief discussion on defining national security as distinguished from mere security, an overview of traditional security studies' assumptions, seminal voices and limitations, followed by an overview of critical security studies assumptions, seminal voices and limitations. It is important to note that at the end of the traditional security studies and critical security studies sections, following the overviews of the assumptions and seminal voices, a detailed examination of each approach's limitations will be discussed. Consequently, there may be markers of the limitations in each section but the full, comprehensive and overarching discussion on the limitations of each approach is reserved until the final section in order to avoid redundancy. Following the critical security studies section there will be a section on conceptualising national security that highlights the theoretical inadequacy of both approaches. This will lay the foundation for the design of the contemporary framework of analysis that will be developed in chapter three.

2.2. Defining national security

It is important to establish points of reference within this research, and one such concept is defining national security, especially when compared to 'other' security to avoid semantic confusion. National security, however, eludes a simple definition and remains an abstract and contested concept. This literature review will examine how the distinction between security and national security is to a large extent non-existent in traditional security studies, and the terms are often used interchangeably in the literature. Conversely, the critical security studies approach has failed to properly engage with the concept of national security, and thus does not define the concept at all. States continue to have an impact on the security of all identified referent objects within critical security studies approaches, thus national security is an important consideration in the security landscape. As such, a working definition of national security that can be used within traditional security studies and critical security studies is necessary.

The phrase national security finds origin in seminal author Walter Lippmann who explained that "[a] nation is secure to the extent to which it is not in danger of having to sacrifice *core values* if it wishes to avoid war and is able, if challenged, to maintain

them by victory in such a war” (As quoted in Wolfers 1952: 484- emphasis added). Arnold Wolfers (1952: 485), states that “...security, in an objective sense, measures the absence of threats to *acquired values*, in a subjective sense, the absence of fear that such *values* will be attacked” (emphasis added). Maxwell Taylor (1974: 577) in his essay defends the legitimization of national security as being rooted in protection and enhancement of “national valuables”. Taylor (1974: 577) notes that “some [national] valuables are tangible and earthy; others are spiritual or intellectual”, ranging from political assets, such as institutions of state and diplomatic friendships, to economic assets such as productive domestic economy. More recently, Williams (2008: 1) has defined security as “...the alleviation of threats to *cherished values*” (emphasis added). In each of the chosen definitions above, there is an emphasis on core values as a driver of national security. Ayoob (1984: 46) urges caution with collating a traditionally narrow understanding of values, as rooted in the realism of Lippman and Wolfers, noting the potential discrepancy between the narrow core values of a regime, such as self-preservation, versus those of the general population. As such, a holistic and contemporary understanding of national security needs to reflect the intersecting values of the population, the national identity, the state and the international community, and provide for a comprehensive understanding of national values. National identity and national values form two sides of the same coin and are both important in the development of shared constructions of the national ‘self’, and national values shape and reinforce the constructions and perceptions of national identity (Henderson & McEwen 2005: 176). Shared national values give meaning and depth to national identity and becomes part of the package of concepts that constitute national identity, as well differentiating the ‘self’ from the ‘other’ (Henderson & McEwen 2005: 176-178). National security, and indeed national values, can thus be understood as being the consequence of a continuous and evolving process of social construction, affected by the interrelated concepts national identity, national interests, national power and national will.

2.3. Traditional security studies and national security

Traditional security studies comprise of a broad categorisation of theoretical approaches to security and includes realism, liberalism, peace studies and various other off shoots (Peoples & Vaughn-Williams: 4). The diversity of traditional security studies thus covers an extensive range of scholars, thinkers and theories, however

what unites these various approaches are the core assumptions, that bare some reference here, if not a thorough investigation. These assumptions form the foundation of the understanding of how traditional security studies will necessarily conceptualise security and therefore national security. Initially it is necessary to engage with the seminal voices of traditional security studies, many of whom have remained popular several decades after their contribution. Following the engagement with the big thinkers, there will be a brief description of the central tenets of traditional security studies, specifically the problem-solving approach, the prioritisation of the state as the referent object of security, the anarchical nature of the international system, the focus on external threats as well as the military and territorial dimensions of security.

2.3.1. Traditional security studies and national security: the seminal voices

The national security landscape has been dominated by realism and the seminal voices authors associated with this theoretical approach. The central tenets of traditional security studies will be discussed in detail below and will provide the necessary terms of reference for understanding traditional conceptions of national security. This includes a critical analysis of the positivist and problem-solving foundation of traditional security studies, the state as the enduring referent object of security, the preoccupation with survival and territorial integrity brought about by the constraining influence of an anarchical international order, as well as the emphasis on the military dimensions of national security. Traditional security studies as a result of these assumptions often conflates security and national security, using the terms interchangeably in the literature.

Several prominent academics, including Arnold Wolfers (1952), Hans Morgenthau (1985) and Kenneth Waltz (1979; 1988; 2000), have focused on national security within what is here defined as the traditional security studies umbrella. Due to space constraints within this dissertation, traditional security studies will be limited to classical realist and neorealist theory although there exists a wealth of other theories that can be included under the term. Classical realism was selected as it is the genesis of the concept of national security. Neorealism on the other hand is evidence of the malleability of realism and its ability to adjust, albeit inadequately, to new security problems. Furthermore, all the traditional security studies theories share the above-mentioned assumptions to a greater or lesser degree.

The term 'national security' is often attributed to Walter Lippmann in 1943 in his article *U.S. Foreign policy: Shield of the Republic* (Jablonsky 2002: 18). Lippmann noted that "[a] nation is secure to the extent to which it is not in danger of having to sacrifice core values if it wishes to avoid war and is able, if challenged, to maintain them by victory in such a war" (As quoted in Ayoob 1984: 41). This inference is an indication that national security, far from being a static and monolithic construct, rises and falls with a state's ability to deter an attack or, if necessary, defeat the attackers (Wolfers 1952: 484). Following the logic of Lippmann and Wolfers, the military and external dimensions of national security is in the very genesis of the concept of national security, and therefore national power becomes an overarching concern.

Following Lippmann's assertions several other seminal voices emphasised the importance of national security and national power within this narrow and militaristic construction. Wolfers (1952: 490) argued that "[t]hose who call for a policy guided by national security... take for granted that they will be understood to mean a security policy based on power, and on military power at that". This emphasis on national power is a common feature amongst traditional security studies scholars. Morgenthau is notable for his emphasis on the state's insatiable desire for the accumulation of power; the consequence of which is states competing to maximise their share of power in the international system (Mearsheimer 2002: 25). According to Morgenthau, states seek to maximise their relative power, through the elements of national power⁵ (or 'power resources' or 'capabilities') in seeking a favourable 'balance of power' in the international system (Guzzini 2018: 25). This emphasises the focus on the pursuit and accumulation of national power as a determining and critical concept in the classical realist approaches to national security.

Not all traditional approaches to national security elevate the pursuit and accumulation of national power, for instance neorealist approaches emphasise the role structure plays in power distribution. As such, and in contrast to classical realist assumptions, states should not to seek to maximise their power as an absolute end but instead to control an 'appropriate' amount of power thus avoiding the risks associated with either excessive weakness or strength (Waltz 1988: 616). States thus, according to Waltz (1988: 616), are primarily concerned with security, rather

⁵ Morgenthau's eight elements of national power are: geography, natural resources, industrial capacity, military preparedness, population, national character, national morale, and the quality of diplomacy (Guzzini 2018: 25).

than the accumulation of power. The focus on power, in absolute or relative terms, remains one of the enduring characteristics of traditional security studies.

Another seminal voice in traditional security studies, specifically neorealism, Stephan Walt noted that the focus of security studies is "...easy to identify...it is the study of the phenomenon of war" (Walt 1991: 212). This is further articulated in Walt's definition of security studies, which he borrowed from seminal thinkers Joseph Nye and Sean Lynn-Jones who argue that, security is "...the study of the threat, use and control of military force ... [that is] the conditions that make the use of force more likely, the ways that the use of force affects individuals, states and societies, and the specific policies that states adopt in order to prepare for, prevent, or engage in war" (Walt 1991: 212). In this regard, Walt provides an important caveat by noting that "... military power is not the only source of national security, and military threats are not the only dangers that states face (though they are usually the most serious)" (Walt 1991: 213). Walt (1991: 213) then goes on to specifically emphasise statecraft through diplomacy, arms control and crisis management as other areas of interest due to their direct impact on the likelihood and character of war. He further cautions against the expansion of security to include other dimensions as this would undermine theoretical and practical coherence and cause confusion among academics and practitioners, limiting its utility in terms of devising solutions to security problems. This illustrates the continuous prevalence of problem-solving and positivism in traditional security studies. Walt's contribution to the understanding of national security within the neorealism framework is important as it comes after the end of the Cold War and the concerted efforts of scholars to broaden and deepen security studies and move away from the preponderance of national security (Walt 1991: 213). It is characteristic of the enduring appeal of traditional security studies in international relations discourse, and the focus of national security in terms of national (often but not exclusively military) power and the pursuit of national interest defined in terms of the external foreign policy environment.

National interests, like national security, is often poorly defined and often ambiguous. Nuechterlein⁶ (1976: 247) a seminal author on national interests offers a simple

⁶ Nuechterlein's *National Interests and Foreign Policy: a conceptual framework for analysis and decision making* (1976) is an important contribution to the conceptualisation of national interests, where he draws a distinction between the basic national interests of defence, economics, world order

explanation by noting that the term national interest is delineated by the “...perceived needs and desires of one sovereign state in relation to other sovereign states comprising the external environment”. Morgenthau’s plea that the United States’ foreign policy should “...follow but one guiding star, the National Interest” (as quoted in Wolfers 1952: 481) is a further reminder of the longevity of the concept. Indeed, Morgenthau’s approach to international relations is rooted on the national interest defined in terms of national power (Guzzini 2018: 18). Joseph Frankel (1970:15-16) in his book *National Interest* references the distinction between the use of the concept for political analysis and as an instrument of political action. The former being used as a descriptive, analytical and/or evaluative tool of foreign policy analysis, the latter as a justification either denouncing or advocating certain foreign policy proposals (1970:15-16). The consensus among traditional security studies is that the national interest is demarcated to foreign, external policy environment and that the concept thus serves a prescriptive and descriptive role (Nye 1999:22). National interests can thus be a tool for analysis or a tool for garnering political support for policy decisions.

National power, national interests and national values form a nexus that remains the foundation of the traditional security studies conceptualisation of national security. The common theme across the classical and neorealist literature is certainly embedded in national security being necessary in order to protect a nation’s values, and this being achieved through the promotion of the national interest and the pursuit of national power.

2.3.1. Positivism and the problem-solving approach

Traditional security studies, neorealism in particular, is often rooted in a positivist⁷ approach to security in that the task of the traditional approach is to explain the world in a way that is scientific, empirical and necessarily objective in the same way phenomena in the natural world are explained (Smith 2006: 50). Smith (1996:11) noted the pervasive influence of positivism when he argued that

and ideology. Nuechterlein further determines the intensity of national interests by classifying issues as survival, vital, major or periphery.

⁷ It is important to note that not all traditional security studies scholars universally accept positivism as the most appropriate approach to security. A significant example is Kenneth Waltz, whose seminal neorealist book *Theory of International Politics* (1979) is notably anti-positivist and anti-empiricist.

For the last forty years the academic discipline of IR (international relations) has been dominated by positivism. Positivism has involved a commitment to a unified view of science, and the adoption of methodologies of the natural sciences to explain the social world.

Positivism remains an enduring characteristic of international relations theory generally and security studies theory specifically (Smith 1996:11). The central tenets of empiricism, progressivism, an overarching commitment to secular humanist philosophy and a belief and reliance on the scientific methods of inquiry remain at the foundation of traditional security studies approaches to security and by extension national security (Shepard 2013: 4). Rationalism underpins how traditional approaches to security conceptualise national security, threats and referent objects, all which must be quantifiable. Traditional security studies theories have further tended to be foundationalist in that it assumes that there is an objective reality that exists outside of and is independent of perception, and thus relies heavily on quantitative research methodologies (Shepard 2013: 4). If the world can be explained quantitatively, then practical and value free solutions can be devised to resolve a problem.

Traditional security studies is entrenched in the problem-solving approach⁸ to security in that it

...takes the world as it finds it, with the prevailing social and power relationships and the institutions into which they are organised, as the given framework for action. The aim of problem-solving is to make these relationships and institutions work smoothly by dealing effectively with particular sources of trouble (Cox & Sinclair 1996: 88).

This is a particularly practical approach, as it is not rooted in normative assertions of what the world should or ought to look like, but rather seeks to resolve problems as they arise. As such problem-solving theory is concerned with resolving issues within the existing status quo, thereby maintaining or replicating the current social order rather than challenging the system or attempting to overcome the limitations (Brincat 2016: 566-567). Cox & Sinclair (1996: 88) further noted that “[t]he strength of the problem-solving approach lies in its ability to fix limits or parameters to a problem area and to reduce the statement of a particular problem to a limited number of

⁸ The problem-solving approach is sometimes referred to as traditional theory by Horkheimer, and although there is some differentiation between Cox’s problem-solving theory and Horkheimer’s traditional theory this essay draws on their equivalence.

variables which are amenable to relatively close and precise examination”. Problem solving theory is often contrasted with critical theory approaches, in much the same way that traditional security studies is contrasted with critical security studies which will be discussed in more detail below.

The positivist and problem-solving approaches to security within traditional security studies is further underpinned by realist assumptions about the aggressive nature of ‘mankind’ that lends itself to a fiercely competitive and anarchical (discussed in more detail below) international system, and a distinctly zero-sum approach to national security (Smith 2006: 50). Within this system of anarchy and competition, fuelled by uneven power capabilities, insecurity becomes an inevitable characteristic of international security relations and needs to be managed as it is impossible to resolve.

A positivist and problem-solving approach to national security provides a neat framework of understanding, as the purpose is not to change the system but rather to resolve national security problems as they arise. The maintenance, legitimisation and reproduction of the status quo is the strategic end of national security policy, and normative questions about the impact of latent power structures, the transformative possibilities and the conceivable disruption of the international system are side-lined.

2.3.2. The state as the primary referent of security

The state as the primary referent of security is another central assumption of the traditional security studies approach. The prioritisation and elevation of the state as the exclusive referent object of security means that the state is the unit of analysis and needs to be secured (Peoples & Vaughn-Williams 2015: 4). A core aspect of the argument in favour of the state remaining the primary referent object is that states provide security to its population from both internal and external threats and should therefore be given preference in security studies (Bilgin 2008: 94). In an era of a globalised world order, many academics and policy makers expected that the very concept of the state would be threatened, and its relevance diminished⁹. Realists instead argue that states remain the unit of analysis and thereby reinforced the prevailing appeal of traditional security studies. Certainly, an argument for a re-

⁹ The debate on the relevance, endurance and necessity of states requires significant engagement and discussion, however it goes beyond the ambit of this research and as such remains a topic for further research.

conceptualisation of national security requires a nation to be secure, and nations are arguably delineated by their states. The prevailing utility of the state as a unit of security analysis is predicated on five interrelated factors, as outlined in McGowen & Nel (2002: 29); firstly states continue to control the means of legitimate violence; secondly, the state is the only entity that can legally and legitimately declare war; thirdly, states control the movement of people through travel documentation; fourthly, states almost exclusively coordinate and control national development; and finally, the state continues to play a leading role in management of the economy. However, it goes without saying that the exclusive roles of the state have been eroded, however traditional security studies argue that, in balance, the state prevails as the main unit of analysis due to its coercive and regulatory role in international politics (McGowen & Nel 2002: 30). States are, at least for the foreseeable future, the enduring unit of analysis within the international system as they continue to have an impact on all security actors. It is for this reason that traditional security studies often conflate security and national security.

2.3.3. The constraining influence of an anarchical international order

An enduring assumption of traditional security studies, emphasised particularly within neorealism, is the constraining influence of the anarchical international structure (Deudney 2011: 17). The *anarchy problematique*, a phrase coined in neorealism, notes that anarchy is a distinctive, a dominating and an enduring characteristic of the international system (Deudney 2011: 17). Anarchy within this context refers to the lack of an overarching, international authority above that of states, and as a consequence states operate as sovereign political entities (Mearsheimer 2002: 25). Consequently, there is an inherent focus on power, both in terms of accumulation and competition in the international system (Mearsheimer 2002: 25). States operating within this anarchical system are inherently insecure and as such their survival and security is largely dependent on the use of national power in the international system and state's ability to maintain it (Deudney 2011: 17). Here the influence of the problem-solving and positivism approach is again highlighted, as it is in a state's interest to maintain the status quo for as long as it is favourable. As such, it is in the interest of powerful states to resolve issues that arise out of the system rather than threaten to disrupt a favourable system.

Within an anarchical international system, insecurity is an inevitability due to the relational and constitutive nature of security between states. Consequently, the security dilemma is one of the theoretical linchpins of traditional security studies, drawing attention to the fact that states, in the pursuit of security and survival, will maximise their security through acquisition of predominately military capabilities and power (Tang 2009: 586). The result of this build-up of capability has the unintended consequence of generating insecurity among the other states in system, leading to these states building up their defensive capabilities (Tang 2009: 588). This results in a spiral of insecurity as states build up their defensive capabilities in response to other states doing the same. The term “security dilemma,” was first coined by John Herz (1950: 157) who explained:

Groups and individuals who live alongside each other without being organized into a higher unity . . . must be . . . concerned about their security from being attacked, subjected, dominated, or annihilated by other groups and individuals. Striving to attain security from such attacks, they are driven to acquire more and more power in order to escape the effects of the power of others. This, in turn, renders the others more insecure and compels them to prepare for the worst. Because no state can ever feel entirely secure in such a world of competing units, power competition ensues, and the vicious circle of security and power accumulation is on.

Fear-based insecurity among states is one of the underpinning factors that can result in arms races as states attempt to protect themselves from each other. In many ways this latent insecurity due to the security dilemma offers an explanation for why there is a distinctive focus on the military and the external dimensions of national security within traditional security studies.

2.3.4. The focus on the military and external dimensions of security

Taking due cognisance of the aforementioned assumptions of traditional security studies, including the embedded problem-solving theoretical approach, the state as the primary referent object and the constraining influence of the anarchical international system, it thus plausibly follows that a state’s fundamental national security consideration will be rooted in the threats posed to its continued survival within the anarchical international system. Survival in this context refers to the protection of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the state from predominately external threats. Louw (1977: 10-11) notes that national security is defined as the

“[t]he condition of freedom from external physical threat which a nation-state enjoys”, he further explains that although normative issues should be included, it is an overarching concern with the threat of physical violence that informs the understanding of national security. This is because physical violence is regarded as the most real and tangible threat to a state’s survival (Louw 1977: 11). As such the military capacity of a state is especially significant as it is a determining factor on whether a state will be able to ensure its survival by protecting itself from external and predominately military threats (Peoples & Vaughn-Williams 2011: 4). It is notable that traditional security studies does not ignore other threats to the state, but instead deliberately prioritises the threat of military action against the state.

A state’s resources for building military strength within this framing becomes a significant signifier of national power, which is a defining feature for survival within the anarchical international system (Glaser 2010:14). A state’s national power capacity is informed by several key elements, including its economy, population and technological development, which results in a powerful state being able to build larger and more sophisticated militaries (Glaser 2010:14). National power and the consequential military capacity are important determinants of power in the international system marked by anarchy, where there is no higher authority than the state, a state will need to rely on its own capabilities in order to not only survive but thrive in the global system (Glaser 2010: 14). A state’s national security policy will therefore determine and reflect the effectiveness with which a state is able to mobilise, allocate and use its resources, including military capability, when threatened (Louw 1977: 11). In this regard, states have a variety of strategies available to protect themselves from threats, including coercion, particularly when understood in terms of deterrence and compellence. The strategy of coercion relies on the use of deliberate and purposive military threats in order to influence or put pressure on another security actor to either do or stop doing something against their wishes (compellence) or to dissuade an actor from initiating an undesirable act (deterrence) (Freedman & Raghavan 2008: 216). At a state level coercive strategy relies inherently on the creative use of national power in order to deter or compel certain behaviour of security actors in order to secure themselves and ensure survival in the anarchical international system (Freedman & Raghavan 2008: 217).

Military capabilities and national power are the most effective tools of coercion available to states, hence the focus on the military dimensions of security.

Within traditional security studies the survival of the state in the anarchical international system is the overriding concern of national security, national power and military capacity is a major, if not exclusive, part of that survival strategy.

2.3.5. Limitations

The first limitations of traditional security studies is that its understanding of national security is that it is too narrow and has not adequately adjusted to the security problems that characterise the 21st century. Traditional security studies emerged within an important and distinctly militarised international security environment in the years following the end of World War Two and leading through and until the end of the Cold War. However, the end of the Cold War, the move away from a distinctly dichotomised world order towards increased multi-polarity and cooperation within the international system was not foreseen by traditional security studies scholars. Furthermore, the security problematiques that have since emerged, including but not limited to intra-state conflict, humanitarian crises and the strength of non-state actors are not adequately explained by orthodox approaches, even within the “neo” frameworks. Baldwin (1997: 132) notes the need for a restructuring of security studies, and by extension the concept of national security noting

[i]n sum, the field of security studies seems poorly equipped to deal with the post-Cold War world, having emerged from the Cold War with a narrow military conception of national security... Its preoccupation with military statecraft limits its ability to address the many foreign and domestic problems that are not amenable to military security.

This is a challenge to the foundational assumptions that mark traditional security studies, in particular the realist and neorealist constructions. Certainly, the inability of traditional security studies to adequately adjust to and explain or operationalise against new emerging threats is a severe limitation of the approach’s utility. However, national security even defined in the narrow, limited sense here still has relevance in the discourse of policy and politics at all levels of analysis in international relations.

A second limitation of traditional security studies is found within the positivist and problem-solving approach to national security. The positivist approach has been argued to be an inadequate lens for understanding social realities in that seeks to explain social realities in the same way natural scientists explain natural phenomena, and in that fails to consider how alternative theoretical approaches can play a role in constituting the social world (Smith 2006: 50-51). The unreflective and reified approach to national security by traditional security studies scholars is an echo of the dominance of the western, and especially United States, discourse in security studies which over simplifies the diverse, complex and interrelated nature of security in the international system (Smith 2006: 50-51). This is discussed in detail below in the third limitation. Significantly, traditional security studies embody the now perhaps too often quoted phrase of Robert Cox (1981: 128) “...theory is always for someone, and for some purpose’. The fact that traditional security studies emerged out of a specific historical, temporal and spatial demarcation that was inherently biased toward the western security problematic, and that it has marginalised many voices in the international system, particularly those without power or agency continues to limit its utility as an approach to security and for conceptualising national security. Furthermore, the problem-solving approach adopted by traditional security studies is problematic in that it may well replicate both the system and the problems arising out of the system by not seeking to challenge the status quo, by reifying the established world and social order. As such, as reassuring as the simplistic notions espoused by traditional security studies, particularly in terms of the realist and neorealist assumptions are, the conceptualisations of national security within this positivist and problem-solving framework are not particularly useful both in terms of academic analysis and practical policy making.

A third limitation of traditional security studies’ conceptualisation of national security is the overarching western bias which has resulted in several scholars drawing attention to the fact that this approach has historically derived its “...core categories and assumptions about world politics from a particular understanding of European experience’ (Barkawi & Laffey 2006: 330). This critique can be noted in the seminal works of Franz Fanon (1961), Edward Said (1978), Mohammed Ayoob (1984), and more recently Buzan & Hansen (2009), among many others (Hönker & Müller 2012). This is a common limitation of orthodox approaches to security which have

traditionally come from the so-called West (or Global North). As such many critical approaches to security seek to reinforce the notion that the 'realities' of traditional security studies, as necessarily bounded in survival, the externalisation of the threat and the self-help policy orientation, ought to be viewed differently (Shepard 2013: 6). Hence, the need for a critical re-orientation of security.

A fourth notable limitation of traditional security studies' conceptualisation of national security is its focus on survival and sovereignty above all else, which no longer reflects the multifaceted nature of international security. This is reinforced by the focus on the state as the exclusive referent object of security. Traditional security studies, specifically realism and neorealism, perceives the amoral pursuit of national interests as rational as the state seeks to maintain or enhance the national power of the self in relation to other states within the anarchical and self-serving international system (Hough 2008: 3). This approach presupposes the absolutism of sovereignty above all else, which in some ways defined the Cold War approach (Hough 2008: 3). However, this narrow definition of national interests, rooted in state sovereignty, has been challenged in several ways in recent history. The European Union (EU) is an example is where independent sovereign states voluntarily surrender aspects of their sovereignty to a regional intrastate authority (Hough 2008: 3). In Africa the African Union's security framework known as the African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA) consolidates several overarching norms (SAIIA 2013). These norms include sovereign equality of member states as well as the African Union's right to intervene, in cases of mass atrocities and unconstitutional changes of governments (SAIA 2013). As such, member state's thus voluntarily surrender aspects of their absolute sovereignty to the African Union. A more recent example is the African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA) which will seek to effectively break down trade barriers and improve the flow of people, goods and capital on the continent, expanding and enhancing the competitiveness of the African market away from historically small, isolated and fragmented economies (Brookings Institute 2019: 1). National interests, as a fixed, isolated and rational concept is no longer sufficient for understanding national security.

The limitations of traditional security studies, including its inability to account for new security problematics, its reliance on positivism and problem-solving, the patently western bias, its overarching focus on the state as a primary referent object, its

constricted definition of national interests specifically survival and sovereignty, means that traditional approaches to security provide a limited, narrow and insufficient conceptualisation of national security. Despite these limitations, traditional security studies have remained resilient in security discourse, and does provide useful, although limited, engagement with the interlinking concepts of national interests, national power and nations values.

2.4. Critical security studies and national security

Critical security studies is often associated with a so called 'critical' turn in the discipline of international relations in the 1990's, however its genesis in terms of its temporal, spatial and intellectual underpinnings can be traced further back in history. Critical security studies does not have clearly defined parameters and core assumptions that delineate it neatly and distinctly from its traditional counterpart, and scholars operating under this umbrella approach do not universally and without question reject all the tenets of traditional approaches to security. It is perhaps useful to conceptualise the difference between traditional and critical security studies in terms of a spectrum rather than a dichotomy, and any engagement requires a caveat that critical security studies comprises a vast array of approaches which converge or diverge in terms of epistemology, ontology, methodology and approaches. An initial engagement with the seminal voices of the critical security studies orientation will provide the foundation for determining the overarching, but by no means exhaustive, assumptions of this approach. It is important to note that unlike traditional security studies, which contains deeply embedded assumptions about the nature of international and national security, critical security studies is far less established and far more fluid in its security approach and assumptions. Furthermore, critical security studies has for the most part inadequately engaged with the concept of national security, focussing rather on the dimensions of security largely overlooked by its traditional counterpart.

2.4.1. Critical security studies and national security: the seminal voices

The academic landscape of critical security studies is a veritable smorgasbord of approaches, thinkers and perspectives, consequently it is nigh impossible to do true justice to the landscape of critical security studies within this research. Despite the distinctly diverse field there are several seminal voices who rise above the

cacophony of the critical security studies approach and that ought to be noted here. This research will rely on the Welsh School and the Copenhagen School as the archetypal reference points for the examination of the critical security studies umbrella. This in no way excludes the vast array of other research and contributions by scholars that is taking place under the critical security studies banner. On the one hand the Welsh School, which is rooted in Critical Theory, provides a more robust denunciation of the traditional security studies approach to security. The Copenhagen School, on the other hand, was selected for its conservative disassociation of traditional security studies assumptions, through its expansion of the sectors of security but its maintenance of the state as the primary referent object of security. The Copenhagen School in many ways acts as a bridge between traditional and critical security studies approaches. The two schools thus offer two nodal points in the critical security studies approach.

The term critical security studies is attributed to a publication that followed a small conference in 1994 held at York University in Toronto, Canada (Mutimer 2013: 69). The conference was entitled *Strategies in Conflict: Critical Approaches to Security Studies*, and the resultant book edited by Keith Krause and Michael C. Williams (1997) *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases* was an important contribution to the emerging reorientation away from traditional security studies (Mutimer 2013: 69). Krause and Williams (1996) also contributed to the critical security agenda with an article titled *Broadening the Agenda of Security Studies: Politics and Methods*, in which they sought to redress and review the emerging debates in contemporary security studies with regards to broadening and deepening the security agenda.

Another seminal academic in critical security studies is the self-proclaimed 'fallen realist' Ken Booth, who contributed a chapter titled "Security and Self: Reflections of a Fallen Realist" to *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases* (Krause & Williams 1997). Booth has systematically critiqued traditional security studies, in particular realism, through edited books such as *Realism and World Politics* (2011). In addition, Booth continues to engage the still emerging critical security studies approaches by critiquing and supporting other academics in the field, including providing a Forward to books such as *Critical Approaches to Security: An introduction to theories and methods* (Shepard 2013). Booth, along with his colleague in the Welsh School, Richard Wyn-Jones, argue for a specific and

delineated critical security theory, which is rooted in a post-Marxist tradition of emancipation and is commonly associated with the Frankfurt School of Critical Theory (Mutimer 2013: 77). Notably, the Welsh School specifically excludes feminism, the Copenhagen School, constructivism and post-structuralism (Mutimer 2013: 77). Booth (2007:102) in his book *Theory of World Security*, defines security as “survival plus... the plus being some freedom from life-determining threats, and therefore space to make choices”. As such, if security is the absence of threats and emancipation is the “...freeing of the people from physical and human constraints”, it follows that “...security and emancipation are two sides of the same coin” (Booth 1991:319). Booth’s critique of traditional approaches to security is vast and complex, although there are several examples that require specific reference in this research.

Booth (1991: 322) notes in his powerful essay *Security and Emancipation* that there is a need to better attend to the security linkages between domestic and foreign, or internal and external, politics and security issues. He laments that the study of international politics and security continues to be bedevilled by the problematic dichotomies of internal and external security in the name of simplicity (Booth 1991: 322). Security as a process of emancipation, according to Booth (1991: 322) would thus encompass both the traditional, and western, top down conceptualisation of national security and the more critical, and global South, bottom up approach of “...‘comprehensive security’ concerned with problems arising out of underdevelopment or oppression”. Security in critical security studies is thus a more comprehensive construction, which takes cognisance of both internal and external dimensions of security, and which sees emancipation of the individual of society as the ultimate purpose of security. This has significant impacts for understanding national security, as the state may be a central component of security, but it is de-centred as the referent object in favour of the individual.

Barry Buzan, Ole Wæver and Jaap de Wilde are associated with the Copenhagen School which provided two important contributions to the research agenda of security studies. Buzan (1991) was among the first to explore the broadened sectoral approach to security as discussed above. *People, States and Fear* (1991) is an influential work by Buzan and where the military, political, environmental, societal and economic sectors were initially proposed. This was further developed by Buzan in collaboration with Wæver and de Wilde in their work *Security: A New Framework*

for Analysis (1998) which also built on earlier work by Wæver including *Securitization and Desecuritization* (1995), and Wæver's work with Buzan, Morten Kelstrup and Pierre Lemaitre *Identity, Migration and the New Security Agenda in Europe* (1993). The Copenhagen School delineates security as survival, and a security issue as an existential threat to the chosen referent, often but not always the state, and this is the hallmark of securitization (Emmers 2013: 132). This explanatory tool of securitization is considered to be one of the most important contributions to security studies, importantly noting the social construction of social life, it frames securitisation as a speech act, which is a concrete action that is performed by virtue of it having being said (Mutimer 2013: 73). The Copenhagen School has been a seminal contribution to security studies.

Security: A Framework for Analysis (Buzan, Wæver & de Wilde 1998) blending Wæver's securitization and Buzan's security sectors of analysis, proposed that a threat in any of the abovementioned sectors need to be to "...be staged as existential threats to a referent object by a securitizing actor who thereby generates endorsement of emergency measures beyond rules that would otherwise bind" (Buzan, Wæver & de Wilde 1998: 5). Within this framework of analysis each sector has its own distinctive security dynamics, threats are delineated by their existential nature; that is, a threat to the survival of the referent object (Buzan, Wæver & de Wilde 1998: 5). The Copenhagen School recognises that referent objects may differ depending on the sector into which they are characterised, however the state is privileged as the primary referent object as it continues to impact all other referent objects in security (Nyman 2013: 56). This approach to security, embedded in securitization theory, calls implicitly for a broadened national security agenda that continues to privilege the state but allows for a wider variety of national security issues to be identified.

Buzan, in conjunction with Wæver and de Wildt (1998), appears to resolve the issue of national security conceptualization and policy making in a seemingly effortless theoretical re-conceptualisation. However, the approaches proposed by these seminal voices do not offer a panacea to the problem of conceptualizing security generally, let alone national security. The Copenhagen School and the associated academic orientation has had a significant influence on critical security studies, but paradoxically intellectually distanced itself from critical security studies (Mutimer

2013: 73). Many of the elements of traditional security studies remain prominent in the Copenhagen School. These includes a positivist epistemology, the inherent focus on the state as the primary referent of security as well as the innate belief that reality is socially constructed (common to most critical approaches to security) (Mutimer 2013: 73). With regards to the social construction of reality, the Copenhagen school posits that this belief is underpinned by the fact that within the security realm reality is sufficiently stable in the long run that it can be treated as objective, in essence this is what lends the Copenhagen School towards a positivist epistemology (Mutimer 2013: 73). As such the Copenhagen School can be seen to be a *via media* of traditional security studies and critical security studies.

Critical security studies is a quagmire of approaches, perspectives, methodologies and assumptions. The lack of consensus on what security is, who ought to be secured, against which threats, by whom and to what end, leaves significant conceptual uncertainty in terms of national security within this umbrella. However, there are several assumptions that are common across the critical security studies landscape. The assumptions outlined below are an attempt at finding commonality in the critical security studies approach to security, with application to an understanding of national security. The epistemological repositioning away from positivism to post-positivism will be discussed, followed by a critical engagement with critical theory within critical security studies approaches. This will be followed by a brief discussion on security as a derivative concept, as well as the deepening and broadening (widening) of security beyond the traditional conceptualisations which is seen both as a necessary and inevitable re-conceptualisation of security in the post-Cold War security landscape. This section will conclude with an outline of the limitations of the critical security studies approach in adequately conceptualising national security.

2.4.2. Post-positivism

The intellectual diversity of critical security studies is an indication of both the strength and limitations of the critical orientation in security studies. At one level the unifying dictum is the critical recognition that theory plays a role in constituting everyday life and that these constitutive processes need to be challenged and questioned (Shepard 2013: 5-6). This is a direct challenge to the traditional security studies approach which sees theory as an explanatory tool for understanding an objectively knowable world (Nel 2002: 34). Critical security studies marks an inherent

epistemological repositioning in terms of traditional security studies' traditions of positivism, objectivity and empiricism in security studies, towards a distinctly post-positivist thinking about the nature and sources of security and insecurity (Mutimer 2013: 71). Critical perspectives in security are underpinned by a belief that human communities are constituted by idea, norms and values at all levels of analysis (Mutimer 2013:71). As such, the world is socially constructed and by extension theory is a subjective pursuit. The pluralism of critical security studies is based on a critical pluralism which seeks to uncover the embedded power and structure in security, critically scrutinise the dominant discourses of security, seek to empower the marginalised people and voices, and provide the foundation upon which alternative conceptualisations of security can be built (Shepard 2013: 5-6) Security, within this framing is thus a socially constructed concept and thus far more open ended and site of contestation and negotiation.

2.4.3. Critical theory and critical security studies

It is perhaps a misnomer to refer to critical security studies as a critical approach to security since it implies that its traditional security studies is inherently uncritical which is patently false. Rather, critical security studies is rooted in approaches that are critical of the prevailing orthodoxy of traditional security studies approaches, and inherently seek to re-conceptualise international relations generally and security studies in particular. Prominent critical security studies academic Ken Booth (2007: 242) noted that "...a critical theory of security 'goes beyond problem- solving within the status quo and instead seeks to help engage with the problem of the status quo". He further states that in order to be critical it is necessary to "...attempt to stand outside prevailing structures, processes, ideologies, and orthodoxies while recognising that all conceptualisations of security derive from particular political/theoretical/historical perspectives" (Booth 2007: 30). As such, unlike traditional security studies, theorising within critical security studies does not claim objectivity nor does it rely on positivist methodologies, and rather embraces post-positivism and acknowledges the social construction of reality (Booth 2007: 30). Some branches of critical security studies such as post colonialism and feminist studies, takes this further in that they posit that theory has a transformative role, and that it should actively seek to make the world a better place through radical change, rather than simply explaining the world and seeking superficial and cosmetic

changes (Nel 2002: 34). This approach is rooted in Marxist ideology and is often paired with Critical Theory.

It is important to distinguish between Critical Theory and critical theory (upper- and lower-case distinctions). Critical Theory refers to the attempt by some prominent academics including Richard Wyn-Jones and Ken Booth, both of whom are associated with the Frankfurt School of Critical Theory. The Frankfurt School of Critical Theory is rooted in Marxist traditions which includes an overarching focus on economics and a critique of capitalism (Peoples & Vaughn-Williams 2015: 18). Critical Theory established prominence in international relations academia through the writings of Robert Cox in *Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory* published in 1981 and “*Gramsci, Hegemony and International Relations: An Essay in Method*” published in 1983 (Wyn-Jones 1999: 2). Cox drew a distinction between Critical Theory and the problem-solving approach favoured by traditional security studies (Brincat 2016: 263). Cox in many ways is credited with building on, and in some ways deviating from, the earlier works of Max Horkheimer who distinguished between traditional theory and Critical Theory (Brincat 2016: 563). Regardless of its origin, this has marked an important turn towards a critical alternative approach and away from realist, positivist hegemony which had long dominated international relations security discourse.

In contrast, critical theory (lower case) is a more general approach in security studies to denote an orientation that is far more diverse theoretical range, that includes but is in no way limited to Marxist approaches (Peoples & Vaughn-Williams 2015: 18). This has also led to a distinction between Critical Security Studies (capitalised) and critical security studies (lower case), the former being associated with Critical Theory specifically and with the Welsh School in particular (Peoples & Vaughn-Williams 2015: 18). The Critical Security Studies approach is centred on the Marxist concept of ‘emancipation’ of the individual as the primary referent of security; which is the freeing of the individual from insecurity (Peoples & Vaughn-Williams 2015: 32). Although it is necessary to make reference to the distinction between the Critical Security Studies and the critical security studies approaches to security, the lower case critical security studies that goes beyond Marxist traditions and beyond the individual level of analysis is deemed more appropriate for conceptualising national security.

2.4.4. Security as a derivative concept

Following on from the Critical Theory orientation of critical security studies, it is necessary to examine one of the foundational assumptions of critical security studies: security as a derivative concept. The argument follows that the way in which security is viewed is not abstract or accidental but rather "...derives from the way in which we see the world and the way we think politics works: what we think of as the most important features of world" (Peoples & Vaughn-Williams 2015: 22). In other words, how an individual, community or state views security follows on from the way they think about the world (Peoples & Vaughn-Williams 2015: 4). As such security reflects the nature of the politics (Wyn-Jones 1999: 103) and derives from particular political, theoretical or historical perspectives (Booth 2007: 30). Consequently, questions around the identity of the political actors becomes a significant part of conceptualising security, and at the level of the state, national identity is central to conceptualising national security. Critical security studies views security as the consequence of social construction rather than existing in an abstract, absolute and objective reality.

2.4.5. Deepening security

A unifying assumption of critical security studies is the criticism of the traditional security studies' reification of the state as the exclusive referent object of security. The referent object of security as the primary unit of analysis within traditional security studies has been challenged to various degrees, and the decentring of the state as the referent object allows critical security studies to consider an array of alternative referent objects both above and below the state, including individuals, communities below the state level and regions, continents and the international system above the state (Bilgin 2007: 98). The deepening agenda of critical security studies marked a fundamental shift away from the reification of the state as a referent object, however this deepening of security has had significant epistemological consequences (Mutimer 2013: 71). If critical security studies is to examine individuals and the communities they live in as referent objects, it necessitates a deeper examination of the ideas, norms and values that constitute the communities as referents of security (Mutimer: 2013: 71). As a consequence, critical security studies has a more normative perspective than its traditional counterpart,

concepts including national values and national identity must be elevated in an examination of national security within this framework.

2.4.6. Broadening security

Traditional security studies has been perhaps most overtly critiqued for its inability and unwillingness to engage effectively with the emergence of new types of threats following the dichotomous discourse of the Cold War which had reinforced the military and external dimensions of a state's security threat landscape. The security landscape of the post-Cold War was marked by the emergence of non-traditional transnational security threats including intrastate conflict, terrorism, organised crime, climate change, migration among others (Singh & Nunes 2016: 109). Critical security studies emerged as a platform for addressing these limitations, and a way of seeking to address and engage with new (non-traditional) security problems (Shepard 2013: 2). The closest that the umbrella of critical security studies comes to consensus is that there is a need to broaden the agenda of security beyond the traditional security studies focus on the military and economic sectors of security.

In broadening the security agenda, particularly when examining individuals or communities as referent objects, it becomes necessary then to re-examine what constitutes a threat. Critical security studies is marked by a concerted effort to broaden the traditional security studies conception of security to include a wider range of potential threats, ranging from economic and societal issues to human rights, green security and migration (Krause & Williams 1996: 230). Buzan, Wæver and de Wilde were seminal in this regard when they broadened security beyond the traditional security studies focus on political and military sectors, by introducing five sectors of security: military, environmental, economic, societal and political security (Buzan 2007: 35). This broadened sectoral approach to security was initially analysed in the influential work of *People, States and Fear* (Buzan 2007), and was further developed in *Security: A New Framework for Analysis* (Buzan, Wæver & de Wilde 1998) and continues to be a hallmark of the critical security studies discourse. On the one hand the five sectors of security have been criticised by traditional security studies scholars as being too broad, whereas on the other hand some critical security scholars have critiqued it for being too restrictive and limited in its security threat conception. Despite the lack of consensus on the outer and inner limits of broadening the security agenda, the consensus among critical security

studies scholars is that the traditional security studies focus on the military dimensions of security is wholly insufficient when attempting to analyse new and non-traditional security issues and threats.

2.4.7. Limitations

The greatest limitation of the critical security studies approach is an overarching lack of consensus, resulting in semantic confusion, persistent infighting and questions regarding the approaches practical utility. The lack of ontological, epistemological and methodological consensus within critical security studies means that there is an inherent analytical incoherence in the field. With regards to the concept of national security, it would appear if it is largely a peripheral conceptual concern within critical security studies. Even within the theoretical confines of critical security studies, security is often so broad and imprecise that undoubtedly the concept of national security would be as vague and ill-defined, if not more so. This would naturally raise several issues of defining, conceptualising and actualizing national security policy and strategy. The lack of consensus in critical security studies means that despite its significant promises and efforts in academics, critical security studies has failed to provide a sophisticated or convincing understanding of security (Browning & McDonald 2013: 239-243). Indeed, critical security studies has established its self in opposition to traditional security studies and has systematically critiqued the assumptions implicit therein. However, it has failed to move beyond critique towards a proper articulation and reformulation of security and the concept of national security.

The second group of limitations are found within the archetypal critical security studies frameworks of the Copenhagen School and the Welsh Schools, both of which have been heavily criticised both from within the critical security studies umbrella as well as from outside of it. The Copenhagen School has been disparaged for its continued reliance on the positivism inherited from traditional security studies; this is furthered by the inherent epistemological contradiction and incoherence in Buzan, Weaver and De Wilde's (1998) *Security: A New Framework for Analysis* in which the sectoral analysis remains fundamentally positivist whereas securitization is rooted in post-positivism in terms of the social construction of security (Mutimer 2013: 74). The seminal voices of the Copenhagen School have addressed this critique by positing that the social construction of security is sufficiently stable over

the long term that it can be framed in the positivist epistemology (Buzan, Wæver & de Wilde 1998: 34-35). In addition, Buzan Wæver and de Wilde intentionally dissociate with critical security studies, arguing that critical security studies is rooted in the possibility of social change owing to its post-structuralist underpinnings which contradicts their objective approach (Mutimer 2013: 73). This inconsistency undermines the theoretical utility of the Copenhagen School.

The Welsh School, although not explicitly concerned with the politics of security, has none the less asserted that security has significant power and that security articulates and signifies priority (Booth 2007: 108–109). Further, the Welsh School anchors and re-orientate the theory and praxis of security to a broader and overarching concern with emancipation (Peoples & Vaughan-Williams 2015: 29). Emancipation is defined by Booth (2007:112) as:

[T]he securing of people from those oppressions that stop them carrying out what they would freely choose to do, compatible with the freedom of others. It provides a threefold framework for politics: a philosophical anchorage for knowledge, a theory of progress for society, and a practice of resistance against oppression.

The limitation of the Welsh school is that this broad and vague framing of emancipation has been critiqued for its potential to be used as a justification for intolerant actions such as ethnic violence and its failure to provide a sophisticated security framework both in theoretical and practical terms (Browning & McDonald 2013: 247). Further, emancipation is associated with an overarching western-philosophical alignment that could be inappropriate in non-western security contexts (Peoples & Vaughan-Williams 2015: 29-30). A common critique of the Welsh School is its methodological individualisation, with the individual being the referent object of security, which makes it an untenable research project in that it is so inclusive that it lacks analytical utility (Tarry 1999: 8). Many of the general critiques against critical security studies are reflected in the limitations of the Welsh School.

The third limitation of critical security studies relates explicitly to the first limitation in that a lack of consensus on the extent of deepening of the concept of security, which makes identifying the referent object and delineating the threat landscape all but impossible. As with all the assumptions within critical security studies, the deepening of security in terms of referent objects of security is not without its detractors, possibly most notably is Barry Buzan and Ole Wæver who continue to focus of the

primacy of the state while broadening the threat landscape beyond the predominantly military dimensions of traditional security studies (Peoples & Vaughn-Williams 2015: 23). Buzan's justification for the state as the main referent of security and a focus on state security is due to three overarching reasons. Firstly, it is the state that has to cope with the security problematic both above and below its own level of analysis, secondly the state remains the primary agent for alleviating insecurity, and finally the state is the dominant actor of international relations (Smith 2005: 32-37). Wæver (1995: 67) argues for the "...reconceptualization of the security field in terms of a duality of state and societal security". State security in its traditional security studies conception focusses on survival, territorial integrity and sovereignty, in contrast societal security focusses on the identity of the state (Wæver 1990: 23). This argument continues to remain relevant as states maintain their dominance in the international political, economic and security environment. The effects of globalisation, perhaps counter intuitively, have served to reinforce the legitimacy and prevailing nature of states. Consequently, national security and the state as a referent object will continue to remain an important unit of analysis even within the critical security studies approach, although the state can no longer be reified as the only referent object. Critical security studies needs to acknowledge the state as an important referent object of security in conjunction with its deepened security agenda.

The fourth limitation relates to the potential limits of broadening security in pertuity, to include any number of potential security threats and issues. Buzan, Wæver and De Wild have acknowledged that the military and economic focus of traditional security studies is no longer useful in conceptualising national security. Instead they proposed the five sectors of security, being military, economic, political, environmental and societal (Buzan, Wæver & de Wilde 2007). This limited widening of security has faced contestation from within critical security studies, arguing that it does not go far enough, and should include additional sectors in order to be more inclusive and encompassing of the variety of threats in the international system. Traditional security studies however argues that to broaden security too much, is to render the political and security clout of the word all but useless. If everything is a threat to security, then nothing is. This is even more evident in attempting to conceptualise national security within critical security studies. As Deudney (1990:

465) has noted there is a constraining impracticality of extending the concept of national security to its zenith; “If we begin to speak about all the forces and events that threaten life, property and wellbeing (on a large scale) as threats to our national security, we shall soon drain the term of any meaning. All large-scale evils will become threats to national security.” This is the fundamental concern with the critical security studies approach to security generally, and in terms of this research, the conceptualisation of national security specifically. The lack of consensus in this regard reinforces the inclusivity of critical security studies but undermines its potential utility in conceptualising a national security framework.

The limitations of critical security studies approach to security, including ongoing contestation regarding the extent to which expansion of the concept of security is necessary, theoretical individuation, and questions about normative and transformative versus analytical and positivist security studies agendas. Furthermore, the lack of internal coherence in the critical security studies approach makes conceptualising national security extremely difficult. However, critical security studies continues in its task of challenging the traditional security studies orthodoxy, and is part of a process of continuous self-reflection and critique which allows a fluidity and malleability of engagement when conceptualising security.

2.5. **Conclusion**

The critical literature review has broadly outlined the landscape of security studies in terms of the traditional and critical approaches to security. The traditional security studies approach was delineated in term of the realist and the neorealist archetypes, which outline a specific if somewhat constrained view of security generally and national security specifically. The contributions of several seminal realist and neorealist authors were critically examined to provide a holistic overview of the traditional security studies approach to national security. Traditional security studies approach was then scrutinized for its common assumptions reflected within realism and neorealism. These assumptions can be summarised as follows; traditional security studies is rooted in a positivist and problem solving approach to security, in which the state is the exclusive referent object of security and it operates within the anarchical international system in which insecurity is an inevitability. Consequently, there is an inherent focus on the military, economic and external dimensions of security. The critical review of the traditional security studies literature found that

national security is defined in terms of the acquisition and pursuit of national power, the defence of national interests and the protection of national values. This conceptualisation of national security is further constrained by the military and economic construction of security, in a state centric theoretical framing rooted in a positivist epistemology which asserts that the social world is objectively knowable. An overview of the limitations of traditional security studies, including the failure of the narrow and limited conceptualisation of national security was then provided. It was found that traditional security studies provided a limited, but still inherently useful, conceptualisation of national security that focused on the three overarching concepts of national power, national interests and national values.

Traditional security studies discourse, particularly realism, maintained hegemonic supremacy in security studies during the Cold War but was challenged following its failure to predict the fall of the Berlin Wall and the new security problematics that emerged in the post-Cold War era. Critical security studies emerged out of an academic desire to re-orientate security studies away from these restrictive parameters towards a more inclusive, contemporary and critical construction of security.

Following the focus on traditional security studies there was a necessary paradigmatic shift to critically engage with the critical security studies approach. Critical security studies was not the panacea that it promised to be, and the field has been marked with methodological ambiguity, spirited debate and theoretical dispute. The primary premise of critical security studies is a reorientation away from the core assumptions of traditional security studies. However, the degree and extent to which critical security studies rejects the central tenets of traditional security studies varies greatly across the field. An overview of the highly contested field of critical security studies revealed several assumptions that could be applied to the critical security studies conceptualisation of security generally, at varying degrees. The assumptions included the critical security studies post-positivist theoretical positioning, the Critical Theory orientation of some schools, the assertion that security is a derivative concept as well as the expansion of the concept of security including deepening and broadening. Two archetypes of the diverse academic field of critical security studies, the Copenhagen School and the Welsh School were examined in terms of the contributions of the seminal authors associated with each school. Finally, the

limitations of the critical security studies approach were outlined, including the lack of intellectual coherence and the potential issues around broadening and deepening security. It was found that critical security studies has failed to provide a sophisticated conceptualisation of national security, although its focus on the impact of identity and the social construction of security are important contributions.

The primary finding of the critical literature review was that the narrow, limited conceptualisation of national security within traditional security studies has failed to adequately evolve to be a comprehensive reflection of the post-Cold War security environment. In contrast, the broader and deeper critical security studies approach goes some way in providing a more holistic understanding of security but has for the most part been prevented from utility by lack of consensus and a failure to engage with the concept of national security. As such, it is necessary to re-evaluate the strengths of both traditional security studies and critical security studies, and address the limitations of each, and re-conceptualise national security to provide a contemporary framework for analysis. This framework will be developed in the next chapter, and will focus on the interplay between national identity, national values, national will, national power and national interests in the conceptualisation of national security. The theoretical framing of this framework will be rooted in constructivism and will as such examine the social construction of national security.

CHAPTER 3: NATIONAL SECURITY FRAMEWORK

3.1. Introduction

In the preceding chapter it was determined that traditional security studies and critical security studies have failed to adequately conceptualise national security for contemporary analysis. Traditional security studies, rooted in realism, positivism and problem solving defines national security within intentionally constrained parameters, by focussing on the state's national power (be it military or economic), narrowly defined national interests (survival and sovereignty) and national values. Critical security studies, with its broadened and deepened security agenda has failed to provide an adequate engagement with the concept of national security, even though states and their national security policies continue to have an impact across all levels of analysis in the international system. Consequently, it was determined that the concept of national security requires engagement to provide for a contemporary framework of analysis. This chapter will include the development of a national security framework for analysis that provides a more contemporary and holistic understanding of the concept of national security.

The national security quintet¹⁰ will focus on the interplay of five inter-related concepts that will provide for a reconceptualization of national security that is holistic, contemporary and draws on the relative strengths of traditional security studies and critical security studies whilst addressing the limitations of each outlined in Chapter 2. A contemporary framework of analysis requires theoretical infrastructure that is both malleable and critical. In this regard constructivism, specifically critical constructivism, was selected as it provides the necessary flexibility and theoretical scope to underpin a contemporary national security framework of analysis. What follows is the broad concept of the national security quintet, followed by a brief overview of the conventional and critical variants of constructivism which underpin the quintet, and then an outline of national security in terms of each individual concept of the national security quintet.

¹⁰ The national security quintet was developed for the theory of national security module at the South African National Defence College as a teaching aid. This research is an attempt to give structure and impetus to the national security quintet to provide a contemporary framework of analysis that can transcend the theoretical confines of traditional and critical security studies. His conceptualisation of the quintet has informed the work of Petrus Cornelius Bester who presented a version of the quintet during a lecture titled "Emerging Challenges in Terrorism and Counterterrorism: A National Security Perspective" at The Hague University of Applied Sciences, Faculty of Public Management, Law and Safety in 2019.

3.2. The national security quintet

The national security quintet as a framework of analysis for a contemporary reconceptualization of national security has been formulated in terms of its individual and collective aspects which will be outlined below. Although individually the concepts of national identity, national values, national interest, national power and national will are important considerations when conceptualising national security, the combined and mutually constitutive nature of each element creates a holistic, contemporary and complimentary understanding of national security today. When examining the combined impacts of these five concepts on a more contemporary, holistic and inclusive understanding of national security, it can be modelled as the national security quintet. The metaphorical use of the quintet is not without a poetic implication; a quintet is reference to “[a] musical composition or movement for five instruments or voices” (Merriam-Webster 2019), and as such the national security quintet takes this further to reference the interaction, interplay and interconnection of the five concepts of national security. National identity, national will, national power, national interests and national values are all significant for conceptualising national security individually, however collectively they form a powerful, relevant and contemporary framework of analysis. Although the framework is rooted in critical constructivism and thus highlights the construction of national identity, this does not preclude it from being used in a trans-theoretical way as it draws upon the combined strength and utility of both traditional and critical security studies’ national security constructions.

Each concept of the quintet relies intrinsically on the other four elements to construct a national security picture that is inclusive. Critical constructivism was used as the theoretical adhesive within the quintet as it allowed an engagement with the social construction of each element and rooted the whole framework in national identity. Below is a graphic representation of the national security quintet and illustrates how each element constructs and reconstructs each other element and how each element combines to provide a contemporary understanding of the concept of national security. National security takes place, as the concept implies, at the state level, however domestic factors including at a subnational and even individual level have a significant impact on national security. Further, levels above the state

(McDonald 2013: 63-64). Constructivism borrows insights from cognate disciplines such as psychology and sociology and is predicated on several assumptions and core concepts: firstly, constructivism argues that the world is socially constructed through intersubjective interaction, secondly, there is mutual constitution of agents and structures, and finally, and perhaps most significantly, ideational factors including identity, culture and norms are essential to the constitution and dynamics of the global system (McDonald 2013: 64). In this way constructivism is seen as occupying the theoretical middle ground between rationalist and traditional security studies approaches such as realism and the interpretivist, non-traditional approaches including critical security studies. Although these assumptions form the unifying basis of constructivism, it is not a monolithic or uniform theoretical approach, and includes several variations owing in part to its diverse backgrounds and differing meta-theoretical positions (Cho 2009: 76). Broadly speaking, constructivism is divided between two camps, namely: conventional constructivism and critical constructivism (Cho 2009: 76). What follows is an engagement with constructivism within its broad theoretical confines, including an overview of the core ontological assumptions and key concepts. Following this will be an overview of conventional constructivism and national security, including its central tenets and most influential voices. This will be followed by a similar discussion on critical constructivism and national security, highlighting its differences and similarities to its conventional peer as well as engaging with the writings of seminal critical constructivist voices.

3.3.1. The core assumptions of constructivism

Rooted in the pervasive importance of ideas, identity and interaction, constructivism argues that the world, inclusive of the states and institutions that comprise it, is not natural or indeed accidental but rather a consequence of social construction by actors within the system (Agius 2013: 88). It therefore follows that within constructivism; security is also constructed, highlighting the significance of ideational and social factors over the material as per the traditional approaches to security (Agius 2013: 88). However, it would be inaccurate to assume that traditional security studies approaches including realism, are somehow unaware of the impact of ideational aspects of security, rather realists tend to treat norms, ideas and identity as epiphenomenal rather than primary factors, and are therefore largely ignored under international conditions of anarchy (Cho 2009: 77). Constructivism according

to seminal thinker Karen Fierke (2007: 56) "... is an act which brings into being a subject or object that otherwise would not exist". With this in mind, security is thus a site of articulation and negotiation between actors in a particular social and historical context and is developed through interaction between these actors (McDonald 2013: 65). This reinforces the critical security studies core assumption that security is a derivative concept, and that any understanding of security is derived from the way we engage and think about the world (Peoples & Vaughn-Williams 2015: 4). As such, constructivism does not espouse the logic of a universal, concrete or monolithic understanding of what security is, who to secure and with what means, but rather recognises the fluid and changeable nature of security and the specific perspectives and contexts of the security actors (McDonald 2013: 65). This undoubtedly has a significant impact on the way security is viewed and understood, as it contextualises the actions, beliefs and interests of actors and the structures they create and inhabit and how this impacts them (Agius 2013: 88). This flexible construction of security already allows for a more inclusive and holistic construction of national security, which will be discussed in more detail below.

Constructivism is underpinned by three core ontological assumptions that bear reference if not detailed analysis here. Firstly, normative or ideational factors are elevated and privileged significantly in constructivism and are equally if not more important than the material factors espoused by traditional security studies approaches (Agius 2013: 88). Secondly, identities in constructivism are central to understanding actors' interests, and interests are consequently important for understanding actor's behaviours (Agius 2013: 88). Alexandra Wendt (1999: 50) notes that material forces such as power and interest give no clear indication of an actors' source of ideas, values, norms and beliefs which are significant in determining how interests are developed and obtained. Finally, agents and structures in constructivism are mutually constructed, and as such construct and deconstruct each other in global politics and security (Agius 2013: 88). This has significant impact on how security is understood, a telling example is rooted in Wendt's (1992: 395) oft quoted phrase "Anarchy is what states make of it". In analysing this statement, it is postulated that anarchy is not in fact an inevitable, enduring and natural state of the global system as realists insist, but rather anarchy is itself a constructed idea that actors, specifically states, have bought into and

constructed and thus state's will inevitably act in accordance with that belief (Agius 2013: 90). Consequently, the overarching assumption of constructivism in relation to security generally and with application to national security specifically, is that it is a social construction. Far from rendering the concept of national security void of meaning, it instead gives gravitas to the concept by bringing it into being for particular actors in particular contexts. This allows for national security to be a constitutive process marked by individuation of nations and their institutional representations, states.

3.3.2. Conventional constructivism and national security

Conventional constructivism is rooted in several of the key aspects of traditional security studies, including the centrality of the state as the referent object and the overarching concern with positivism (Agius 2013: 98). In terms of methodological implications, Wendt (1999: 39-40) delineates the conventional and critical approaches by stating that positivism is significant because conventional constructivism serves an a more ontological than epistemological function, that is it is more important to determine what we know rather than determining how we know it. Conventional constructivism posits itself as analytically neutral in that it seeks to explain, not change, the world (Cho 2009: 93 72). However, conventional constructivism departs significantly from traditional security studies in that it places emphasis on the cultural and institutional factors of security, within the security environments in which states are embedded, above exclusively material factors (Jepperson, Wendt & Katzenstein 1996: 33). It is important to note that conventional constructivists are not dismissive of the impact of the material, but rather that this impact is mediated by the ideas, norms and identity that give meaning to the material (Cho 2009: 79). Further, conventional constructivists argue that culture affects the basic character of a state, the national identity, which is in contradiction to the assumption of traditional security studies that a state's defining properties are intrinsic and exogenous to the internal and external environment (Jepperson, Wendt & Katzenstein 1996: 33). Thus, conventional constructivism notes the importance of the state and is rooted in positivism, but argues that social construction through norms, ideas and identity are as important as material factors in security.

The centrality of social structure *vis-à-vis* norms is an embedded feature of conventional constructivism's framing of national security. Norms defined in the

sociologically standard way as being “...collective expectations about proper behaviour for a given identity”, means that conventional constructivism perceives norms as defining or constituting identity as they specify the actions by an actor (in this instance, a state) to act in such a way that other states recognise and validate the specific identity of the actor and thus respond appropriately (Jepperson, Wendt & Katzenstein 1996: 54). Norms are distinct from national values, in that values transcend specific situations, whereas norms form a prescriptive or proscriptive role in specific situations (Rokreach 1973: 19). Further, values are more personal and in the contexts of state’s, more domestic, whereas norms are consensual and usually external to the state (Rokreach 1973: 19) As such, national values are the standards for determining what a state ought to pursue and protect, and thus provide the justification for whether or not a state accepts a social norm (Rokreach 1973: 19). In terms of regulatory or prescriptive roles of norms, conventional constructivists see them as being the genesis of the standards for the proper enactment of the defined national identity in specific circumstances (Jepperson, Wendt & Katzenstein 1996: 54). Norms shape the national identity which in turn plays a fundamental role, according to constructivists, in the construction of national values and national interests that the state will then pursue (Cho 2009: 80). To summarise, the conventional constructivist approach tends to treat social structure as an explanatory tool in a positivist framework within security studies (Cho 2009: 85). Therefore, in a broad sense, there is a complementary relationship between the rationalist traditional security studies approach and the conventional constructivist understanding of national security. Kowert & Legro (1996: 496) note that “...norms and identity fill the gaps where other [traditional and rationalist] perspectives fall short”. This approach allows researchers to determine how, for instance, states gain their particular preferences through their values, norms and identities, whereas a traditional security studies approach focuses on how a state can strategically realise these preferences.

Conventional constructivism contributes to a deeper understanding of national security; however a threefold critique renders it unsuitable for use within the reconceptualization of national security. Firstly, conventional constructivism does not adequately address the impact of domestic factors in determining national identity, and is thus unable to interrogate what norms constitute a state itself, which has an important impact on what a state considers a referent object of security and

determine what ought to be secured (Cho 2009: 89). Secondly, conventional constructivism falls short in its reliance on a stable and circumscribable state identity, which does not sufficiently engage or question how state identity is itself socially constructed and reconstructed (Wendt 1999: 244). These rigid ideas of state identity allow limited scope for fluidity and change in a state's identity and as such its national security and national interests (Wendt 1999: 244). Finally, conventional constructivism fails to adequately address the impact of power differentials between states in the development of and formation of international norms (Cho 2009: 84). This is where a more critical turn in constructivism could provide conceptual space for a deeper understanding of national security.

3.3.3. Critical constructivism and national security

Constructivism in its broad form gained prominence following the end of the Cold War, with the term itself being first coined in 1989, and along with critical security studies formed an important part of the post-Cold War security studies transformation (Agius 2013: 88). As discussed above, conventional constructivism paid due ontological and epistemological deference to traditional security studies approaches to national security and stayed true to positivist and statist understandings. Critical constructivism takes this one step further, and argues that not only are socially constructed values, ideas and identity central to the understanding of national security, but also how these are formed forms a critical part of understanding any state's national security approach. Further, in contrast to its conventional peer, critical constructivism seeks to question the dominant constructions and discourses of global politics and security (Cho 2009: 93). Critical constructivism differentiates itself from conventional constructivism by analysing discourse and the historical and discursive constitution of identities and how it links to security policies (Buzan & Hansen 2009: 197). Security thus significantly becomes a site of competition, contestation and negotiation between security actors, owing to the changeable and unstable nature of identity (McDonald 2013: 60). The critical shift away from conventional constructivism allows significant conceptual space for debate around national security approaches, practices and priorities for states by engaging in the construction and narratives of national identity. Further, it allows for engagement with the changeability of national identity and national security.

Critical constructivists dispute conventional constructivism's continued reification of the state as the primary unit of analysis and the preferable referent object (Buzan & Hansen 2009: 197). According to Buzan and Hansen (2009: 36) critical constructivism focusses on other 'collectivities', such as social groupings of people, whether it be political parties of civil society groups, rather than focussing exclusively on the state, however the state as a 'collectivity' ought not to be dismissed but should rather form the basis of a critical constructivist's conceptualisation of security. Critical constructivists accept that the state cannot be ontologically separated from the many and varied practices that constitute it and bring it into being, and that the state itself is a consequence of the enduring process of reproduction that performativity constructs its national identity (Campbell 1998: 9). Therefore, there is a need to interrogate the practices, processes and narratives that result in a state's identity being constructed and reconstructed.

Particular narratives of national identity are likely to become dominant, or hegemonic, in certain contexts through a power-political struggle which will inevitably lead to other national identity narratives becoming marginalised (McDonald 2008: 62). National identity influences national security, particularly through representations of security, identity and history, which serve to legitimise political action. These security representations are result of negotiations between political elites and the public, the resultant discourses serving to bind the individual to the state (McDonald 2008: 64). Critical constructivism further argues that there is a need for public support for or consent to these constructed elite discourses, and that the former is able to effect change to national security discourse, practices and policies through non-state collectivities such as civil society groups and non-governmental organisations (McDonald 2008:64). Thus, national security discourse, as reliant on national identity, becomes a contested space, marked by competition and negotiation of security. Ultimately, dominant national identity narratives will assist in defining the domestic and international parameters of legitimate or feasible political action by states through representations of national security issues (McDonald 2008: 62). Representations of security, can serve "...to define who 'we' are and the 'other/s' from whom 'we' need protection." (McDonald 2008: 62). For critical constructivists, the contestation of how to define national security and how to determine what constitutes a national security threat or issue, is important in

conceptualising national security. This is because insecurity is also the product of identity construction in which the self is constituted in contrast to the other, or multiple others (Jung 2019: 6). This dichotomy, of identity and difference, the 'self' and 'other', is central to an understanding of national security especially in terms of security representations.

Within critical constructivist literature there is an overarching focus on the identity and difference spectrum, as highlighted by seminal critical constructivists including Woodward (1997) and Connolly (2002). Woodward (1997: 2) suggests that "...identity is most clearly defined by difference", a position reinforced by Connolly (2002 :9) who notes that "...the definition of difference is built into the logic of identity" and that the inclination to construct the 'Other' within a negative light particularly when defined in relation to the 'Self' will inevitably result in exclusion. This also has a significant impact on the fluidity and unfixed nature of national identity within critical constructivism, with Campbell (1998: 9) noting that identity "... is not fixed by nature, given by God, or planned by intentional behaviour. Rather, identity is constituted in relation to difference". Campbell (1998: 9) takes this further by stating that the constitution of identity is achieved through these inscriptions of boundaries in terms of simplistic binary constructions, between the 'Other' and the 'Self', between the 'inside' and the 'outside', between the 'domestic' and the 'foreign'. This delineation often manifests within state's domestic security environments, and result identifying 'self' from 'other' along tribal, racial, class and political affiliations lines. Pervasive othering is a hallmark of security. This line of thinking has an impact on the reconceptualization of national security, as a state must necessarily make a distinction between the 'domestic' and the 'national' as well as the 'regional', 'continental' and the 'international'. However, difference and distinction does not necessarily have to be framed in the negative, although when it is insecurity is usually an inevitability.

This raises important foundational queries regarding the conceptualisation of national security. It is important to continuously interrogate and reflect on key questions including: what is national security? Whose national security matters? What designates a issue as a national security problem? How can national security be achieved? These questions need to remain at the forefront of any investigation into national security.

The scaffolding of the re-conceptualisation of national security for the purposes of constructing a contemporary national security framework of analysis within this research is rooted in the analysis and interrogation of the impact of national identity alongside national values, national power, national interests and national will. Critical constructivism, with deeper engagement with the concept of national identity, particularly the construction thereof, is the ideal theoretical lens through which to view national security, together with the agents, structure and the impact of change.

3.4. National security framework

The national security framework that will be used to re-conceptualise national security within this research is rooted in five inter-relating concepts¹¹ that form the basis of understanding national security, in an expanded but still constrained prototype. By using critical constructivism this framework will be rooted in the overarching and pervasive concept of national identity as it is constructed and reconstructed. Combined with the four central concepts of national values, national power, national interests, and national will this will form the foundation of the national security framework of analysis. The following section will critically engage with the individual concepts of the quintet. Although separated here, there will be continued reflection on how each individual concept informs, reinforces and influences the others to create an intersubjective understanding of national security. Due to the theoretical underpinning of critical constructivism, there will be an ongoing critical engagement of the construction of identity within the quintet.

3.4.1. National identity and national security

Francis Fukuyama (2018) wrote a book *Identity: The Demand for Dignity and the Politics of Resentment*, in which he critically examines the effects and impact of identity politics across all levels of analysis. In South Africa, Hlumelo Biko's (2019) *Africa Reimagined* argues for a rediscovery of an African identity that transcends the colonial boundaries of the Berlin Conference and the consequent individualised sovereign states imposed on the continent, towards a reorientation of Africa's values. The preponderance of narratives on identity and national identity is not accidental but are rather a reflection of the global system that is increasingly marked by the

¹¹ National identity, national values, national power, national interest and national will.

construction and deconstruction of identity, at all levels, but increasingly at the national level.

National identity serves as the foundation of the national security quintet, as it not only informs the development of the other four concepts, but it also roots the quintet in critical constructivism and provides for a comprehensive and contemporary understanding of national security. It is therefore necessary to engage with the concept of national identity more comprehensively than in the preceding theoretical framing of critical constructivism.

“National security depends on national identity” (Kowert 1998: 1). This simplistic assertion never the less is the foundation of this research. This statement is premised on two broad overarching claims. The first claim being that internal cohesion is a necessary element to ensure that external threats to a state are addressed in an orderly and efficient way (Kowert 2005: 1). However, it is notable that attempts at producing internal cohesion can also be a source of threats especially along pre-existing fault lines including race, ethnicity, language or class (Kowert 2005: 1). The second claim is that external distinctiveness is a second necessary element of national identity and is that which distinguishes one state from another and differentiates the state’s interests, which are discussed in detail below (Kowert 2005: 4-7). These two claims form two sides of the same coin and cannot be analytically separated from each other. Internal coherence and external distinctiveness in terms of national identity construction is not a singular process that creates an enduring and whole national identity, rather national identity remains in constant flux, and can be reinforced by domestic and foreign social forces or destabilised by the social forces both inside the state and outside of it.

In traditional approaches to security, a state’s national identity is treated as a singular, monolithic construct incapable of significant change or divergence from its principal identity as a self-interested, survival orientated, power and capability obsessed sovereign operating under conditions of anarchy (Fierke 2007: 75). This is furthered by arguments that the internal/ domestic dynamics of a state bear little significance when attempting to understand or explain international behaviour (Fierke 2007: 75). The traditional security studies understanding of national identity has been challenged by critical security studies and constructivism alike. Wyn-Jones

(1999: 116) of the Welsh school makes an important contribution regarding the unfixed, changeable and dependent nature of identity:

Identity never occurs in the singular ... The human condition is one of overlapping identities; that is, each person has a number of different identities, all (potentially) in flux, and all of which come into play at different times and in different situation... it points to the complex, multifaceted and even fluid nature of identity.

Although Wyn-Jones was explicitly outlining the nature of the individual's identity, this description rings true for collectivities including people, classes and even states. Katzenstein (1996: 11) notes that states are embedded in international and domestic societies which shape a state's identities in powerful ways. A state's constructed identity, along with the construction of actors and structures, are the result of "...social processes, purposeful political action, and differences in power capabilities", which in turn affect national security (Katzenstein 1996: 4-5). The state is a social actor that is entrenched in social rules and agreements that constitute its identity and motivates its national interests. The concept of national identity is dependent on the four dimensions of identity, which are fluidity, alterity, multiplicity and constructedness (Goff & Dunn 2004a: 237). These are discussed briefly below.

Fluidity, as already addressed to an extent above, is the ability of national identity to change and be dynamic, contradicting the traditional security studies stance that national identity is "fixed, homogeneous, natural, bounded, and easily defined" (Goff & Dunn 2004: 6). However, it remains important to be cognisant of the fact that the fluid versus fixed construction of national identity is not a binary, but rather that there is a level of continuity and a level of changeability in national identity (Frueh 2004: 63-64). If identity can change, and states along with it, then the other elements of the national security quintet will also not be fixed monolithic constructs, but rather capable of a level of change and continuity.

Alterity, or 'otherness', is the emphasis on the fact that identity is a relational concept and that this relationship is context specific (Fierke 2007: 76). Further, national identity is a representation of the national self that is understood in relation to an "other" that is positioned "outside" the self. This emphasises that identity construction is an intersubjective process (Fierke 2007: 76) and relates closely to the discussion around identity and difference in the previous section on critical constructivism. Alterity can be problematic in the construction of a national identity and can have

significant implications for national security by potentially reinforcing exclusionary, exceptional and subordinating practices and policies, which can consequently have a significant impact on construction of threats within the national security framing (Goff & Dunn 2004: 5). This is not to say that alterity must necessarily be exclusionary, it can be a force for inclusiveness too as the relationship between the “self” and the “other” is also fluid and changeable (Goff & Dunn 2004: 5). Fierke notes that alterity and difference are significant in the processes used by states to build a national identity that contrasts the self from the other (Fierke 2007: 77). The state, according to Connolly (2002: 201) is the:

...site of the most fundamental division between inside and outside, us and them, domestic and foreign, the sphere of citizen entitlements and that of strategic responses. It is the centre surrounded by a periphery and the community surrounded by danger. For if the state does not serve as a centre of self-conscious collective action in pursuit of common purposes, then nothing does.

He further notes that “[m]ost appeals to reason of state are accepted as legitimate by most people most of the time because of a perception that security from external threat is essential to internal democracy¹², because state security is perceived to be in perpetual peril”. As such, the pervasive “othering” within the construction of national identity has an impact on national security, especially in terms of threat identification and national interest in relation to other states.

Constructedness, has also been dealt with to an extent earlier in this chapter, however it bears reinforcement here. The social construction of national identity is the *raison d'être* for the decision to embed the reconceptualization of national security and the resultant contemporary framework for analysis in critical constructivism. National identity being a consequence of social construction is not contested here, however there remains significant debate around what forces, actors and dynamics are involved in the process of the national identity construction (Goff & Dunn 2004: 6). National identity construction does not occur within a vacuum, and various internal and external ideas, narratives and processes can impact on national identity (Goff and Dunn 2004a: 241). This re-emphasises the fluidity and alterity of national identity, as any change in the environment of a state, whether it be to the

¹² Connolly speaks of democracy within the context of the United States however even in non-democratic states there is a continuous reinforcement of the self in contrast to the other, the internal in contrast to the external and the national identity in contrast to other states.

external “others” or whether it be domestically driven, will have an impact on how the national identity is constructed and changeable.

Multiplicity, is the marker that national identity is not a single, unified and uncontested, rather national identity is multidimensional, sometimes hierarchical and in a constant state of flux. The multiple representations of national identity relate to different sets of practices and processes, which may at times be in competition or conflict with each other (Fierke 2007: 76). When national identities of a singular state are in tension, a compromise may have to be reached in order to mediate between competing identities, however in the end a single identity may have to dominate (Goff & Dunn 2004: 242). With a multiplicity of national identities, there will inevitably need to be an engagement with a multiplicity of national interests too that will shape and constrain a states behaviour (Wilson & Black 2004: 208). How a state is seen and how the state views itself in relation to its neighbours, region, continent or indeed in the international system is often diverse, multiple and even schizophrenic. The impact of national identity on national security is thus “multiple” hence multiplicity, as it affects the behaviour of states in different situations. How a state internally reflects on its national identity and how it projects its national identity externally will necessarily have an impact on the construction of national values and national interests, how the state is prepared to accumulate and if necessary, use its national power, and how it will leverage the national will in support of the afore-said.

Critical constructivism is particularly concerned with fluidity, alterity, constructedness and multiplicity of national identity and emphasise the delineation of boundaries that are created by security narratives and representations (Alexandrov 2003: 37). The identity/difference spectrum of opposition reinforces the attribution of negative, immoral traits to the other and positive, moral traits to the self (Alexandrov 2003: 37). This can even occur in terms of the domestic environment, in which the ‘other’ can be a reference to the past or previous ‘self’ (Alexandrov 2003: 37), as is the case of post-apartheid South Africa defining itself largely in opposition to the pre-1994 apartheid state. Campbell’s (1998: 68) *Writing Security* argues that national identity is the result of “...exclusionary practices in which resistant elements to a secure identity on the ‘inside’ are linked through a discourse of ‘danger’ with threats identified and located on the ‘outside’”. This ‘danger discourse’ is the result of representations of various national security threats, that reproduce the

identity/difference distinction and are reinforced by national identity and national security discourses.

The construction and reconstruction of national security through dominant, usually elite driven, narratives of national identity is the unifying component of the national security quintet. National values, national interests, national power and even national will stem from the narratives of internal coherence and external distinctiveness. As such, as the national security quintet is formulated above by the individual and collective elements of the national values, national interests, national power and national will, it is necessary to remain aware of the overarching impact of national identity within each of these concepts, and that when the quintet is examined as a holistic and contemporary framework for analysing national security, identity remains its most significant and enduring characteristic.

3.4.2. National values and national security

The protection of national values is an overriding theme in security discourse, especially when engaging in the concept of national security. Although used as a justification for national security policies, and the foundation of traditional security studies national security objectives, realism offers limited engagement with national values, how they are constructed, reconstructed and changed over time. National values however are central to a comprehensive understanding of national security as they not only inform how states behave but also impact on the formation of national identity and interests, the harnessing of national will and the pursuit of national power. National security policy is comprised of decisions and actions that are considered to be imperative to the protection of domestic core values or national values. This is emphasised in the definition of national security in Chapter 2.

It is necessary to examine the concept of values in general, before applying it to security studies specifically. Although individual values remain significant, the interaction of values at a group level, such as in communities, societies and states will be highlighted in this research in order to avoid methodological individualisation which is ultimately untenable. Values lie at the foundation of human interaction and influence human behaviour by giving structure to current realities while providing markers for the future (Kilby 1993: 55). When people form stable groups and start interacting with each other there are several processes that occur simultaneously;

what is commonly referred to as group dynamics (Kilby 1993: 55). Group dynamics include the establishment of stable channels of communication, emergence of leadership and other roles, and significantly, the emergence of rules and norms that govern the groups' behaviour (Kilby 1993: 55-56). It is within this context that values will emerge and are reciprocated within and between groups, these now shared values will generally emerge in in any newly formed group and become integral to a group's internal cohesiveness and identity (Kilby 1993: 56). It thus follows, generally, that the emergence of differing values will be source of conflict and discord (Kilby 1993: 56). National identity remains crucial in this regard, as different articulations of national identity will result in different designations of threat and definitions of security, reflected in a state's national values. When examining values at a state level, and through critical constructivism, national values becomes an important determinant of national security.

National values, the values of a group at a state level, are those overarching values which emerge as the state's priorities even after trade-offs are necessary; as such national values are the merging of ideological precepts, cultural symbols and national interests that are pursued at any cost (Leffler 1990: 145). National values are critical for legitimising national security, and the process of their construction is in many ways a reflection of national identity in terms of threat determination. What a state delineates as a national security priority, is the result of domestic security narratives reinforced by national identity and shared national values (Risse-Kappen 1996: 363). This forms part of the internal coherence and external distinctiveness of national identity, but shared values further impact on what other security actors are friend or foe. An oft quoted example of this, is following the rise of United States military, economic and political hegemony at the end of the Cold war, its western allies, including France and the United Kingdom, were not overtly threatened by the United States' increased power and influence (Risse-Kappen 1996: 363). This is because shared values form an important part of threat perception in the external environment.

The determination of national values is a political process, and politics is centred on the authoritative allocation of the national values (Hough 2004: 19). Within a traditional security studies framing of national values, there is a fusing of material values such as survival and protection of sovereignty with other fundamental goals

such as the defence of a state's defining ideology, as was evident within the capitalist versus communist rhetoric of the Cold War, the protection of the state's institutions and national identity and the safeguarding of the state's physical base or territorial integrity (Leffler 1990: 145). The construction of national values is a mutually constitutive process that is rooted in national identity. States have a multiplicity of national values as well as diverse strategies for pursuing or protecting their values, and much like identity, there is a requirement for internal cohesiveness and external distinctiveness of national values. As such, although states may share one or many values, their national security policies in pursuit and protection of these values will diverge and converge across time and space due to their unique historical and social contexts.

In order to conceptualise national security using the theoretical infrastructure of critical constructivism it is necessary to investigate some core questions with regards to national values: what are the state's national values; where do the threats to a state's national values potentially emanate from (both internal and external dimensions); and how to achieve the preservation or advancement of national values (McDonald 2008: 61). Further, it is necessary to note that national values, much like the national identity that they inform, are not monolithic or constant across states, rather they emerge in particular historical and social contexts, develop through social interaction between various state and non-state actors, and are capable of change.

States seek to protect and advance their national values both in domestic and foreign policy. National values are therefore an important consideration in any national security policy equation, as policy must be assessed in terms of the national values that will be impacted by the actioning of any given policy decision. Values are therefore a fundamental consideration when determining and understanding a state's national interests. National values tend to be fairly stable across time and space, and do not readily change without social disruption. National interests in contrast are less stable and more susceptible to transformation as the domestic and foreign security environment changes.

3.4.3. National interests and national security

The concept of national interests is predominately seen as being rooted in realism and as being pursued through foreign policy (Hough 2004: 2). Hans Morgenthau

famously asserted that American foreign policy "...should have but one guiding star, the National Interest", (as quoted in Wolfers 1952: 483), this was contextualised further by Morgenthau when he noted that foreign policy's aim is to ensure "...the integrity of the nation's territory, of its political institutions and of its culture" (as quoted in Hough 2008: 4) and that the national interest is "...defined in terms of (National) power" (as quoted in Weldes 1996: 278). Buzan and Hansen (2009:198) in contrast assert that:

Foreign and security policies... do not arise from objective national interests but become legitimated through particular constructions which are not free-floating or 'just words' but follow a specific set of rule-bound games.

Much like national security, national interest is an emotive term used to justify policies in the pursuit of the intentionally vague but rhetorically useful, national interest. This limited conceptualisation of national interests is insufficient and unsophisticated. What is required is an understanding of national interest within the constructivist paradigm established above.

Alexander Wendt (1992: 395) convincingly challenged the orthodoxy of the realist conceptualisation of national interests as being rationally and deductively determined by self-interested states, operating in an anarchical international system, by arguing that "anarchy is what states make of it". Thus it is argued in that the national interests of the state, and the national identity and national values upon which those interests depend is not determined by structure of the international system alone, but is rather created, or more suitably constructed, by collective meanings that constitute the structures that organise the state's action (Weldes 1996: 279). Wendt (1999: 231) argues that "interests presuppose identity" thus in order to understand a state's action in pursuit of its national interest it is necessary to understand the intersubjectively constituted structures and meanings that inform national identity, national values and national interests. Once again, the centrality of national identity is emphasised in the shaping of a state's national interests.

The role of identity in the formation of national interests is rooted in an understanding of norms, which matter both in regulative and constitutive contexts. National identity and national interests are shaped by norms, which influences state action in creating permissive conditions for the action (Cho 2009: 81). Norms and national identity should not be conflated however, constructivists both conventional and critical agree

that norms shape identity, and this national identity will thus in turn shape national interests (Cho 2009: 80). It is within the conceptualisation of national interests that the distinction between critical and conventional constructivism matters. Conventional constructivists such as Wendt, continue to be largely dismissive of domestic factors in shaping identity and thereby informing national interests particularly as the state is seen as a monolithic construct itself (Cho 2009: 94). Critical constructivists in contrast take due cognisance of how domestic factors can shape national identity, which in turn shapes national interests, and how national interests pursued through foreign policy constructs and reconstructs the states national identity (Campbell 1998: x). National interests, like national identity and national values, are the socially constructed and defined, through processes of social interaction in which states are affected by and responding to domestic and international norms, identities and cultures (Das 2009: 963). Liotta (2000) notes that national interests reflect a state's national identity, and that they therefore are only a broad set of often vague guidelines that allow states to function as they deem suitable. This in order to understand a state's particular national interests a thorough examination of the state's domestic and international environment is necessary. This undermines the realist notion that national interests are exclusively orientated towards policies in the external environment and warrants further investigation into a broader conceptualisation of national interests.

National interests within the orthodoxy tend to focus on the foreign, external environment of the state, however the concept of national interests should be extended to include incorporate both foreign and domestic policy choices, although the latter is usually framed in terms of the public interest (Nuechterlein 1976: 247). Notshulwana (2012:3) in his Development Bank of Southern Africa policy brief conceptualises a wider and more inclusive understanding of national interests, by defining it in the following way:

A country's national interest is the collective – and, indeed, an aggregation – of all the other interests in all the political, economic and social dimensions of state activity. To define the national interest of a state based on one of its subsystems [foreign policy] is not only incorrect, but also narrows the scope of state-society interaction that is required to construct an overarching statement of national interest.

The wider and more inclusive conceptualisation of national interests, that draws on the impact of domestic and foreign factors, and leans heavily on the construction and deconstruction of a national identity and national values, and what a state is willing to sacrifice resources, attention and potentially, lives, for.

3.4.4. National power and national security

National power, like national interests, is often confined to the traditional security studies approach to national security and is rooted in an understanding of the relative military and economic capabilities of state's operating in anarchy (Glaser 2013: 14). Within realism the exercise of national power is necessary to protect and pursue national values and national interests (Leffler 1990: 146). National power, within this framing, predominately stems from the scale, strength and productivity of the state's domestic economy as well as its access or control over other state's capabilities including industrial infrastructure, skilled labour force and/or raw materials (Leffler 1990: 146). Jablonsky (2001) defines national power and its relationship with security in terms of relational characteristics of the natural and social determinants of power. Natural determinants include, geography, natural resources and population, whereas social determinants include military, political, psychological and technology among others (Jablonsky 2001). These conceptualisations of national power are useful but wholly insufficient and needs to be re-examined in order to be analytically useful, particularly in light of the ideational factors that give national power meaning.

National power serves a discursive role in understanding national security; national identity and national interests as constituted through the pursuit and protection of national values and the harnessing of national will, requires the utilisation of both material power and discursive power. Emmanuel Adler (1997: 336) significantly noted that

[p]ower, in short, means, not only the resources required to impose one's own will to others, but also the authority to determine the shared meanings that constitute the identities, interests and practices of states, as well as the conditions they confer.

This conceptualisation of national power reinforces the strong relationship between ideational factors and national power and is a powerful explanatory tool for determining national security.

Material national power capabilities are an undeniably important aspect of national security, and a contemporary reconceptualization of national security would be incomplete without a comprehensive understanding of power in both its hard and soft forms. Seminal author Joseph Nye (2011: 11) made an important contribution to the differing manifestations of power, most notably the distinction between hard power and soft power, as well as smart power which is the strategic use of both hard power and soft power. Hard and soft power are references to the adage of carrot versus stick as a resource of persuasion; coercive hard power, the stick, is the state's ability to affect change through military and economic means. The more persuasive soft power, the carrot, is the ability of a state to encourage, shape and attract a security actor's preferences. As with many distinctions in security studies, hard power and soft power operate on a spectrum rather than as a binary. Furthermore, Nye (2011) makes reference to the transition of power in the international system, from one dominant state to another, for instance the preponderance of power shifting back to the east vis-à-vis China and away from the west vis-à-vis the United States. This is further complicated by the diffusion of power away from the state, downwards to sub national groups including non-governmental organisation, civil society and the individual (Nye 2011). This is an indication of how national security, and national power, do not exist in a vacuum at the level of the state but are continuously affected by internal domestic factors as well as external, foreign and systemic factors.

Critical constructivism takes the concept of national power a step further by analysing and engaging with the concept of discursive power including knowledge, ideas, values, language, and ideology in a complimentary addition to simple material power (Nugroho 2008: 92). It is the combination and interaction of material power and discursive power that construct the world order and thus impact on national security (Nugroho 2008: 92). Constructivism indicates how discursive power produces and reproduces the intersubjective meaning of national power (Nugroho 2008: 92). It is discursive conditions that constitute national identity, national values and national interests (Wendt 1999:135-136), and therefore discursive elements of national power are an essential component of the explanation of national security. Constructivism does not postulate that national power capability in the realist conceptualisation is unimportant, but rather claims that effects of ostensibly material power are a virtue of the ideational forces that comprise them. In other words, the

material informs the ideational, and by extension the ideational thus informs the material.

Critically, critical constructivism is concerned with the inherent power relationships that result in one narrative or discourse of security becoming dominant while subjugating or marginalising others. The representations of security are in many ways a reflection of those who have the power to legitimise political action in the name of security, which brings to the fore concerns about underrepresentation in the security environment at all levels of analysis. From individuals' and communities' narratives been drowned out in national security discourse at a domestic level, to smaller states having the power to place security issues on the international security agenda. Latent power differentials raise several questions regarding the conceptualisation of national security: should the marginalised voices of powerless be included in national security discourse? If so, how should this take place? How would prioritization of national security take place? A zero-sum mentality of quantitatively assigning state resources and capabilities to national security concerns that affect the greatest number of actors and/or structures is limited and short sighted. Thus, national power as conceptualised within the national security quintet, is not merely material power capabilities and the discursive power to influence representations of security at a national level. A truly contemporary and inclusive conceptualisation of national power within a national security framework requires engagement with the power differentials that impact or indeed fail to impact a state's national security. It becomes important to assess not just what is being said but also what is not being heard. It is a methodological task of gigantic proportions, but one that contributes to a national security framework that is truly holistic, that is truly representative, that doesn't take the loudest and most dominating narratives about security as the starting point of analysis.

3.4.5. National will and national security

National will is an elusive construct, yet it plays an important role in determining national security. Realism provides a simplistic construction of national will as the state's ability "...to sustain sufficient extraction of resources from society to pursue political objectives through military force" (Kubiak 2014: 11). The Rand Corporation in the book *National Will to Fight* define the national will to fight as:

... the determination of a national government to conduct sustained military and other operations for some objective even when the expectation of success decreases or the need for significant political, economic, and military sacrifices increases.

However, these limited definitions of national will as rooted in support of war rhetoric is not useful in the context of a reconceptualization of national security; therefore, a broader, encompassing definition will be used within this research. National will is here defined as the degree of fortitude with which a state's citizens support its policies, even when such policies require a level of sacrifice (Key 1996: 3-4). It is thus evident that the concept of national will is an important aspect within the conceptualisation of national security. The concept of national will is commonly used in framing support for foreign policy, however within a reconceptualization of national security that deepens the concept of national security it will be used in terms of harnessing support for domestic and foreign policies.

Critical constructivism emphasises that reality is a result of social construction, and therefore it is necessary to challenge the argument that material factors are the only basis for policy making (Kubiak 2014: 25). As a consequence of this, and as emphasised above, national identities, national values and national interests are social constructs and are therefore not exclusively materially or objectively determined (Kubiak 2014: 25). As such, narratives are an important aspect of policy legitimisation which forms the foundation of national will; policy legitimation is achieved through the construction of a subjective version of the policy environment called an 'image' through the use of constructed and dominant narratives (Kubiak 2014: 25). These narratives are socially constructed and often draw on national interests, national values, and above all else, national identity in order to promote and ensure the requisite national will in support of the national security policies.

National will is a notoriously difficult concept to measure, as it is changeable and fluid, Morgenthau (as quoted in Key 1996: 3) noted, "A nation's will tends to manifest itself most clearly in times of national crisis, when the existence of the nation is at stake or *an issue of fundamental importance must be decided*" (emphasis added). The last part of this quote is significant in reconceptualising national security and providing a contemporary framework of analysis, as determining whether an issue is of fundamental importance, or is in the national interest, requires an engagement with a country's national identity and national values and need to be understood in

terms of its national power. Post, Raile & Raile (2010: 656) note that political will is a group-level concept, arguing against defining political will in terms of individual volition. As such, political will can be constructed and gain inter-subjective meaning within collectivities and be a reflection of public will and national will. It thus follows that national will, is the overarching political and public will of the state. National will through this critical constructivist lens is thus a political and social process “...which involves complexly aggregated preferences of a large number of political actors, and which is largely context-dependent” (Mujkić 2015: 11). In order to understand the national will, there is a need to engage with various areas of knowledge including social norms, political and security structures and the historical and social context (Post, Raile & Raile 2010: 672). National will remains dependent on the social construction of national identity and national values, for the defining of national interests and the legitimate use of national power.

National will, of the five elements of the quintet, is the least conceptualised and requires further analysis and conceptualisation through a trans-disciplinary approach that includes security studies, international relations, psychology and sociology among other disciplines. Yet its importance should not be undermined within the quintet, as national security requires the ability to harness national will for security policies that would require short term sacrifices in the pursuit of long-term national security strategies.

3.5. Conclusion

This chapter constructed a contemporary framework of analysis for national security, using the theoretical infrastructure of critical constructivism in order to frame national security around the five intersecting, inter-related and mutually constitutive concepts of national identity, national values, national interests, national power and national will. The national security quintet seeks to develop the limited and constrained conceptualisation of national security within traditional security studies by drawing on and expanding realism’s focus on inadequate conceptualisations of national values, national interests and national power. Critical security studies in contrast has failed to provide enough engagement with the concept of national security, despite the enduring relevance of states and their continued impact on the security of referent objects both above and below the state level. It was thus determined that there is a need for a reconceptualization of national security, that would use critical

constructivism to cement the relative strengths of both traditional security studies and critical security studies in providing a contemporary framework of analysis.

The first finding is that national security, as well as the five inter-related concepts of the national security quintet, is the consequence of social and historical factors at a domestic and international level which inform what is considered security and insecurity for any given state. As such, a national security framework for analysis is not a blueprint for determining what national security is for a state, but rather provides the tools of analysis that assist in determining what national security is for a state in a specific context at a specific time. The quintet will not provide a check list of national security issues, threats or priorities for each investigated state. Rather it will provide a conceptual landscape from which national security objectives, policies and priorities can be drawn out and understood in their social and historical context.

A second finding is that critical, rather than conventional constructivism, was the more appropriate lens for framing the national security quintet. Critical constructivism was shown to have a deeper and more critical engagement with the concept of national identity, particularly its construction through intersubjective meaning. Furthermore, the post-positivist orientation of critical constructivism allows for a deeper understanding of national security that is cognisant of the impact of power on national security representations, discourses and narratives.

The third finding is that national identity forms the foundation of the national security quintet, and therefore impacts an analysis of the other four concepts in the quintet. Drawing on national identity, its construction and reconstruction through intersubjective meaning, as the foundation for the quintet the other concepts are constructed through a mutually constitutive process. Critical constructivism brings to the fore questions regarding how national security is constructed through security representations, and how this draws upon national identity for legitimisation. National values can legitimise political action in the name of national security. National values derive from as well as inform national identity, the two concepts are inherently bound together. National interest, usually presumed to be a concern of traditional security studies, was conceptualised using critical constructivism. It was determined that far from being concrete and monolithic, national interests, like identity and values, are the result of a process of social construction and are capable of change over time as a state's identity changes. National power that is represented by more than a state's

material capabilities followed on from the discussion on national interests. It was determined that power is a combination of both material capabilities, be it economic strength or military might, as well as discursive power. That is the ability to speak national security onto certain issues. This was followed by a brief discussion on the necessity to be cognisant of latent power differentials, in societies, in-between states, and at a global level. It is necessary to engage the less powerful actors of security in order to prevent marginalisation or subjugation of their security issues. Finally, national will was analysed for its impact on national security. It was determined that national will draws on national identity and national values in order to determine what national issues are worth sacrificing national power for. The five inter-related, mutually constitutive and socially constructed concepts of national identity, national values, national interests, national power and national will provide the framework for analysis that is the national security quintet.

The fourth and final chapter of this research will critically engage with the national security quintet in order to provide recommendations for the pragmatic use of the framework of analysis.

CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1. Introduction

The concept of national security has traditionally been associated within a limited theoretical space, used extensively and almost exclusively by traditional security studies approaches and especially realist and neorealist approaches. However, national security remains in contemporary political and international relations language today, used by policy makers and politicians alike to justify policy decisions, garner support for electoral promises and instil a sense of national unity and identity among citizens. National security rhetoric is pervasive and as such even if the concept is academically associated with a very particular theoretical stance, it requires engagement beyond its limited and constrained definition and understanding. This research has outlined the infrastructure and scaffolding of a contemporary framework of analysis for national security, that seeks to unify the old and the new, the archaic and the modern and the traditionalist and the critical, to offer a more inclusive and updated understanding of national security within the new and non-traditional security landscape.

The enduring analytical usefulness of the state as a primary, if not exclusive, referent of security was not critically examined within this research, however this research has leaned heavily on the assumption that the state is, and will continue to be, an important unit of analysis. National security presupposes a state to provide security for. Many nay-sayers have declared the end of the state as a relevant concept, citing the diminishing relevance of sovereignty and the overarching effects of globalisation, however despite this the state remains surprisingly resilient and relevant to security studies. The reasons for this are varying and up for significant debate, but suffice to say that despite regionalism, localism, multinational corporations, the internet, migration and religion (Grant 2019) the state has endured, albeit in a more fluid and malleable construction. For as long as the state remains an actor in the international system, and for as long as people, both citizen and non-citizen, are impacted by the policies and actions of these states, the concept of national security will remain relevant and pertinent in security studies. This research provides a new way of looking at an old concept and provides fresh and contemporary perspectives on national security that can be used to examine the

impact of national security on security policy at the local, national, regional and global levels of analysis.

4.2. From the traditional to the critical

To truly look forward and re-conceptualise national security in a contemporary framing it was necessary to initially look back and determine the way in which national security was originally conceptualised. This required an engagement with the traditional approaches to security studies, which focussed specifically on realism and its more contemporary associate neorealism. Through a rich and thick critical literature review, the concept of national security was traced from seminal realist voices including Lippman¹³, Wolfers (1984) and Morgenthau (1985) to the more contemporary neorealists including Waltz (1979; 1988; 2000) and Walt (1991). The literature on traditional security studies approaches to national security outlined the overarching assumptions that inform the traditional understanding of national security. Firstly, traditional security studies rely on a positivist and rationalist epistemology and ontology and therefore conceptualises national security within the problem-solving approach. Secondly, traditional approaches to national security elevate the state as the exclusive referent object of security which is to say that the sanctity of the state in terms of territorial integrity and national sovereignty are prioritised in terms of the security objectives of national security. Thirdly, the realist and neorealist understanding of national security is informed by the constraining influence of the anarchical international system, which is accordingly a distinctive, dominating and enduring characteristic of the international system. The consequence of this is that states are, by the uncertainty of anarchy, focussed on survival and are inherently insecure. Fourthly, and as informed by the third assumption, the threat landscape of traditional national security approaches is rooted in the military and external manifestations of security risks and threats.

The assumptions outlined above create the environment for a specific and intentionally constrained understanding of national security, and consequently the traditional security studies approach has an overarching focus on a constrained conceptualisation of national values, national power and national interests. National security can thus be simplistically summarised as the utilisation and accumulation of

¹³ As quoted in Wolfers (1952) And Ayoob (1984).

national power, in all its forms, to pursue predominately external national interests and protect and enhance national values. This conceptualisation of national security is useful but incomplete and inadequate for understanding security in the post-Cold War context. The Post-Cold war security environment is marked by a smorgasbord of traditional and non-traditional security threats, from security issues that include territorial integrity to intra-state war and terrorism. In contrast to the traditional security studies approach to national security critical security studies was examined as a possible alternative.

Critical security studies is a diverse, fluid and multifaceted approach to security, and is at times deeply critiqued for its lack of ontological and epistemological coherence, and at other times praised for its conceptual space that allows for a multiple conceptualisations of security. Due to the many and varied approaches within critical security studies this research critically examined the general theoretical approach rather than focusing on a single, specific approach. In critically engaging with the critical security studies approach to national security it became apparent that the distinction between the traditional and critical approaches to security is not as clear cut as it first appears. As a part of the critical literature review, several seminal voices were identified, and two schools of thought were identified to offer nodal points for discussion, namely the Copenhagen School and the associated works of Buzan, Wæver & de Wilde (1998) as individuals and as collectives, and the more Critical Theory orientated, Welsh School and the associated thinkers Booth (1991; 2007; 2011) and Wyn-Jones (1999). Several other seminal voices were also identified including Krause & Williams (1996; 1997), and People & Vaughn-Williams (2015). It is from engagement with the critical security studies approach that several overarching assumptions were identified.

The shared assumptions of critical security studies can be summarised as follows; firstly, there is a commonly shared association with post-positivism within critical security studies, in that there is a rejection of the traditional security studies approach of security being understood in terms of empirical, rational and an inherently knowable, objective reality. Post-positivism elevates norms, ideas and the socially constructed nature of politics and security to understand and theorise around what it means to be secure. This approach to security opened the conceptual space for understanding national security, beyond the rigid constraints of the traditional

security studies approaches. This resulted in a broadening of understanding security beyond the military and economic elements towards a more inclusive and holistic conceptualisation that included various other sectors. These sectors are themselves up for debate, but an example is Barry Buzan's (2007) sectors of military, political, economic, environmental and social. Concurrently, there was a deepening of the concept of security, that included several other referents beyond the state which is favoured by the traditional security studies approach, this included a downward projection towards the security of communities, collectivities and individuals and the upward projection towards the security of regions and the international system as a whole. Already this indicates a much broader theoretical topography than the traditional studies approach, which means that for the most part national security has been overlooked within this critical turn in security studies in favour of a more nuanced framing of security that focusses on the multifaceted nature of security. This resulted in examining security within the critical security studies framework and applying the ideational understandings and analysis to a national security context. Therefore, it can be posited that there is an inherent focus on the impact of national values, national will and above all national identity on national security.

A careful analysis of the two security studies approaches shows that both make important and relevant contributions to a conceptualisation of national security, however both fail to adequately and holistically provide an understanding that is useful in contemporary security studies. As such there is conceptual space to develop a framework of analysis that makes use of the combined elements of both traditional and critical security studies to provide architecture that will allow for a contemporary reconceptualization of national security. The national security quintet is proposed as framework for analysis that can provide an integrated understanding of national security and that adequately addresses the limitations of traditional and critical security studies approach, while drawing from the conceptual strengths of both approaches.

4.3. The national security quintet

The national security quintet required a theoretical framing that allowed for the required malleability and paid sufficient deference to the ideational factors that impact a conceptualisation of national security. As such, critical constructivism was the natural choice of theory as it focusses on the socially constructed nature of the

world in general and security in particular. The national security quintet draws on the inter-related and mutually constitutive concepts of national identity, national values, national interests, national power and national will in order to re-conceptualise national security in a contemporary and holistic framework. Each concept is both independently and collectively important, and the foundation of the quintet is national identity which is the constructivist adhesive that unites the concepts of the quintet.

Constructivism was a natural theoretical infrastructure choice for the national security quintet, owing to its focus on the construction of security and the ideational factors that have an impact on national security. Critical constructivism was selected due to its epistemological shift away from the positivist limitations still found within conventional constructivism. Within a critical constructivist framing, conceptualising national security requires engagement with foundational questions regarding the construction and constitution of national identity as well as the other concepts of the quintet. It further requires an interrogation of dominant constructions and discourses of national security. Furthermore, critical constructivism allows for an engagement with the internal, domestic environment as well as the external, international environment, when determining how certain narratives become dominant and others become subjugated.

A re-conceptualised understanding of national security depends on national identity. This research explicitly rejected the archaic conceptualisation of national identity being stable, monolithic and incapable of any significant change that is favoured by traditional approaches to security. In contrast national identity is conceptualised as being fluid, changeable, multifaceted and the result of processes of social construction both within and external to the state. Furthermore, national security is informed by a construction of a national identity that is internally cohesive and externally distinctive, which serves to delineate the 'self' from the 'other'. This delineation is especially significant in terms of national security issue and threat identification, which is driven by constructed security narratives and discourses. The 'self' versus the 'other' dichotomy highlights the identity/difference spectrum, which reinforces exclusionary practices through the discourse of danger. That is, the representation of the 'other' as being an external danger to the 'self' strengthens national identity and national security discourses. Furthermore, national identity has

an impact on the social construction of national values, national interests, national power and national will.

National values, as discussed in the defining national security section above, are an essential element of national security, and the protection and enhancement of these shared values are used as a justification for national security policies. National values are those collective, group level values that emerge as a state's priorities even after trade-offs are necessary. As such, national values are central to the legitimisation of national security prioritisation, policy and strategy. National security priorities are the result of domestic security narratives and discourses that are reinforced by a shared national identity and national values.

National interests are more than exogenously predetermined foreign policy direction, rationally and deductively determined by a self-interested state in the pursuit of power. Rather, national interests are the aggregate and collective of all interests within a state, including the economic, social and political dimensions and are the result of inter-subjectively construction at a domestic and international level. National interests rely on ideational factors such as national identity and national values in order to derive meaning, substance and legitimisation. As a result, national interests are not fixed and constant, but rather fluid and changeable much like national identity.

National power has been conceptualised as more than the aggregate of the hard, material dimensions such as the military, and the soft, ideational dimensions such as diplomacy. Rather national power is rooted in discursive power, which is the ideational counterpoint to material power. This discursive power constructs and reproduces the intersubjective meaning of national power, and this in turn is constituted by and constitutes national identity, national values and national interest. Furthermore, it has been argued that there is a need to engage with the power differentials in determining national security, as the more powerful actors of security are able to dominate and ultimately subjugate the security discourses of the minorities and less powerful in society.

Finally, national will was examined as a fifth essential concept in the national security quintet. Although national will is often conscripted by traditional security studies approaches as being the willingness of a nation to partake in war or support foreign

policy, it has been shown to be more than that. National will is socially constructed and often context specific and refers to the level of support for domestic and foreign policies that may require a level of sacrifice. This is particularly relevant when determining and prioritising national security. National will is harnessed by policymakers through the construction of national identity, the pursuit and protection of national values, the shaping of national interests and the legitimate use of national power.

The national security quintet, using critical constructivism, offers a contemporary, holistic and comprehensive framework of analysis for national security. By drawing on the mutually reinforced constructions of national identity, national values, national interests, national power and national will, the quintet offers an engagement with national security that embraces the strengths and transcends the limitations of the traditional and critical security studies approaches. Each concept is both collectively and severally important for conceptualising national security, but when analysed as a collective rooted in the concept of national identity the quintet offers a useful tool of analysis for engaging with national security policy, strategy and theory.

4.4. Re-conceptualising national security: A strategy

This research requires a strategy on how to engage with the national security quintet as a framework of analysis that can be used to re-conceptualise a holistic, contemporary and comprehensive understanding of national security. Strategy is often conceptualised as the relationship between the 'ends', 'means' and 'ways'. 'Ends' are the specific desirable objectives to be accomplished through a strategy (Heffington, Oler & Tretler 2019: 3), within this research this relates specifically to creating a contemporary, comprehensive and holistic understanding of national security that has both pragmatic and theoretical utility. 'Means' are the resources and tools that can be harnessed in order to enact the strategy (Heffington, Oler & Tretler 2019: 3), this relates to the strategic use of the national security quintet as a framework of understanding for national security. Finally, the 'ways' are the methods that the 'means' will be used for in achieving the strategic 'ends' (Heffington, Oler & Tretler 2019: 3). This research relied explicitly and intentionally on critical constructivism as the most appropriate 'way' to conceptualise national security through the use of the national security quintet. It is important to note that the strategy to use the national security quintet is a multidimensional and iterative

process that is never complete, and that it requires continuous and ongoing critical analysis and engagement with the 'ends', 'means' and 'ways'. Due to the socially constructed nature of each of the individual concepts, as well as the mutually constitutive nature of the quintet, the process of conceptualising national security will never be complete as it requires a continued reflection and adjustment to the indicators in the domestic and foreign environment.

The strength of the national security quintet as a framework for analysis is its malleability in terms of trans-theoretical utility. Although critical constructivism was used in this research as the theoretical scaffolding of the quintet, this by no means precludes the use of the framework by other theoretical approaches. The efficacy lies in the conceptual emphasis in the framework of the quintet. By way of example: if national security was being analysed using the realist theoretical lens, as described above, with its overarching focus on the concepts of national values, national interests and national power (even within the limited conceptualisation of each), then those three elements can be prioritised in the subsequent analysis within the national security quintet. Significantly, this research argues that the other two concepts should not be ignored within the analysis of strategy, but rather engaged for their impact even at an epiphenomenal level. Thus, through the utilisation of the national security quintet, realism can adapt to the new security problematics that characterise the post-Cold War security environment.



Figure 2: A graphic representation of strategy: 'ends', 'ways' and 'means'.

The iterative strategy of reconceptualising national security is rooted in the national security quintet as a framework for analysis, its utility surpasses the theoretical confines of a single theoretical lens but rather offers the opportunity to engage the quintet across theoretical boundaries.

4.5. Avenues for further research

The national security quintet as a framework for analysis in reconceptualising national security has the potential to be utilised for theoretical and practical purposes, by intellectuals, academics and policy makers alike. There are therefore several significant avenues for further research:

- An analysis of the national security quintet through other theoretical lenses, including but not limited to realism, liberalism, post-colonialism, feminism etc. This would show how the national security quintet is a useful tool of analysis in a trans-theoretical way.
- An analysis of the national security quintet through other academic disciplines, including but not limited to, sociology, anthropology, psychology etc. This would reiterate the trans-disciplinary utility of the national security quintet.

- The national security quintet as a framework for analysis will need to be tested through the use of a case study or comparative case studies to illustrate its usability beyond pure theory. This could also include the practical application thereof, by proposing national security policy and strategy recommendations.

4.6. Conclusion

The development of the national security quintet as a contemporary, comprehensive and holistic framework of analysis for reconceptualising national security has been traced from the genesis of the research question to the strategy for utility of the quintet.

It was necessary to initially engage with the limitations and assumptions of traditional and critical security studies conceptualisations of national security. It was determined through a critical literature review that traditional security studies, particularly the archetypes of realism and neorealism, often conflated the terms of security and national security within fixed and limited parameters. Rooted in positivism and problem-solving, realism reifies the state as the primary referent object and unit of analysis, presupposes that states are rational actors that are constrained by the inherently anarchical international system, and that the military and external dimensions of security should be prioritised above all else. This conceptualisation of national security was determined to be useful but inadequate in contemporary security analysis.

Critical security studies on the other hand, is to a greater or lesser degree, rooted in assumptions of post-positivism, critical theory, security as a derivative concept as well as the broadening of security into additional sectors and the deepening of security away from the exclusively statist assumptions of traditional security studies. It was determined that critical security studies offers a more comprehensive and flexible construction of security generally but fails to adequately engage with the concept of national security specifically. It was thus determined that a reconceptualization of national security requires a theoretical infrastructure that is rooted in critical constructivism.

The national security quintet used the critical constructivist lens to re-conceptualise national security as being socially constructed through the mutually constitutive and

interrelated concepts of national identity, national values, national interests, national power and national will both collectively and severally. The national security quintet is a framework of analysis that draws on the relative strengths of traditional and critical security studies, while addressing the limitations of each. Constructivism in both its conventional and critical forms was discussed as an appropriate theoretical framing for the national security quintet. It was determined that critical constructivism with its deeper engagement with national identity, its focus on ideational factors and the social construction of reality was the most appropriate theoretical scaffolding for the national security quintet. Consequently, each of the individual concepts was engaged with through the critical constructivism lens, starting with national identity which serves as the foundational concept of the national security quintet. National values were analysed next to provide an inclusive understanding of the concept beyond the rigid confines of traditional security studies. A more comprehensive understanding of national interests was developed, that conceptualised national interests as being socially constructed and notably changeable. National power was theoretically strengthened as being more than merely hard and soft derivatives of military and economic strength, towards an engagement that includes discursive power and a reflection of latent power disparities in national security discourse. Finally, national will was conceptualised as more than a state's appetite for war, but as the willingness of a state's citizens to legitimise and support national security policies, even if that support requires a level of sacrifice. The harnessing of national will is an essential part of reconceptualising national security.

Following the establishment of the national security quintet as a framework of analysis for reconceptualising national security, including the brief overviews of each of the individual concepts, it was necessary to develop an appropriate strategy for the use of the framework. Strategy within this context comprised of the traditional elements of 'ends', 'means' and 'ways'. The strategic 'end' of reconceptualising national security is achieved through an analysis using the national security quintet as the strategic 'means', or methods, and the strategic 'ways' are the chosen theoretical lenses. The theoretical lenses include critical constructivism, which was emphasised in this research, or alternative theories including realism, liberalism and post colonialism among others. This emphasises the trans-theoretical utility of the

national security quintet as a contemporary and comprehensive framework of analysis.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adler, E. & Barnett, M. 1998. Security Communities. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Adler, E. 1997. Seizing the middle ground: Constructivism in world politics. European Journal of International Relations, 3(3): 319-363.

Adler, E. 2001. Constructivism and International Relations. In Handbook of International Relations, edited by W. Carlsnaes, T. Risse & B. A. Simmons. London: Sage Publications.

Agius, C. 2013. Social Constructivism. In Contemporary security Studies 3rd edition, edited by A. Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Alexandrov, M. 2003. The Concept of State Identity in International Relations: A Theoretical Analysis. Journal of International Development and Cooperation, 10(1): 33-46.

Ayoob, M. 1984. Security in the Third World: The Worm about to Turn? International Affairs, 60(1): 41-51.

Barkawi, T. & Laffey, M. 2006. 'The Postcolonial Moment in Security Studies', Review of International Studies, 32 (2): 329–352.

Baldwin, D.A. 1997. The Concept of Security. Review of International Studies, 23: 5-26.

Ben-Haim, Y. 2018. Positivism and its limitations for strategic intelligence: a non-constructivist info-gap critique, Intelligence and National Security, 33(6): 904-917.

Bester, P.C. 2019. Emerging Challenges in Terrorism and Counterterrorism: A National Security Perspective. Internet: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330728224_EMERGING_CHALLENGES_IN_TERRORISM_AND_COUNTERTERRORISM_A_NATIONAL_SECURITY_PERSPECTIVE. Access: 14 July 2019.

Biko, H. 2019. Africa Reimagined: Reclaiming a Sense of Abundance and Prosperity. South Africa: Jonathan Ball Publishers.

Bilgin, P. 2008. Critical Theory. In Security studies: An Introduction, edited by P. Williams. London – New York: Routledge.

Booth, K. 1991. Security and Emancipation. Review of International Studies, 17 (4): 313–326.

Booth, K. 2007. Theory of world security. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Booth, K. 2011. International Politics: The Inconvenient Truth. In Realism and World Politics. Edited by K. Booth. Routledge: New York.

Brincat, S. 2016. Traditional, Problem-Solving and Critical Theory: An Analysis of Horkheimer and Cox's Setting of the 'Critical' Divide. Globalizations, 13(5): 563-577.

Brookings Institute. 2019. Creating one market under the African Free Trade Area: Progress and challenges. Internet: <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/africa-in-focus/2019/01/16/creating-one-market-under-the-african-free-trade-area-progress-and-challenges/>. Access: 11 July 2019.

Browning, C.S. & McDonald, M. 2013. The future of critical security studies: Ethics and the politics of security. European Journal of International Relations, 19 (2): 235–255.

Buzan, B. 2007. People, States & Fear: an agenda for international security studies in the post-Cold War era. 2nd edition. Essex: European Consortium for Political Research Press.

Buzan, B. & Hansen, L. 2009. The Evolution of International Security Studies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Buzan, B. Wæver, O. & de Wilde, J. 1998. Security: A New Framework for Analysis. USA: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Campbell, D. 1998. Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity (revised edition). USA: University of Minnesota Press.

Cho, Y.C. 2009. Conventional and Critical Constructivist Approaches to National Security: An Analytical Survey. The Korean Journal of International Relations, 49(3): 75-102.

Connolly, W.E. 2002. Identity/Difference: Democratic Negotiations of Political Paradox. USA: University of Minneapolis Press.

Co, R.W. 1986. Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory. Millennium, 10(2), 126–155.

Cox, R.W. & Sinclair, T.J. 1996. Approaches to World Order. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Das, R. 2009. Critical Social Constructivism : "Culturing" Identity, (In) Security, and the state in International Relations Theory. The Indian Journal of Political Science, 70(4): 961- 982.

Deudney, D. 1990. The Case Against Linking Environmental Degradation and National Security. Millennium Journal of International Studies, 19 (3): 461–76.

Deudeny, D. 2011. Anarchy and violence Independence. In Realism and World Politics, edited by K. Booth. USA & Canada: Routledge.

Elman, C & Jensen, M. 2014. The Realism Reader. New York: Routledge.

Emmel, N. 2014. Sampling and Choosing Cases in Qualitative Research: A Realist Approach. London: Sage Publications.

Emmers, R. 2013. Securitization. In Contemporary Security Studies 3rd Edition, edited by Allen Collins. United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Fanon, F. 1961. The Wretched of the Earth. New York: Grove Press.

Fierke, K. 2007. Critical Approaches to International Security. Oxford: Polity Press.

Frankel, J. 1970. National Interest. London: Pall Mall Press Ltd.

Freedman, L & Raghavan, S. 2008. Coercion. In Security studies: An Introduction, edited by P. Williams. London – New York: Routledge.

Frueh, J. 2004. Studying Continuity and Change in South African Political Identity. In Identity and Global Politics, edited by K.C. Dunn. USA: Palgrave Macmillan.

Fukuyama, F. 2018. Identity: The Demand for Dignity and the Politics of Resentment. USA: Macmillan Publishers.

Given, L. 2008. The SAGE Encyclopaedia of Qualitative Research Methods. USA: Sage Publications.

Glaser, C.L. 2013. Approaches to security. In Contemporary Security Studies 3rd edition, edited by A. Collins. Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Goff, P.M. & Dunn, K.C. 2004. Introduction: In Defense of Identity. In Identity and Global Politics, edited by K.C. Dunn. USA: Palgrave Macmillan.

Goff, P.M. & Dunn, K.C. 2004a. Conclusion: Revisiting the Four Dimensions of Identity. In Identity and Global Politics, edited by K.C. Dunn. USA: Palgrave Macmillan.

Grant, M.L. 2019. The Beginning of the End of the Nation State? Internet: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/marklyallgrant/2019/01/03/the-beginning-of-the-end-of-the-nation-state/#15bffd1e21dc>. Accessed: 01 August 2019.

Grant, M.J. and Booth, A. 2009. A Typology of Reviews: An Analysis of 14 Review Types and Associated Methodologies. Health Information & Libraries Journal, 26: 91-108.

Guzzini, S. 2018. Hans J. Morgenthau and the Three Purposes of Power. DIIS Working Paper 2018: 4. Internet: <file:///C:/Users/Dasheek/Downloads/GuzziniDIISWP2018-4-HansJ.Morgenthauandthethreepurposesofpower.pdf>. Accessed: 01 November 2019.

Heffington, S., Oler, A. & Tretler, D. 2019. A National Security Strategy Primer. Washington, D.C: National Defense University Press.

Henderson, A. & McEwen, N. 2005. Do Shared Values Underpin National Identity? Examining the Role of Values in National Identity in Canada and the United Kingdom. National Identities, 7(2): 173-191.

Herz, J.H. 1950. Idealist Internationalism and the Security Dilemma. National Identities, 7(2):173-191.

Hönke, J. & Müller, M-M. 2012. Governing (in)security in a postcolonial world: Transnational entanglements and the worldliness of 'local' practice. Security Dialogue, 43 (5): 383-401.

Hough, P. 2008. Understanding Global Security (2nd edition). London: Routledge.

Jablonsky, D. 2002. The state of the national security state. Parameters, 43(4):4-14.

Jepperson, R.L., Wendt, A. & Katzenstein, P.J. 1996. Norms, Identity and Culture in National Security. In The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics, edited by P.J. Katzenstein. New York: Columbia University Press.

Jung, H. 2019. 'The Evolution of Social Constructivism in Political Science: Past to Present', SAGE Open. doi: 10.1177/2158244019832703.

Katzenstein, P. 1996. Introduction: Alternative Perspectives on National Security. In The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics, edited by P.J. Katzenstein. New York: Columbia University Press.

Key, L.E. 1996. Cultivating National Will: An Introduction to National. Maxwell Paper No. 5. Alabama: Will. Air University Press.

Kilby, R.W. 1993. The Study of Human Values. United States: University Press of America.

Klotz, A., Lynch, C., Checkel, J., & Dunn, K. 2006. Moving beyond the Agent-Structure Debate. International Studies Review, 8(2), 355-381.

Kowert, P. 1998. National identity: Inside and out. Security Studies, 8(2-3): 1-34.

Kowert, P. 2001. The Peril and Promise of Constructivist Theory. Ritsumeikan Journal of International Studies, 13(3): 157-170.

Kowert, P. & Legro, J. 1996. Norms, identity and their limits: A Theoretical reprise. In The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics, edited by P. J. Katzenstein. New York: Columbia University Press.

Krause, K. & Williams, M.C. 1996. Broadening the Agenda of Security Studies: Politics and Methods. Mershon International Studies Review, 40(2): 229-254.

- Krause, K. & Williams, M.C. 1997. Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases. London & New York: Routledge.
- Kubiak, J.J. 2014. War Narratives and the American National Will in War. United States: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kumar, R. 2014. Research Methodology: a step-by-step guide for beginners. London: Sage publications.
- Leffler, M.P. 1990. National Security. The Journal of American History, 77(1): 143-152.
- Liotta, P.H. 2000. To Die For: National Interests and Strategic Uncertainties. Parameters: US Army War College Quarterly, XXX(2): 46-57.
- Louw, M.H.H. 1977. Introduction to the National Security Concept. In National Security A Modern Approach, Edited by M.H.H. Louw. South Africa: Institute for Strategic Studies
- McDonald, M. 2013. Constructivism. In Security Studies: An introduction, edited by Paul D. Williams. USA & Canada: Routledge.
- McGowen, P.J. & Nel, P. 2002. Power, Wealth and Global Equity: An International Relations Textbook for Africa (2nd edition). Cape Town: Institute for Global Dialogue & University of Cape Town Press.
- Mearsheimer, J.J. 2002. Realism, the Real World, and the Academy. In Realism and Institutionalism in International Studies, edited by In M. Brecher & F.P. Harvey. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Merriam-Webster. 2019. Meaning of Quintet. Internet: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/quintet>. Access: 29 June 2019.
- Morey-Hawkins, J. 2017. Thematic Analysis. In The SAGE Encyclopaedia of Communication Research Methods, edited by M. Allen. Thousand Islands: Sage Publications.
- Morgenthau, H. 1985. Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace (6th edition). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Mujkić, A. 2015. An Introduction to Political Will. In Political Will: A short introduction case study - Bosnia and Herzegovina, edited by D. Abazović & A. Mujkić. Bosnia and Herzegovina: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (FES).
- Mutimer, D. 2013. Critical Security Studies: A schismatic History. In Contemporary Security Studies third edited, edited by A. Collins. United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Nel, P. 2002. Theories of International Relations. In Power, wealth and Global Equity: An International Relations Textbook for Africa, edited by P.J. McGowen and P. Nel. Cape Town: UCT Press.

Neuman, L. 2014. Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

Notshulwana, M. 2012. DBSA: South Africa's national interest and BRICS: Towards bandwagoning or balancing? Policy Brief No: 4. Internet: <https://www.dbsa.org/EN/About-Us/Publications/Documents/Policy%20Brief%20No.%204%20South%20Africa%E2%80%99s%20national%20interest%20and%20BRICS%20-%20Towards%20bandwagoning%20or%20balancing.pdf>. Accessed: 28 August 2019.

Nuechterlein, D.E. 1976. National Interests and Foreign Policy: A Conceptual Framework for Analysis and Decision Making. British Journal of International Studies, 2(3): 246-266.

Nugroho, G. 2008. Constructivism and International Relations Theories. Global & Strategis, 11(1): 85-98.

Nye, J.S. 1999. Redefining the National interest. Foreign Affairs, 78(4):2-35.

Nye, J.S. 2011. The Future of Power. New York: Public Affairs.

Nyman, J. 2013. Securitization Theory. In Critical Approaches to Security An introduction to theories and methods, edited by L.J. Shepard. London & New York: Routledge.

Peoples, C. and Vaughan-Williams, N. 2015. Critical Security Studies an introduction 2nd edition. Abingdon: Routledge.

Post, L.A., Raile, A.N.W. & Raile, E.D. 2010. Defining Political Will. Politics & Policy, 38(4): 653-676.

Rand Corporation. 2018. National Will to Fight: Why Some State's Keep Fighting and Others Don't. Santa Monica: Rand Corporation.

Risse-Kappen, T. 1996. Collective Identity in a Democratic Community: The Case of NATO. In The Culture of National Security, edited by P.J. Katzenstein. New York: Columbia University Press.

Rokreach, M. 1973. The Nature of Human Values. New York: The Free Press.

Said, E. 1978. Orientalism. New York: Pantheon Books.

SAIIA. 2013. The African Union and Security. Internet: <https://saiia.org.za/research/the-african-union-and-security/>. Accessed: 25 January 2020.

- Shepard, L.J. 2013. Introduction: critical approaches to security in contemporary global politics. In Critical Approaches to Security An introduction to theories and methods, edited by L.J. Shepard. London & New York: Routledge.
- Singh, N.K. & Nunes, W. 2016. Nontraditional Security: Redefining State-centric Outlook. Jadavpur Journal of International Relations, 20(1): 102–124.
- Smith, S. 1996. Positivism and Beyond. In International Theory: Positivism and Beyond, edited by S. Smith, K. Booth & M. Zalewski: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, S. 2005. The Contested Concept of Security. Critical Security Studies and World Politics, edited by K. Booth. Boulder: Lynn Rienner Publishers.
- Smith, S. 2006. The Concept of Security in a Globalizing World. In Globalization and Conflict, edited by R.G. Patman. New York: Routledge.
- Tang, S. 2009. The Security Dilemma: A Conceptual Analysis. Security Studies, 18(3): 587-623.
- Tarry, S. 1999. “Deepening” and “Widening”: An Analysis of Security Definitions in the 1990s. Journal of Military and Strategic Studies, 2(1): 1-13.
- Taylor, M. 1974. The Legitimate Claims of National Security. Foreign Affairs, 52(3), 577-594.
- Tracy, S.J. 2010. Qualitative Quality: Eight “Big-Tent” Criteria for Excellent Qualitative Research. Qualitative Inquiry, 16 (10): 837-851.
- Walt, S. 1991. The Renaissance of Security Studies. International Studies Quarterly, 35(2): 211-239.
- Waltz, K. 1979. Theory of International Politics. Addison: Reading.
- Waltz, K. 1988. The Origins of War in Neorealist Theory. Journal of Interdisciplinary History, 18 (4): 615-628.
- Waltz, K. 2000. Anarchy is what States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics. International Organization, 46(2): 391-425.
- Wæver, O. 1995. Securitization and Desecuritization. In On Security, edited by D. L. Ronnie. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wæver, O., Buzan, B., Kelstrup, M & Lemaitre, P. 1993. Identity, migration, and the new security agenda in Europe. London: Pinter Publishers.
- Weldes, J. 1996. Constructing National Interests. European Journal of International Relations, 2(3): 275-318.

Weldes, J., Laffey, M., Gusterson, H., & Duvall, R. 1999. Introduction: Constructing Insecurity, In Cultures of Insecurity: States, Communities, and the Production of Danger, edited by J. Weldes, M. Laffey, H. Gusterson, & R. Duvall. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Wendt, A. 1992. Anarchy is what States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics. International Organization, 46(2), 391-425.

Wendt, A. 1999. Social Theory of International Politics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Williams, P. 2008. Security Studies: An Introduction. London – New York: Routledge.

Wilson, J.Z. & Black, D. 2004. Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity: Human Rights, Zimbabwe's "Land Crisis" and South Africa's "Quiet Diplomacy". In Identity and Global Politics, edited by K.C. Dunn. USA: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wolfers, A. 1952. "National Security" as an Ambiguous Symbol. Political Science Quarterly, 67(4): 481-502.

Woodward, K. 1997. Identity and Difference. London: Sage Publications.

Wyn-Jones, R. 1999. Introduction. In Security, Strategy, and Critical Theory, edited by R. Wyn-Jones. Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

SUMMARY

RE-CONCEPTUALISING NATIONAL SECURITY:

A FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS

By

ELIZABETH MAY FERGUSON

SUPERVISOR : MR ROLAND HENWOOD
CO-SUPERVISOR : COLONEL (RET) ROBIN M BLAKE
DEPARTMENT : DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCES
DEGREE : MASTER OF ARTS IN SECURITY STUDIES

It would be an exaggeration to claim that the symbol of national security is nothing but a stimulus to semantic confusion, though closed analysis will show that if used without specifications it leaves room for more confusion than sound political counsel or scientific usage can afford.

Wolfers 1952: 438

Intellectuals, academics and policy makers alike continue to conjure national security as a catch-all phrase that evokes a call to arms against real or perceived threats, a unifying dictum around which society can rally and be mobilised, and in some cases, as a justification for limitation of certain fundamental rights and freedoms. Phrases such as “threat to national security”, “national security policy”, “national security priorities” and “national security strategies” are part of the rhetoric that shapes citizens engagement with the state. However, very little has changed in conceptualising national security; it continues to be favoured by the traditional security studies approaches, especially realism and neorealism, drawing from the likes of Arnold Wolfers (1952), Hans Morgenthau (1985) and Walter Lippmann, who was among the first to explicitly define national security in the 1940s (as quoted in Wolfers 1952: 484). Although realism has made significant theoretical strides since the 1940s, the concept of national security has to a large extent remained unchallenged and unchanged. As such national security, as originally conceived, has failed to reflect the constantly changing international and national security

environments, and has not adapted to the new security problems of contemporary politics and international relations. As the opening quote to this summary cautions, to continue to use national security as an ambiguous symbol, without reflecting on its meaning or conceptualisation, will create more confusion than we can afford.

This research has re-conceptualised national security by providing a comprehensive, holistic and contemporary framework of analysis. It was important to first orientate this research within the veritable smorgasbord of security studies approaches and literature. Traditional and critical security studies were selected as the two primary nodal points of engagement. Traditional security studies, as already noted, engages with national security explicitly but only within limited and constrained constructions. Critical security studies, which sought to re-orientate security studies after the Cold War to adapt to new security issues and threats, has failed to effectively engage with national security. This is despite the fact that states continue to impact security and therefore national security continues to remain relevant in security studies.

The national security quintet as framework for reconceptualising national security was developed using critical constructivism, and seeks to provide an understanding of national security that draws on the strengths of both traditional and critical security studies while addresses the limitations of each. Using the five inter-related, mutually constituted and socially constructed concepts of national identity, national values, national interests, national power and national will, a framework of analysis for national security has been developed. Each concept is collectively and severally significant in any analysis of national security, and has relevance in national security theory and praxis.

The strength of the national security quintet as framework for analysis lies in its ability to be used in a trans-theoretical and trans-disciplinary way and can be used as a tool for understanding sub-national and international factors of security. The national security quintet allows academics and policy makers alike to elevate chosen concepts within the framework for the foundation of their analysis.

Key Words

National security, traditional security studies, critical security studies, constructivism, national identity, national values, national interests, national power, national will, National security quintet.