# The Consequences of Securitizing Health Crises in Southeast Asia: opportunities or obstacles?

## Nadirah Mohd Azmi

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Leeds

School of Politics and International Studies

# Table of Contents

## List of Tables and Figures

### Tables

### Figures

# Abbreviations

AADMER – ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response

AAHTF – ASEAN Animal Health Trust Fund

AI – Avian influenza

AIDS – Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome

Ads-Net – ASEAN Disease Surveillance Net

AEC – ASEAN Economic Community

AHM – ASEAN Health Ministers

AIHD – ASEAN Institute for Health Development

APEC – Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation

APSC – ASEAN Political-Security Community

ASC – ASEAN Standing Committe

ASEAN Security Community

ASCC – ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community

ASEAN – Association of Southeast Asian Nations

ASEAN+3 – Association of Southeast Asian Nations plus Three Countries

ATFOA – ASEAN Task Force on AIDS

ATWGPRR – ASEAN Technical Working Group on Pandemic Preparedness

AU – African Union

AWP – ASEAN Work Programme on AIDS

BBC – British Broadcasting Corporation

CCC – Component coordinating country

EAS – East Asia Summit

EID – Emerging infectious disease

EOC – ASEAN Emergency Operations Centre Network

EU – European Union

FAO – Food and Agriculture Organization

FMD – Foot and mouth disease

GDP – Gross domestic product

GISN – Global Influenza Surveillance Network

HIV – Human Immunodeficiency Virus

HPAI – Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza

IHR – International Health Regulations

ILI – Influenza like illness

NAMRU – Naval Medical Research Unit

NCD – Non-communicable diseases

NTS – Non-traditional security

OIE - Office International des Epizooties or World Organization for Animal Health

SARS – Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome

TB  – Tuberculosis

SDG - Sustainable development goals

STD – Sexual Transmitted Disease

UN – United Nations

UNSC – United Nations of Security Council

US - United States of America

WHO – World Health Organization

# The Consequences of Securitizing Health Crises in Southeast Asia: opportunities or obstacles?

## Introduction

This thesis examines the consequences of securitizing policy challenges in a non-Western context. Security is usually considered something that is positively valued or as something that is good or desired that we should strive for (Gjørv 2012, p.836). More security is usually considered good as it can legitimize and justify policy choices. Attaining positive security involves protection from threats and the presence of conditions, thus facilitating human 'flourishing', and in this sense positive security can be understood as 'security plus' (Nyman 2016). Positive security can be associated with multiple actors as the referent object (Gjørv 2012), including humans (McsSweeney 1999) and states (Roe 2008). In turn, some scholars view negative security as an 'absence or lack of threat/s', and it often associated with traditional militarized and state-centred security (Gjørv 2012). However, a key point of academic contention is whether security should be framed as a positive or a negative value. In some academic circles, there is a deeply ingrained view that 'security should be seen as negative, a failure to deal with issues of normal politics' (Buzan et al. 1998, p.29) since it will only bring more particular emergency politics which are not necessarily positive and unproductive and sometimes can be manipulated for a political purpose. It is this view of securitization that this thesis will test, and ultimately challenge, in exploring how infectious disease has been addressed as a security challenge in Southeast Asia.

**Table 1 Positive/Negative Security**

| POSITIVE SECURITY | NEGATIVE SECURITY |
|---|---|
| Security is desirable | Security is bad and should be avoided |
| Protection from threats | Absence of threat |
| Facilitated by multiple actors | Associated with traditional security (military and state-centric) |

Much of the focus of this positive/negative debate has been on the Copenhagen School's securitization theory. Securitization theory explores what happens when particular threats are labelled as a security issue by the securitizing actors (Buzan et al. 1998). Securitization scholars argue that if an issue is successfully securitized, it moves from the realm of 'normal' politics to the realm of 'emergency' politics, where exceptional measures are legitimized and issues are treated differently: using 'threat, defence, and often state-centred solutions' (Wæver 1995). In this context, the security dynamic has provided the securitizing actors with a means to legitimize their actions in attracting attention and extra resources to an issue that may otherwise be overlooked. Aradau (2004) draws on securitization theory and as such critiques securitization as negative because of its processes (non-democratic, fast-tracked procedures) and its outcomes (produces categories of enemy 'others'). Others have suggested that securitization is not necessarily negative (Roe 2012; Floyd 2011). Roe, for example, while recognizing that security/securitization can be problematic, argues that securitization can have a positive impact. The consequences of securitization debates has been furthered explored in other policy areas such as HIV/AIDS (Garrett 2005; Piot 2000; Elbe 2006; Selgelid & Enemark 2008), climate change (Trombetta 2007; Trombetta 2008; Scott 2012; Brauch 2008), migration (Leonard 2010; Carrera & Hernanz 2015) and pandemics (Elbe 2010a; Enemark 2009; Youde 2008).

However, most of the positive/negative debate reflects the European experience only. Empirically, the meaning of security tell us that security means different things in different contexts, that it doesn't have an unchanging 'essence'

2

(Ciuta 2009, p.303). Moreover, the notion of security also has no inherent value, which has serious implications for the negative/positive debate (Nyman 2016). Therefore, if we are trying to understand security by studying how security is used, we cannot justifiably ignore alternative voices. Hence, Nyman suggested that in order to understand the value of security, it is important to study different empirical contexts to see how different actors use it and how individuals experience it, in order to understand security practices (Nyman 2016). It is in this regard that the research aims to strengthen the securitization theory by adding the perspectives of a non-Western area, the Southeast Asia region.

The rationale for choosing Southeast Asia is threefold. First, in the last decade, empirical studies of securitization especially issue on migration, the environment and health have grown in number and relevance (Balzacq et al. 2015, p.14). Health for instance, has been appearing on national security agenda with some issue like pandemic influenza now apparently well-established (McInnes & Rushton 2012). In addition, there is commonly held view that securitization theory is Eurocentric as it reflects European security concerns and questions and only few empirical studies have been conducted in a non-Western, non-democratic, or even Asian context (Curley & Herington 2011, p.146; Caballero-Anthony & Emmers 2006a). Wilkinson (2007) for instance, pointed out that the theoretical framework presented by the Copenhagen School is currently unsuited to empirical studies outside the West because of a framework biased towards democratic systems, and the assumption that ideas of 'normal' or 'emergency' politics are applicable globally. However, the description only relevant a few years ago. By contrast, it is against such odds that the framework of securitization has arguably become the most widely applied theoretical framework in addressing the NTS in the recent years (Jones 2011, p.407). Indeed, securitization theory has been regularly deployed by analysts of non-traditional security (NTS) issues (Curley & Herington 2011; Herington 2010; Emmers 2003a; Collins 2003; Caballero-Anthony 2008a). Yet the presence of the securitization theory outside Europe certainly deserves critical scrutiny (Bilgin 2011, p.401). Hence, Southeast Asia is a suitable case to study the value of security.

Second, although the amount of literature on securitization theory in the Southeast Asia has increased, securitization theorists struggle to explain the gap between the security discourse and the regional practice (Jones 2011, p.405; Hameiri & Jones 2013). The practice of the 'ASEAN Way' has been the central debate in studying Southeast Asia's actions and inactions. The 'ASEAN Way' is a code of conduct that includes principles of non-interference, consensus and consultation, and non-binding and non-confrontational decision-making (Acharya 2009b). These norms have been identified as the cause of ASEAN collective inaction over the years (Acharya 2009b; Kim & Lee 2011; Jones 2010) as the decision-making process has often become slow and highly politicized. Therefore, some scholars (Emmers 2003a; Caballero-Anthony 2008a) have argued that there is little evidence that securitization of the NTS issue goes beyond the rhetoric of securitization into deeper institutionalization. However, the recent security environment in Southeast Asia indicates that NTS threats play a major role in affecting the regional cooperation of the member states (Caballero-Anthony 2016; Caballero-Anthony 2010). Indeed, there is a noticeable trend among states and non-state actors of turning to regional and multilevel relationships as preferred frameworks, especially through the authority of regional institutions, in response to the NTS threat (Caballero-Anthony & Cook 2013b; Zimmerman 2014; Pennisi di Floristella 2012). In this sense, studying the consequences of securitization theory provides a good platform to examine the contrasting literature in the Southeast Asia region and the governance of security.

Third, beside practices different norms from those found within the European milieu of the Copenhagen School, each member states of the Southeast Asia region has different political and economic system. For instance, based on Table 2, while Singapore has one of the highest per capita income in the world, several of the mainland Southeast Asia states are among the poorest. The countries in the region also feature a number of different types of government. These include democratic and autocratic. In addition, there are countries with absolute monarchy and constitutional monarchies.Therefore, the region provides a complex testing site for the securitization theory (Lo Yuk-ping & Thomas 2010).

**Table 2 Demographic and Socio-Economic Information of ASEAN States**

| State | Types of Government | Major Ethnic Groups/ Religion | GDP per Capita (US$) Estimation | Land Area/ Population (Million/M)/ Estimation 2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Brunei Darussalam | Absolute Monarchy | Malay / Islam | $78,200 (2017) | 5,765 sq km/0.4 M |
| Kingdom of Cambodia | Monarchical / Quasi-democracy | Khmer/ Buddhism | $4,000 (2017) | 181,035 sq km/16.2 M |
| Republic of Indonesia | Quasi-democracy | Malay / Islam | $12,400 (2017) | 1,904,569 sq km/260.6 M |
| Laos People's Democratic Republic | Communist | Laos/ Buddhism | $7,400 (2017) | 236,800 sq km/ 7.1 M |
| Malaysia | Monarchical / Quasi-democracy | Malay / Islam | $29,000 (2017) | 329,847 sq km/ 31.4 M |
| Union of Myanmar | Military | Burmese/ Buddhism | $6,200 (2017) | 676,578 sq km/ 55.1 M |
| Republic of the Philippines | Democratic | Filipino/ Christians | $8,300 (2017) | 300,00 sq km/ 104.3 M |
| Republic of Singapore | Quasi-democracy | Chinese/ Buddhism | $93,900 (2017) | 697 sq km/ 5.8 M |
| Kingdom of Thailand | Monarchical / Quasi-democracy | Thai/ Buddhism | $17,900 (2017) | 513,120 sq km/ 68.4 M |
| Socialist Republic of Vietnam | Communist | Viet/ Buddhism | $6,900 (2017) | 331,210 sq km/ 96.1 M |

**Source:** (Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) 2017; ASEAN 2018). Compiled by the author

**Empirical Case Study: Securitization of Health Crises in a Non-Western Context**

The thesis empirically tests the application of securitization theory to health challenges. This is because, as noted by Curley and Herington (2010, p.142), despite the increase in public health scholarship, the empirical analyses of key cases on the link between health and security remain scarce. Similarly, Rushton (2011, p.59) also proposed that 'a framework for global health security should be assessed against empirical evidence and not solely depend on the basis of theoretical

5

composition'. Southeast Asia provides a suitable test site since the intersection between health and security has become more apparent. The diversity in geography and history, including social, cultural and economic differences, have contributed to the highly divergent range of health statuses and health systems across and within the countries of Southeast Asia (Chongsuvivatwong et al. 2011). Therefore, health issues and communicable diseases, such as TB, HIV/AIDS, rabies, and cholera, and non-communicable diseases (NCD) like diabetes, cardiovascular disease and cancer, record high mortality and morbidity rates in the region compared with other regions, and are considered as a key national concern (Narain & Bhatia 2010; Coker et al. 2011; Braillon 2011).

It was with the outbreak of SARS that ASEAN became more actively involved in health-security linkage (Lamy & Phua 2012; Caballero-Anthony 2006). The emergence of H5N1 and H1N1 have further pushed the health issue into being considered as a serious security threat to the region (Jones 2011, p.404; Haacke & Williams 2008; Curley & Herington 2011; Herington 2010). Therefore, Southeast Asia provides a suitable test site since the region is becoming the hotspot for emerging infectious diseases including those with pandemic potential (Coker et al. 2011; Lamy & Phua 2012, p.236; Acuin et al. 2011, p.534).

In this sense, the aim of the thesis is to critically explore and examine the outcome of the linking of health and security at the regional level. In so doing, the thesis builds on the literature of securitizing health issues by focusing on the process of constituting SARS, avian influenza (H5N1) and swine flu (H1N1) as security challenges in the Southeast Asia region. These epidemics have distinctive characteristics that make their emergences significant and interesting. Unlike other communicable and non-communicable diseases, these epidemics are especially susceptible to securitization because of their impacts caused morbidity and mortality in a relatively short time, and because of the manner in which they spread. Although these diseases have not killed as many people as HIV/AIDS or malaria, they have the potential to spread quickly and far beyond the points of origin or discovery. Therefore, these diseases can be considered ideal representatives of the health

6

threats as the features of 'speed' and 'dread' of infectious diseases make them suitable for securitization (Enemark 2007, p.8).

The objective of this research is to examine the consequences of securitizing health crises at the regional level, and in particular whether such a move has pushed the region to strengthen cooperation or resulted in states becoming more state-centric in accordance with the region's historical norms and practices. The focus of the analysis is therefore on how the process of securitization of health challenges occurs at the regional level and the implications of such process at the regional level. It thus seeks to contribute to bridging critical theoretical and empirical approaches to the study of security. The research, therefore, sheds light on the positive and negative security debate by adding more voices and a periphery perspective (Buzan & Acharya 2007, p.286). In order to achieve the stated aim and objective, the research questions are as follows:

Which health issues have been collectively securitized?

What is the impact of securitizing infectious diseases at the regional level? Has framing the disease as a regional security issue encouraged regional cooperation between states, or have they responded in line with narrow interests, according to the region's practice of the 'ASEAN Way'?

## Methodology

This section will provide a brief explanation of the research methodology, which will be considered in greater depth in the next chapter, Chapter 2.

Qualitative methodology is the appropriate strategy in order to answer the research questions; it provides detailed data in order to challenge the longstanding beliefs and assumptions underpinning securitization theory and to understand the depth and complexity of Southeast Asian perspectives on the security framework. Given the membership of ASEAN and its long history, the thesis adopts the case study approach. In this regard, the methodology of this research has been based on process tracing. Document analysis is used to gather data and it has been complemented by interviews with elite key informants, as official documents and statements only tend to reflect the official position of the ASEAN and do not reveal the internal processes leading up to those positions. These interviews provided data on the perceptions of such actions and the reasons behind any actions taken. Moreover, this method assisted the researcher in the interpretation and clarification of choosing statements and documents. The primary data generated from the interviews supplemented and verified the findings from the existing secondary data, which has determined the implications of framing those diseases. Data collected have been triangulated with academic materials (on health, security studies, security in Southeast Asia, and regional institutions) in order to confirm and validate them.

Prior to undertaking the fieldwork, ethical approval was obtained from the University of Leeds Research Ethics Committee. The aims of this research have been explained to all the individuals who were contacted and interviewed. They have been informed of the methods used for handling their personal data, the justification for requesting their data, the duration of data use and storage, and the guarantees concerning the rightful use of the data.

Two interviews were conducted in English, while another two interviews were conducted through a combination of the English and Malay languages. Likewise, the

8

methods in the document analysis used a combination of English and the Malay language where applicable. As the Malay language is spoken in four out of the ten states in ASEAN, the language itself can be fully utilized to add richness to the data that have been collected.

### Value and Relevance of the Research

The value and relevance of this research is twofold.

First, it contributes to the advancement of the existing knowledge on the positive and negative impacts of securitization in relation to health issues, in this case by adding empirical perspectives from the non-Western context.

On one hand, literature on framing health security issues such as the spread of HIV/AIDS (Prins 2004; Singer 2002; Elbe 2002) or the outbreak of SARS and pandemic influenza (Enemark 2009; Davies 2008; Kamradt-Scott & McInnes 2012; Abraham 2011) has been well presented to the international system, positioning health issues as an actual serious threat to the international system. Despite the increasing amount of literature on the health-security linkage, a growing body of work has also begun to revisit the initial claims made regarding the linkage (Smith 2015; Peterson 2002; Enemark 2009; McInnes & Lee 2006; Nunes 2015). However, like other IR theories, securitization theory is too Western-centric as it does not represent the voices, experiences, knowledge claims, and contributions of the vast majority of the societies and states in the world, beyond the West (Acharya 2014, p.647). The presence of a Euro-centric bias in the securitization theory has been said to weaken the application of the framework outside of the Western context, particularly in the non-Western, non-democratic and transitional states (Wilkinson 2007; Curley & Herington 2011). In contrast, the Southeast Asia region has been regularly deployed in securitization debates on NTS issues (Emmers 2003a; Curley & Herington 2011; Herington 2010; Collins 2003; Caballero-Anthony 2008a; Caballero-Anthony et al. 2006). Nevertheless, in the non-Western regions, literature on the health-security linkage remains scarce (Curley & Herington 2011, p.142). Although health issues are

9

a global phenomenon, how they are addressed varies across geographic regions, and in Southeast Asia this is shaped by the political culture known as the ASEAN Way. Therefore, adding more voices and experiences from non-Western contexts, in particular from the Southeast Asian region, can challenge the assumptions about the consequences of securitization theory.

Second, the thesis challenges the narrow belief that the ASEAN institution is only rhetorical and their norms and practices are absolute, examined further in Chapter 3, by making a contribution to the understanding of how ASEAN has actually responded in facing this key NTS issue.

## Structure of the Thesis

This thesis is structured into two parts: theoretical framework and empirical case study, and each of these are divided into six chapters. Chapter 1 sets out a thorough discussion of the theoretical framework, namely the Copenhagen School of securitization theory. This theory acts as guidance for the empirical analysis of this thesis. It begins by outlining the debate between the main theoretical schools on how to broaden security concept without losing its analytical value. Securitization approach provides an analytical framework to construct particular issue as security threats. The section continues with a discussion of the core assumptions of the theory before highlighting those aspects of the theory that this thesis argues need to be revisited for the purpose of this research: namely, the argument that securitization theory is currently unsuited to the empirical studies outside of the Western region, the question of whether securitization would need extraordinary measures to identify a successful securitization move, and the debate around whether securitizing NTS issues could bring more harm than good.

Chapter 2 specifically addresses the linkage between health and security and the research design and is divided into two sections. The first part of the chapter aims to trace the evolution of the health-security linkage in the global health discourse by examining the scholarly debate on the health-security nexus: the major

10

events that have shaped the rise of the health-security notion. The chapter then continues to provide an overview of how Southeast Asia regional security practice is traditionally structured. The chapter thereby sets up the background to explore the implications of securitizing health issues in Southeast Asia. Chapter 2 continues to explain and justify the selections of research design and case studies, the methodology, and challenges occurring during the research. In order to strengthen the reliability and validity of the collected data, triangulation strategies are also discussed. The last section explains the ethical requirements needed to conduct an ethical fieldwork.

Chapter 3 presents the findings of an analysis of the ASEAN health discourse since the establishment of the organisation in 1967 until 2010. In doing so, the chapter highlights the process of securitizing infectious diseases at the regional level in order to identify the type of health challenges that have been collectively securitized and whether there have been shifts on how the institution views the health issues. The chapter argues that only diseases with pandemic potential that could give threaten the region's economic stability have been successfully securitized at the regional level and ASEAN has managed to create practical mechanisms to address the issue, setting aside the critiques that the regional institution is only a talking shop.

The following two chapters present the main findings of the case studies on the Southeast Asian policy development within the health security field. Chapter 4 picks up the relevant context argued in the previous chapter by focusing on the implications of securitizing series of infectious disease outbreaks in Southeast Asia, a region which has different norms and practices from those found within the European milieu of the Copenhagen model. In parallel with the debate on other NTS issues that have been subject to contested securitizing moves that have been critiqued as ineffective, counterproductive and unjust, the chapter examines the consequences of securitizing the health crises at the regional level. The chapter demonstrates that while there are some disadvantages to the regional effort of constructing the pandemic disease as a regional security threat, the advantages of

such a move outweigh the drawbacks, particularly in terms of establishing regional health mechanisms.

Chapter 5 examines how selected ASEAN member states respond to the health-security linkage, and in particular whether this shift has encouraged closer regional cooperation or, on the contrary, whether securitization has reinforced the historical regional practice in which collective action has often been ineffective. In parallel with the debate that securitization can hinder cooperation, this chapter examines the states' responses to such claim. This chapter contends that instead of causing states to become more state-centric, thus hindering cooperation, framing pandemics as a regional security issue encourages states to become more region-centric, setting aside the region's norms in important instances.

The final chapter, Chapter 6, concludes the empirical findings in this research. In response to the debate in relation to other NTS challenges – in particular, whether this framing of NTS issues will actually improve or lessen any attempts to govern them more effectively – the thesis then explores the consequences. To answer the question, this research investigates the process of securitizing health crises in the Southeast Asia region. Besides contributing to the existing knowledge on security studies, the research also contributes to the regional framework, particularly to their security and policy issues in addressing the health crises.

# Chapter 1

# Securitization Theory

## 1.1   Introduction

This chapter aims to present the structure of the chosen theoretical framework in order to prepare for the analysis of empirical findings in the subsequent chapter. The section sets out with the evolution of security concepts before the debate on the re-conceptualization and widening of the concept of security are explored. The debate created a significant question of how to broaden the scope of security to encompass other non-military issues, while avoiding losing its analytical value. As part of the review, the second section examines two possible outcomes of this debate: securitization theory, and human security. Although human security is viewed as one of the solutions to the debate, it has been criticized for its lack of a meaningful concept, particularly in addressing non-traditional security threats. It is in this contextual gap that securitization theory has attempted to fill. However, the theory also comes with conceptual and methodological shortcomings. By offering an outline of the theory and the different weaknesses identified by security scholars, this chapter highlights the value of the theory while noting it requires further refinement.

## 1.2   Redefinition of Security Concept

Security concept is an ambiguous term as it can be a goal, an issue area, a research programme, or a discipline (Haftendorn 1991, p.3). The Oxford English Dictionary

13

defines security as 'the state of being or feeling secure' [and] 'the safety of a state or organization' (Waite & Hawker 2009). Simply put, security in layman's terms describes the physical and psychological condition of feeling safe and secure from any dangers or threats. However, these definitions are different from the concept of security used by international relations (IR) theorists and experts when referring to national security or security policies as they offered more detailed explanations of the term.

Since the outbreak of the Second World War, security studies have become synonymous with the issue of war and peace. Especially in the midst of the Cold War era, the definition of security was straightforward: anything that involved war and military forces and the state as the only actor in the international system. The security studies literature fits comfortably within the familiar realist paradigm. There are three main assumptions made by realists. First, international systems are in a state of anarchy – there is no international authority that can enforce the agreement and prevent the use of force. Second, the state is the main actor within the international system. Third, power is the defining feature in the international environment. As the state is the main referent of security policy, realists argue that the main responsibility of the state is to protect its citizens against internal and external threats. Hence, a state would use any means, including use of force, to protect their interests, territorial integrity and sovereignty as power and stability are the decisive determinant factors for a state to achieve security (Keohane 1986; Mearsheimer 1995).

Clearly, this model of security is determined by placing the military issues at the central focus of the field. Low-level political issues such as health, welfare and environment are viewed as issues of domestic politics and need to be kept separate from the 'high politics' of state security (Hough 2008, p.3). However, in the years leading up to the end of Cold War, the restricted paradigm of the security concept no longer sufficiently addressed the phenomenon in the contemporary world. These assumptions about security have been questioned above by the group known as

'wideners' ever since the failure of the traditionalist analysts in anticipating the end of the Cold War and the emerging threat posed by NTS problems.

The urgent need to challenge the conventional view of security ushered in abother school of thought, the so-called 'wideners', to widen the security studies agenda. On one hand, with the rise of NTS threats in the late 1980s, the 'widener' scholars such as Buzan (1991), Ullman (1983) and Mathews (1989) believed that the concept of security should not be restricted to the military realm only but should instead incorporate other issues, such as the economic, social and political, which are both the causes and effects of security. On the other hand, the 'deepeners' believed that the security agenda should not be restricted to solely focus on the state but also opened out to include other security referents, such as individuals, communities and social groups. For instance, Buzan, a leading scholar among the wideners, in his seminal book, *People, States and Fear*, points out that security should not be limited to the military discourse as people are also affected by threats in different areas. He also maintains that beside states, other actors in the international system also play significant roles (Buzan 1991). For the wideners, the damaging impacts of these threats on states are no less than the effects impacting on military power. The main aim of the wideners is to extend the range of knowledge and understanding of the concept of security studies.

The traditionalist scholars, likewise, contend the overuse of the term security. Walt raised his concern at the wideners' attempts to broaden the notion of security as the useful prioritization function of security studies could be lost if everything is being regarded as an urgent matter of security (Walt 1991, pp.212–213). For him, security studies are still about the phenomenon of war. Hence, proposals including other non-military issues risk the logic of security studies. If all issues, such as pollution, disease or economic recessions, are regarded as security issues, it would destroy the intellectual coherence and thus make it more difficult to devise solutions. Moreover, the emergence of other threats does not mean that the threat of war is eradicated. Walt asserted that although, 'other hazards exist, [this] does not mean that the danger of war has been eliminated' (Walt 1991, p.213). Thus, any attempt to

ignore or eliminate the role of military forces in security studies is deemed irresponsible. For the traditionalist, widening the security agenda is risky as it can make both scholarship and state policy incoherent. Putting too much effort into widening the security agenda will risk the essential meaning of security becoming void.

The idea of the 'wideners' positioning 'everything as a security issue' has also been refuted by scholars exploring the non-military dimensions of security. Although the word 'security' presently attracts heightened political attention, the ability could be diminished if we overuse or abuse the concept. An example of this has been raised by Deudney (1990) in favour of expanding the meaning of security on the issue of environmental. In his words, 'If everything that causes a decline in human well-being is labelled a "security threat", the term loses any analytical usefulness and becomes a loose synonym for "bad"' (Deudney 1990, pp.463–464). Similarly, Selgelid and Enemark (2008) voiced their concern with characterizing HIV/AIDS as a security threat. Such an effort may put too much strain on the concept of security: if the term 'security' is used too loosely, it will lose its meaning and no longer be able to play a useful role in political discourse (Selgelid & Enemark 2008, p.458). Huysmans (1998), likewise, was concerned that the notion of security will become a 'trivial concept' when the difference between security and non-security problems cannot be deliberately established. Wæver (1995, p.47), one of the leading scholars of widening the agenda, was also concerned by the attempt to widen security issues. He believes that, '...addressing an issue in security terms will allocate the state an important role in addressing it. This is not always an improvement'.

Nonetheless, the traditional conception of defining the notion of security, wherein the security concept should stay in the realm of military issues, does not mean that the non-traditional security threats do not exist nor that they have no impact in the world or the community. Indeed, the traditional definition of security is widely criticized by other academics as it neglects to recognise the whole situation of the 'real' world when the emerging threats posed by non-military issues like territory

conflicts and resource scarcity have the same impact as military issues (Ullman 1983).

In this sense, the traditionalist fails to define the notion of security based on the contemporary world. At the same time, the widener's objective of treating security as a 'catch-all concept' resulted in losing the intellectual coherence of the security concept. In this context, the question focuses on how to broaden the scope of security to encompass non-military issues, while avoiding a loss in its analytical value, but none of these assumptions effectively represent the realityof the contemporary security agenda.  One way to settle this debate is through the concept of human security (Newman 2001, p.241).

## 1.3  Human Security

Human security is based on the intertwined concepts of 'freedom from want' - community, economic, food, health, personal and political securities - and 'freedom from fear'. Human security literature can be traced back to 1994 when the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) published a Human Development Report. This report consisted of seven dimensions: namely, food, economic, political, health, personal, community and environmental.  In the report, human security was defined as the security of people enjoying freedom from want in the midst of threats posed by the seven dimensions and freedom from fear - associated with the state-centric perspectives of the realists such as freedom from authoritarian states (Paris 2001; Nishikawa 2010). This in turn seems parallel to the agenda of broadening the discourse within the academic study of security. The UN's concept of human security suggests a concern with quality of life rather than emphasizing weapons and defence. Human security emphasizes the security of individuals before the state. Hence, scholars studying NTS threats like poverty, malnutrition, disease, or environmental degradation use the human security approach  in an attempt to encourage the state to give more attention and resources to the NTS threats from the perspective of the security of the people (James 2013; Karyotis 2012; Lo Yuk-ping & Thomas 2010).

17

The idea of human security seems plausible as it attempts to address the gap that the traditionalists and the wideners failed to fill. Paris (2001) offers a positive review on the practicality of applying the human security concept in security studies. Using a matrix, shown in Figure 1.1, he portrayed security studies as a four-cell matrix with human security occupying one of these cells. Paris claims that such an avenue would contribute to IR and security studies, as the idea of human security may serve,

> as a label for a broad category of research in the field of security studies that is primarily concerned with non-military threats to the safety of societies, groups, and individuals, in contrast to more traditional approaches to security studies that focus on protecting states from external threats. (Paris 2001, p.96)

**Figure 1.1 Matrix of Security Studies**

What is the Source of the Security Threat?

| | Military | Military, Nonmilitary, or Both |
|---|---|---|
| State | **Cell 1** National Security Conventional realist approach to security studies | **Cell 2** Redefined security e.g. environmental and economic security |
| Security for Whom? Societies, Groups, and Individual | **Cell 3** Intrastate security (e.g. civil war, ethnic conflict, and genocide) | **Cell 4** Human Security (e.g. environmental and economic threats to the survival of societies, groups and individuals) |

However, despite such contributions, human security does not escape from criticism, whether of their conceptual framework or of their analytical weaknesses (Newman 2010; Thomas & Tow 2002). The first negative effect broadens the concept of

18

security to encompass anything that threatens the security of the people, like unemployment or homelessness. Khong (2001, p.232) argues that such efforts to prioritize everything will end up prioritizing nothing. Keith and Krause further argue that 'a broad vision of human security is ultimately nothing more than a shopping list' and this might cause the approach to become a loose synonym for 'bad things that can happen' (Krause 2004a, p.40). Indeed, the term would become meaningless if everything were regarded as a security issue, as this could confuse scholars and policymakers. Second, and more important, it is not clear that anything is gained by linking 'human security' to issues such as education, fair trade practices and public health' (Krause 2004b, pp.367–368). In other words, a more narrowly defined concept of human security is needed to achieve greater analytical and policy value, which could differentiate this concept from the traditional security elements (Thomas & Tow 2002, p.178). It is based on these arguments that the research turned to other approaches of studying the NTS threats.

## 1.4  The Copenhagen School of Securitization Theory

While the wideners believe that the inclusion of other issues as a security threat could enhance the analytical value of the security concept, the traditionalists argue that this move would only make the term lose its meaning and they emphasize the need to focus on the military issues in order to preserve the value of the notion of security. The debate has left a huge gap in defining the security concept in terms of broadening the scope of the term security in encompassing non-military issues, while at the same time avoiding a loss of security's analytical value. Meanwhile, the broad definition of the human security approach might cause vagueness when applying the approach within a sophisticated conceptual and analytical framework.  The Copenhagen School of securitization theory offered an alternative answer in the debate on broadening the security agenda without losing its analytical value. This school of thought fills the gap in the debate between the traditionalists, wideners and human security scholars as they choose a middle position in the debate.

Securitization theory is a constructivist-based theory which originated from the Copenhagen school of thought. The securitization concept first entered the IR arena through Wæver (1995) before he cooperated with Buzan and de Wilde to fully polish the framework (Buzan et al. 1998). In one of the most notable writings offered by this school, 'Security: A New Framework for Analysis', written by these scholars, they argue that security is about 'survival'. It is when an issue is presented as posing an existential threat to a designated referent object (traditionally, but not necessarily, the state, incorporating government, territory and society) (Buzan et al. 1998, p.21). Based on this definition, the school maintains the security-survival-logic found in a traditional understanding of security. Yet, they have broadened the concept of security by extending it beyond military security into four other categories: environmental, economic, societal and political security. At the same time, the school refuted the idea that 'everything is security'. They argued that labelling an issue as 'security' takes it beyond the realm of normal political discourse and allows exceptional actions to be undertaken (Buzan et al. 1998, p.26). Given that context, the school developed an analytical framework to study security known as the securitization and desecuritization model in order to overcome the vagueness in identifying security issues.

Instead of accepting the traditionalist view that the domain of security issue is still in the military sector and proposing a universal list of definitions of security concepts offer by the wideners, the Copenhagen School provides security tools for analyzing many different types of threat by focusing on how particular developments or issues are discursively constructed as a security threat. The theory explores the logic of security to find out what differentiates security and the process of securitization, which is merely political (Buzan 1999, p.3). Securitization theory provides a better view in recognizing a 'normal' politics moving into a realm of 'unusual' of emergency politics. Most importantly, the securitization theory answers the question of how to determine an issue as a security threat without losing its analytical value, as it requires a securitization formula, namely the speech act, target audience, etc. to legitimize their actions.

The idea of securitization theory draws heavily on the theory of language, specifically from the branch known as 'speech act theory'. Through the theory of language, we can regard 'security' as a speech act. Wæver (1995, p.35) indicated that the speech acts are in theory illocutionary in nature. 'Security is not of interest as a sign that refers to something more real; the utterance itself is the act. By saying it [security] something is done (as in betting, giving a promise, naming a ship)'. In other words, labelling something as a security issue turns it into such, although this does not necessarily mean that a real threat is present (Buzan et al. 1998, p.26).

The meaning of security is constructed when the securitizing actor state, as the particular referent object, is threatened in its existence. The actor then claims the issue is positioned as an absolute priority on the government agenda and invoked for an emergency measure to ensure the referent object's survival. This moved the issue from normal politics to the realm of emerging politics. In other words, when someone utters that 'X' is a threat to the government's survival, then it becomes securitized, as it becomes the government priority whereby immediate actions will be taken by the government. This does not mean that everyone can become securitizer, as they need to meet certain conditions; the words have to be said by someone in authority, in the right context and according to certain pre-established rituals or conventions (Peoples & Vaughan-Williams 2010, p.95).

Meeting these conditions does not in itself guarantee that an issue will become securitized: the critical condition for a successful securitization process also requires that the audience be persuaded. In this context, a complete securitization process will not occur even when the securitizing actor has presented something as an existential threat. At this stage, for an issue to be regarded as a security issue, the audience has to accept the interpretation of events by the actor and recognize that extraordinary measures must be implemented. In other words, the issue is only securitized if the audience accepts it as such and if the securitizing actor fails to convince the audience via the speech act, the act is merely 'securitizing move' (Buzan et al. 1998, p.25). In other words, gaining audience acceptance is a crucial move towards securitization. At the same time, the role of audience has prevented

21

the securitizing actors to abuse their power as the securitization process is largely determined by the audience (Buzan et al. 1998, p.31).

Buzan et al. (1998) have referred to it as a two-stage process. In the first stage, to ensure that an issue is addressed as a security issue, an actor has to make the issue into an existential threat. However, it does not automatically mean it has become a security issue. This step is known as the securitizing move, but to ensure the issue is securitized, the audience should accept the move made by the securitizing actor. Thus, the second stage, for an issue to be regarded as a security issue, the audience has to accept the interpretation of events by the actor and recognize that extraordinary measures must be implemented. Through this stage, it is not only revealed how an issue becomes a security issue but also examines which actors initiate the securitizing move and the need for the audience to accept the interpretation

Security is not an objective condition but the outcome of specific social processes. In order for any threat to become represented and recognized, it needs to be analysed by examining the 'securitizing speech act'. As what Wæver (1995, p.55) argues, 'we can regard security as a speech act...the utterance itself is the act...by saying the word, something is done'. In this context, the concept of security can be best defined as a 'self-referential practice, because it is in this practice that the issue become a security issue - not necessarily because a real existential threat exists but because the issue is presented as such a threat (Buzan et al. 1998, p.24). Moreover, securitization is 'essentially inter-subjective process'(Buzan et al. 1998, p.30). Although the securitizing actor managed to present such an existential threat, without the acceptance of the relevant audience, the threat could not be securitized. Only through an audience's consent that such move can precede which will put a 'normal' political issue into a realm of emergency politics agenda. This highlights the importance of inter-subjectivity in determining the success of such process.

Based on the above discussion, the Copenhagen School provides the best answer in broadening the concept of security without losing its analytical value. Both

22

traditional and NTS issues can be incorporated into the security concept through the significant criterion in the Copenhagen School - an issue is defined by the intersubjective establishment between securitizing actor and audience of an existential threat, which legitimates actors to deal with that threat using extraordinary means. Because of that, securitization theory has become the most widely applied theoretical framework by analysts for 'non-traditional' security issues (Jones 2011, p.408), such as issues on religion (Fox & Akbaba 2013), transnational crime (Laki 2006; Emmers 2003a) and drug trafficking (Crick 2012). Despite its success in transforming the security discourse, the theory is not without conceptual and methodological shortcomings. Hence, the next section will be examining the shortcomings of the theory in order to promote its advancement despite the weaknesses.

## 1.5  The Value of Securitization/Security

Securitization theory has two main contributions. First, it stressed the responsibility of securitizaing actors in facing the securitize issue (Wæver 2003, p.24) and second, it serves as an early warning to the referent object (Lo 2012). In other words, based on Waever's argument, securitization mechanism supports the explicitness behind the logic of securitizing move as the securitizing actors need to clarify their reasons for securitizing one issue over others. Therefore, it can avoid misuse of power among the practitioners (Wæver 1999, p.337). Because ofsuch contributions, securitization theory has become the most widely applied theoretical framework by analysts for 'non-traditional' security issues (Jones 2011, p.408), such as issues on religion (Fox & Akbaba 2013), transnational crime (Laki 2006; Emmers 2003a) and drug trafficking (Crick 2012).

Despite securitization theory has been distinguish as one of the most vibrant areas of research in contemporary security studies, scholarly debates on the securitization theory have broadly focus on the the positive/negative debate of security/securitization theory. As discussed briefly in the previous chapter, the Copenhagen School study view security as inherently negative and usually best avoided (Aradau 2004; Buzan et al. 1998). Aradau describes securitization's

23

production of 'us' and 'them' categories as something inherently negative; as there will always be winners, the 'security-haves, there will always be losers, 'the security have-nots' (Aradau 2008, pp.397–400). Even (Wæver 2011, p.469), the pioneer scholar's of the Copenhagen School warned about the unavoidable negative effects of securitization whenever the theory is used including the logic of necessity, the narrowing of choice, the empowerment of a smaller elite. They view the realm of security as opposed to normal politics and based on these assumptions they argue that in most cases 'security should be seen as a negative, as a failure to deal with issues as normal politics' (Buzan et al. 1998, p.29).

Nevertheless, not all scholars agreed with the claim. Rejecting securitization's Schmittian inheritance on the extraordinary politics which constitutes in the Copenhagen School, Booth's understanding of security as emancipation can be read direct counter to such the characteristics of securitization (security) - state-centric, military centric, zero-sum (Booth 2007, p.165). In fact, he instead suggest an alternative renderings to the 'negative' perception on securitization;

> Such a static view of the [securitization] concept is all the odder because security as a speech act has historically also embraced positive, non-militarised, and non-statist connotations … Securitisation studies, like mainstream strategic studies, remains somewhat stuck in Cold War mindsets.(Booth 2007, p.165)

Booth furthered argued that therefore securitization has the potential to resist an 'expectation of hostility' where in positive terms it is able to embrace the potential for human equality which Aradau postulates (Booth 2007, p.165).

Other authors,however, suggest an alternative to overcome this debate by focusing on studying the value of security/securitization in a context. Context, although mentioned by the key authors in the debate, but rarely elaborated upon or taken to its logical conclusions. Rita Flyod for example, the pioneer of the alternative approach to evaluate securitization argued that securitization is neither priori positive

24

nor negative; rather, it is issue-dependent (Floyd 2007, p.327). Floyd (2010, p.4) is against on the narrow perception on the outcome of such securitization move will only end up with either conflict or security dilemma as what the securitization's scholars like (Wæver 1995) claimed. Instead, Floyd which in her later work defines negative security as 'morally wrong' and 'morally prohibited' and positive security as 'morally right' and 'morally permissible', suggests that 'securitizations are not categorically morally wrong, but rather that, depending on the beneficiary of environmental security policies, securitization can be morally permissible' (Floyd 2010, p.4). Thus, she suggests that we need to focus on the consequences or the outcome of securitization in judging securitization. Thus, utilizing a consequentialist ethics, Floyd posits that security outcomes will inevitably serve the interests of some rather than others. In fact, Floyd believes that security for the many rather than for the few – is generally indicative of a positive securitization (Floyd 2007, pp.337–340). Here, she gave an example of Ebola epidemic in West Africa in 2014 where she claimed that securitization in this case is morally required as the harm of failing to securitize the issue is greater than the securitization outcome (Floyd 2016).

As she focuses in the consequences or the outcome of securitization in judging securitization, she argued that 'securitization has no intrinsic value; what matters are the consequences of securitization alone' (Floyd 2010, p.7). In this way, securitizations are judged on their consequences. Therefore, inspired by just war tradition, Floyd proposed a rendition of securitization theory by introducing 'just securitization theory (JST) (Floyd 2010; Floyd 2011; Floyd 2014). JST differentiates between morally permissible and prohibited securitizations only. In other words it is concerned with what securitizing actors are permitted to do, not with what they are morally required to do (Floyd 2014, p.121). Therefore, Floyd (2011) have set criteria that determine the moral rightness of securitization is akin to the Copenhagen School's criteria that can determine the existence of securitization and its success. Unlike the majority of securitization scholars, led by Wæver, object to securitization and advocate desecuritization as the preferred long-term option on normative grounds, Floyd believes that just like securitization, desecuritization itself is not automatically justified, but needs to fulfil criteria in order to be just (Floyd 2016,

p.78). Hence, Floyd stressed the revision of securitization theory is necessary in order to examine the moral rightness of securitization as securitization is not necessarily 'bad' as it depend on the context. In order to do that, the analyst must: 1)establish whether or not existential threats are objectively present; 2) examine both the intentions of aggressors and those of securitizing actors; 3) identify universal values that determine the referent object's moral legitimacy. In fact, in her most recent article, Floyd proposed two issues to avoid securitization from causing direct harm by justifying the securitization itself: when to request security and how to request security, since securitization is very much concerned with security speech (Floyd 2018, p.59).

The important of context in determining the outcome of securitization has been agreed by other scholars. Other scholars also supported the idea that security/securitization is not inherently 'bad' as the consequences of such move should depend on the context. Roe's 2014 article on 'Gender and "positive" security', draws on gender and feminist approaches to emphasize different context in determining security (Roe 2014). Meanwhile, (Gjørv 2012, p.838) who relates context, practices and values in the positive/negative debate, arguing for a 'multi-actor, practice-oriented security framework'. Through the multi-actor security approach, he emphasized the role of actors is the key in determining the result of securitization as it allows us to observe and assess what practices between actors appear to succeed in given contexts, and what processes fail (Gjørv 2012, p.858). Meanwhile, (Nyman 2016), has emphasized 'the need for detailed empirical enquiry to see how different actors use security in different contexts and how individuals experience it, asking what different security practices do, what actions and habits they produce, and how they affect life experiences' (Nyman 2016). In other words, in order to understand the value of security, we need to study how it works and what it does in different empirical contexts. There is therefore much potential for other research on the value of security in different contexts. If we are trying to understand security by studying how security is used, therefore, we cannot justifiably ignore alternative voices. Following this alternative, the research is attempting to study how security is used and what it does in different empirical context by empirically tested it

26

in the Southeast Asia region. Nevertheless, the theory is not without conceptual and methodological shortcomings. Hence, the next section will discuss the shortcomings of the theory that will be addressed in the research.

## 1.6 The Shortcomings of Securitization Theory

There have been numerous attempts to develop, extend and revise securitization theory in order to address various shortcomings in the original formulation (Balzacq 2005; Jones 2011; Wilkinson 2007; Caballero-Anthony & Emmers 2006a; Floyd 2010). The major inadequacies summarised in this research include the positive/negative debate of securitization, the presence of Eurocentrism in the theory, and the role of emergency measures in defining the success of securitization, particularly in a collective regional arrangement. Despite their criticism, scholars attempting to address various shortcomings in the original formulation suggest the importance of this theory in the development of security studies. Therefore, this section draws from and expands upon these various critiques in order to develop a theoretical framework to be applied in this thesis.

### 1.6.1 Securitization or Desecuritization and Its Consequences

The school has offered an innovative and original view from a broad spectrum of security issues. Hence, this approach has become particularly influential in addressing new security threats; as a security issue, it offers a solution on how to answer questions on determining a normal political issue as a security threat without losing its analytical value (Floyd 2015). A number of scholars have begun to apply this theoretical framework in the construction of NTS threats such as the issue of religion (Mavelli 2013; Fox & Akbaba 2013), transnational crime (Laki 2006; Emmers 2003a), drug trafficking (Crick 2012), distribution of aid (Petřík 2008; Aning 2010), development (Hettne 2010), environmental degradation (Trombetta 2008), climate change (Brauch 2008), infectious diseases (Davies 2008; Herington 2010), HIV/AIDS (Elbe 2006), and pandemic influenza (Kamradt-Scott & McInnes 2012; Curley & Herington 2011). By moving the NTS issues higher up on either

27

international or national agendas, it legitimizes the urgent moves needed to address the threats. More security is usually considered good as it can legitimize and justify the leader's policy choices, especially policy in regards to the rise of NTS challenges. Moreover, securitization provides incentives for government policy-makers to devote greater attention and resources to an issue that may otherwise be overlooked. However, with such positive moves come some potentially negative consequences

The attempt at widening the concept of security has sustained inquiry into the effects of placing the label of security onto various types of non-traditional security (NTS). In order to evaluate the debate on the consequences of securitization theory, the thesis focuses on three policy areas: namely, environmental degradation, migration, and health, which the thesis claims received most attention on the international agenda (Balzacq et al. 2015, p.14).

One ultimate reason for the security linkage into NTS issues is to attribute a sense of urgency to the latter. Such steps are often said to have given greater attention to the NTS issues on the global political agendas, attracted more financial resources, generated new policy initiatives and benefited the causes by the involvement of wider ranges of stakeholders - HIV/AIDS and pandemics (Garrett 2005; Piot 2000; Curley & Herington 2011), climate change (Trombetta 2007; Trombetta 2008; Scott 2012; Brauch 2008), and migration (Leonard 2010; Carrera & Hernanz 2015; Karyotis & Skleparis 2013). As urgent mechanisms are needed in addressing the NTS issues, the security linkage is crucial to motivate emergency measures. As noted by Buzan, using the label 'security' on an environmental issue is a useful way of signalling danger and setting priority (cited in Wæver 1995, p.63). For instance, in countries known for the 'absence of a meaningful state response' in addressing NTS problems, securitizing HIV/AIDS at the international level has provoked action domestically, as happened in some African countries when securitization of the pandemic helped the issue climb the political agenda (Elbe 2006, pp.131–132). Moreover, such moves helped the state leaders to legitimize their implementation of extraordinary actions as in the case of the British interventions in Africa, where securitization of Africa helped the government to

28

legitimize its policy of 'war on terrorism' (Abrahamsen 2005). Meanwhile, due to the nature of the NTS threats – that they are transnational in scope, come at very short notice, and are transmitted rapidly due to globalization and the communications revolution (Caballero-Anthony 2008a) – framing NTS issues is crucial to attract regional and multilateral cooperation as national solutions are often inadequate, as in the case of transnational disease (Curley & Herington 2011; Davies 2008; Davies et al. 2012).

**Table 3 The Positive and Negative Debate on the NTS Issues**

| POSITIVE | NEGATIVE |
| --- | --- |
| Garner attention and resources | Diverting attention and resources |
| Legitimize securitizing actor's action | Securitizing actor misuses given power |
| Motivate emergency measures | Ineffective and counterproductive emergency measures |
| Strengthen cooperation | Hinder cooperation (State-centric attitude) |

However, a number of scholars have raised their concerns with the whole securitization agenda. Deudney (1990, p.463) for instance, argues, 'Not all threats to life and property are threats to security. Disease, old age, crime and accidents routinely destroy life and property, but we do not think of them as 'national security' threats or even threats to 'security'…. If everything that causes a decline in human well-being is labelled a 'security' threat, the term loses any analytical usefulness and becomes a loose synonym of 'bad''. As a result, expanding the meaning of security could only affect the term's intellectual coherence.

Based on Table 3, we can the positive/negative debate of While the aim is to garner attention and resources, such moves might perhaps divert the attention from other pressing issues (Mavelli 2013; Youde 2008). There is also a risk that addressing a health issue in security terms will lead to emergency responses which are ineffective, counterproductive or unjust (Enemark 2009; Nunes 2015). There is

also concern about the rise of the securitizing move as it can be manipulated by politicians for their own narrow goals. Securitization will only bring more particular emergency politics, which are not necessarily positive and unproductive and sometimes can be manipulated for a political purpose (Miller 2001). Bigo (2002, p.78) for example, offers the normative case against the securitization of migration. For him, securitizing the migration issue only results in the 'security professionals - those officials and bureaucrats who, empowered with privileged information, purport to authoritatively define threats, rather than responding to such threats 'out there' – creating unease and uncertainty among the immigrants for the purpose of promoting their own institutional interests. Another recurrent concern in the literature on securitization is that it could lead to state-centred approaches to securitized issues. The notion of security is seen as evoking a set of confrontational practices associated with national security (Trombetta 2008, p.586). As the international system is viewed as insecure, states would compete for security through military power enhancement. The security link, therefore, would only cause a state to become a state-centric, hence hindering cooperation (Peterson 2002; Enemark 2009).

Within security studies, there is a long-running debate about the opportunity to link environmental problems and migration with security. The debates relating to the former can be traced back to the 1960s, where a controversial bestselling book had raised concern over the impact of pesticides on human health (Carson 1962). It was the scale of the environmental challenges that encouraged a range of actors to suggest that climate change should be approached as a security threat especially with the possibility of environmental issues like the climate change linked with other sets of challenges like violent conflict, migration and weak states (Elliott 2011; Smith 2007; Homer-Dixon 1994; Homer-Dixon 1999; Trombetta 2014). While these scholars see the link is crucial to attract priority and funding, others are more sceptical about such moves. Some suggested that the link between climate change and failed states risked positioning these states as the source of the threat and prioritizing the needs of states (Dalby 1999; Barnett 2000). Meanwhile, Deudney (1990) warned that promoting environmental change as a security issue in general

30

could encourage military interference. In his view, treating environmental threats as security issues is conceptually confused and misleading as military attacks are totally different from environmental threats; the nature, sources, and agency of military threats differ from environmental degradation and from their timeframes (they are more immediate) and intention (they are usually intended). In another example, scholars are also debating the intention to link the issue of migration with the security agenda. They are afraid of the abuses of power by law enforcers when practicing rules on immigrants (Huysmans 2000) and also, the misleading perception on the relation between immigrants and the increasing rate of crime (Nunziata 2015). This shows that the discourse on the security-migration nexus is exaggerated and problematic (Karyotis 2007).

In this context, more security does not mean that it will improve any situation as securitization is a topological move from the realm of normal politics to extraordinary politics. By this it means that in an exceptional political situation as oppose to a normal one, the element of urgency embedded in the securitization theory causes the process of decision-making to be quick with the space and time allowed for deliberation, participation and bargaining constricted, compared to normal politics where decisions follow strict procedures; this change results in the militarized mode of thinking. Simply put, the securitization move only serves to accentuate a process which has been characterized by an authoritarian approach that brings extraordinary measures and moves the issue outside of democratic debate.

Even scholars engaged in securitization and hence, in 'widening' the security agenda like Buzan, Wæver, and de Wilde, are concerned about choosing securitization as the solution, as they argue that this carries its own hazards. Basically, 'security should be seen as negative, a failure to deal with issues of normal politics' (Buzan et al. 1998, p.29) since it will only bring more emergency politics, which are not necessarily positive and unproductive and sometimes can be manipulated for a political purpose. They once again emphasized the dangers of securitization insisting that, 'avoiding excessive and irrational securitization is thus a

legitimate social, political, and economic objective of considerable importance'
(Buzan et al. 1998, p.208) Among the negative consequences are de-
democratization, depoliticization, security dilemma and conflict. On this
understanding, more security is not always an improvement. Wæver (1995) in
particular suggested that although security threats such as climate challenge could
be constructed and articulated as security threat, a securitized relationship still could
not avoid the possibility of serious conflict; although, some effective counter
measures have been taken As such, desecuritization[1] is the better way (Wæver
1995).

Therefore, Wæver in particular has emphasized the need to aim for
desecuritization – the shifting of issues out of emergency mode and into the normal
bargaining processes of the political sphere (Buzan et al. 1998, p.4). He argues that
desecuritization is the best way of defining security, as the process implies the end
of the emergency and return to the normal politics. Supporting the argument,
scholars like Vuori (2008, p.66) tend to equate desecuritization with the restoration of
democracy after the exceptional politics of a securitization period. They believe that
when the democracy returns (desecuritization), it will lead to politicization, which was
understood as a general opening up for debate. Hence, Wæver (1995, p.57) claimed
desecuritization (politicization) might be 'more effective than securitizing problems'.

The Copenhagen School holds strong views about the value of securitization
and desecuritization: securitizations are morally wrong and desecuritization is
morally right (Buzan et al. 1998, p.29). However, it is difficult to agree with the
school's narrow thoughts on this view. Scholars like (Floyd 2011; Roe 2012) have
suggested that securitization is not necessarily negative as it will not always lead to
conflict or security dilemma. In fact, the positive view on desecuritization is also one-
sided and limited, given that not all desecuritizations will automatically lead to
politicization (Floyd 2010, p.57) and instead could be damaging. For instance, in the
Chinese cases of desecuritization of SARS and avian influenza, the moves proved to

---

1 Desecuritization is a process where an issue shifts out from the realm of securitization and
emergency politics back into the realm of normal politics (Peoples & Vaughan-Williams 2010).

be detrimental as it actually 'led to further restrictions on freedom of expression'.

Moreover, the desecuritization moves were actually contradicting their aim, to

preserve democracy, especially since a return to 'everydayness' implies reaffirming

pre-existing hierarchies of power (Aradau 2004, p.400). Booth (2007, p.168) also

warned against such move. He argued that,

> Desecuritisation can disempower. Having issues settled by 'ordinary'
> politics is a nice idea: who would not prefer it to the threat of political
> violence? But 'ordinary' politics might not help in extraordinary
> circumstances; indeed, treating extraordinary issues as ordinary
> politics is a problem, not a solution.

This raised the question of whether securitization is an inherently negative

concept as desecuritization is also did not necessarily bring the positive impacts

expected by the Copenhagen scholars. Booth (2007, p.165) offers a more positive

perspective on the securitization theory.

> Such a static view of the [securitization] concept is all the odder
> because security as a speech act has historically also embraced
> positive, non-militarised, and non-statist connotations.... Securitisation
> studies, like mainstream strategic studies, remain somewhat stuck in
> Cold War mindsets.

Avoiding securitization neglects the potential of the theory as implementing

desecuritization, which is also problematic despite been suggested by the

Copenhagen's scholars. Based on this situation, the intent behind this thesis is to

make evident the terms of the debate that have served to inform securitization as a

negative concept. In my attempt to do so, this thesis constructed analytical themes

based on the negative perception of securitization theory raised by other scholars.

Generally, they raised their concerns that securitizing the NTS challenges would

either divert the states' attention from other important issues (Elbe 2006, p.119;

Youde 2008, pp.161–162; McInnes & Lee 2006, p.11), mean emergency measures

were ineffective, counterproductive and unjust (Deudney 1990; Enemark 2009), and

hinder cooperation (Elbe 2010a; Enemark 2009; Peterson 2002). Focusing on the

health issues and security in Southeast Asia, these themes are used in Chapters 4 and 5 when examine the consequences of securitizing the NTS issue.

## 1.6.2  Euro-Centrism – Securitization in a Non-Western Context

One of the major criticisms of the theory addressed by a number of scholars is the fact that the theory is 'Euro-centric' by nature and its democratically-biased framework (Caballero-Anthony & Emmers 2006b; Vuori 2008). Wilkinson doubted the applicability of the theory outside of the 'Western' realm in her research in Kyrgyzstan. She claimed that it is due to the presence of the 'Westphalian Straitjacket'[2] embedded in the theory that the application of the theory is weakened in a non-Western context (Wilkinson 2007). This is most obvious when the assumptions about concepts, identity and the state can be valid globally, meaning that 'security dynamics are edited and Westernized through the application of the theoretical framework' rather than in local terms and contexts (Wilkinson 2007, p.22). In other words, applying the theory to non-liberal democratic countries, such as those found in most Asian states, would be problematic as the process would be heavily influenced by the member states' interests. Hence, she suggested a further refinement on the development of securitization theory is crucial, if the school want to begin loosening the Westphalian Straitjacket (Wilkinson 2007, p.22).

Following Wilkinson's suggestion, Vuori (2008) made an attempt to apply the theory in a non-democratic setting. She concluded that although the theory can be applied in a non-Western context, the framework for securitization theory still requires further refinement in order to conduct empirical studies in the non-Western and non-democratic context. The need for the refinement of the concept of securitization comes from the bias of this theory in democratic decision-making detected in the paradigmatic understanding of the theory of securitization (Vuori 2008, p.68). Likewise, Emmers et al. (2008, p.62) claimed that  the application of the theory would be more complicated when the Euro-centric nature of the theory is grafted onto the political system in Asia, especially since most states in this region are non-liberal (e.g. Communist systems, monarchies, authoritarian or failed states). It is this assumption that caused Curley and Herington (2010) to emphasize a

---

[2] Barry Buzan and Richard Little described this phenomenon as IR's 'Westphalian straitjacket', defining it as 'the strong tendency to assume that the model established in seventeenth century Europe should define what the international system is for all times and places' (Buzan & Little 2001).

35

criticism related to the Euro-centric securitization framework. They claimed that only a few studies has been done on the processes of securitization in non-Western, non-democratic or indeed Asian contexts (Curley & Herington 2011, p.146). In other words, because of the limited analytical purchase of this theory beyond Western Europe and North America, the theory should not be expected to have worldwide appeal.

In contrast, if we take into account that most of the non-Western states, especially the Asian states, are non-democratic, states where freedom of speech and debate are restricted, securitization should be easier to accomplish in Asia than in Europe, as non-democratic states only allow limited space for free speech and debate, especially when they involve contesting existing official policies. Hence, securitization is actually easier to achieve outside of the Western realm because of the relative paucity of democracies in most of the states (Caballero-Anthony et al. 2006, p.250).

Moreover, it is against such odds that the theory has actually been applied in a diverse countries outside of the Western realm. The theory has begun to exhibit a presence in places as diverse as Turkey (Bilgin 2011), Africa (Abrahamsen 2005), Israel (Lupovici 2014), China (Wishnick 2010) and Vietnam (Herington 2010). This is somewhat unanticipated, given other scholars' criticism of the Euro-centric feature of this theory that reflects European security concerns and questions. Following this new development, Bilgin (2011) studied the application of the theory in Turkey, a non-Western country with an authoritarian persistence in the political system. Bilgin demonstrated how securitization theory had begun to acquire a presence in Turkey, opposing the idea that the theory is not applicable outside of Western context. He then offers three sets of answers that help to understand securitization theory's presence in Turkey: namely, (1) the trajectory of international relations' development worldwide, (2) the training that peripheral international relations scholars receive, and (3) how some theories may be tackling the challenge of Euro-centric ethnocentrism better than others (Bilgin 2011, p.403). Although some scholars will argue that the list is too short, the mere presence of this school of thought outside of

36

the Western setting deserves scrutiny, as the framework might be the best means of addressing the challenge of Euro-centric ethnocentrism (Bilgin 2011, pp.401-403). The present study concurs with the recommendation by Bilgin and Caballero-Anthony et Al. that the framework for securitization theory is actually applicable outside of the Western realm. In fact, the process of securitization might be easier to accomplish in non-Western states than in Europe.

This criticism brought us to another limitation that has been raised by scholars like Balzacq (2011) concerning the matter of context. He asserted that securitization offers little guidance on context and notes that, 'context itself is difficult to unpack' (Balzacq 2011, p.37). Nonetheless, context plays a crucial role in understanding the security concept. Floyd (2007, p.339) suggested that every security analysis took into consideration what form securitization takes as the concept is issue-dependent rather than static. Likewise, Nyman (2016, p.831) argued that the value of security (positive/negative debate) is depends on how it used and what it does in different empirical contexts. Drawing from these arguments that securitization is actually applicable outside of the Western realm and the need to test empirically the positive-negative debate in a different context, the thesis empirically tests the theory in the Southeast Asia region. Identifying the relevant context in Southeast Asia is relatively straightforward; the region's strict adherence to the norms and practices and different demographic and level of socioeconomic between Member States. Both contexts have been identified as the source of ASEAN's actions and inactions for years. All of these contextual factors are examined in Chapters 4 and 5.

### 1.6.3 Responses to Securitization: beyond extraordinary measures

In the second stage of the securitization process, the Copenhagen School asserts, a successful act of securitization would provide the securitization actors with the extraordinary means to face the threat. In other words, the school requires the audience to accept the exceptional measures that go beyond the normal rules abided by and located outside the usual bounds of political procedures and practices in order to ascertain the securitization process. However, the theory has not been

sufficiently clear about what counts as a successful securitization process – whether the successful securitization process would need agreement on the 'exceptional' situation or whether it requires the adoption of the actual measures.

On the one hand, the Copenhagen School's scholars argue that a successful condition of securitization requires 'merely' agreement on emergency countermeasures (Buzan et al. 1998, p.26). On the other, they said that the theory needs to involve the actual implementation of such extraordinary measures in identifying instances of successful securitization. Another way to consider this problem is to not view the emergency measures as part of the criteria needed within the process of securitization. The school states that they 'do not push the demand so high as to say that an emergency measure has to be adopted' (Buzan et al. 1998, p.25). Despite that, while this still offers little guidance as to which measures have been legitimized, it does suggest that securitization stops at the point of discourse and audience acceptance; although, they do not subscribe to the position that successful securitization would require emergency measures. This thesis submits to the position that a successful securitization occurs when the relevant audience accepts the securitizing move and the claims that there is a serious threat to their interests and that such measures would be necessary and legitimate to address the threat (Haacke 2010, p.127). This has the advantage of allowing the securitization theory to be used as a possible explanation of particular policy outcomes even if they are not 'extraordinary' or 'emergency'. Instead Floyd (2015, p.3) argued that we 'should look at what practitioners of security do when they securitize'. Hence, the research followed Floyd suggestion in determining the 'successful' of securitization process. She suggests that securitization is 'successful' only when: (1) the identification of a threat that justifies a response (securitizing move) is followed by (2) a change of behaviour (action) by a relevant agent (that is, the securitizing actor or someone instructed by the same), and also (3) the action taken is justified by the securitizing actor with reference to the threat they identified and declared in the securitizing move (Floyd 2015, p.3).

38

In order to ascertain whether collective securitization has happened in the region, this thesis will only analyse the language 'agreed' by the ASEAN Member States rather than comparing the national discourses of individual participant states. This is because securitization essentially involves an exchange of validity claims only. Two criteria require ascertaining collective securitization. First, member states should designate a particular threat as a serious threat to their shared values. Second, member states must have agreed on measures to deal with this threat. These criteria are utilized in Chapter 3 of this thesis, which examines the ASEAN health-security discourse.

## 1.7  Conclusion

This chapter has set out the theoretical framework utilised in this thesis. This was developed on the basis of critiques of the Copenhagen School's securitization framework, which, it is argued, make it more suited to the examination of the possible link between securitization and its consequences. The next chapter lays the groundwork for the analysis of the health-security linkage and the research design used throughout the thesis.