

# The 'Homeland Security Moment' in International Politics: Implications for the Third World

International Studies

58(3) 380–396 2021

© 2021 Jawaharlal Nehru University

Reprints and permissions:

[in.sagepub.com/journals-permissions-india](http://in.sagepub.com/journals-permissions-india)

DOI: 10.1177/00208817211030828

[journals.sagepub.com/home/isq](http://journals.sagepub.com/home/isq)**Shailza Singh<sup>1</sup>**

## Abstract

This article attempts to understand the emergence of the idea of homeland security in the US in the recent past, the attendant security praxis, and its impact on the Third World security (predicament). It maps the journey of the idea of homeland security—from a US-specific domestic policy framework to a globalizing security framework. It is argued that in the emerging security understanding, the concerns of Third World countries, which were getting some global attention in the past few decades through the concepts like human security and societal security, have been marginalized. By referring to security-related policy changes in other countries, the article explains the US efforts to export this new understanding of security to the Third World and its long-term implications. As the homeland security paradigm and practices make their way into many developing countries, understanding the 'homeland security moment' from the perspective of the latter is of crucial significance to gauge their security predicament in the newer context.

## Keywords

Security, homeland security, security studies, Third World, state

## Introduction

The beginning of the 21st century saw the emergence of a new nomenclature in the realm of security called 'homeland security'. The term originated in the US even before the 9/11 terrorist attacks; however, it became an official vocabulary only in its aftermath. The backdrop of terrorist threats coming from non-state actors and the changing nature of the threat environment led to the launch of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Bharati College, University of Delhi, New Delhi, Delhi, India.

---

### Corresponding author:

Shailza Singh, Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Bharati College, University of Delhi, New Delhi, Delhi 110058, India.

E-mail: [shailza134@gmail.com](mailto:shailza134@gmail.com)

Global War on Terrorism (GWOT) by the US and a subsequent overhaul in its existing security structure. The Department of Homeland Security was created, and homeland security as an evolving paradigm began to be popularized through official documents like the National Strategy for Homeland Security (NSHS) and Homeland Security Quadrennial Review, among several others. Since then, homeland security has been undergoing constant expansion in its meaning and definitions, moving from a predominantly terrorism-focused to an all-hazards approach.

Homeland security involves several distinctive security practices. Though concerned mainly with domestic security, it involves a unique perception of the international strategic landscape, giving rise to newer ways of assessing threats and addressing them. There have been concerted efforts by the US to make homeland security a dominant global security paradigm. It is achieved by popularizing an approach that perceives the threat perception's domestic and international dimensions to be interlinked. The threat assessment is based on the efforts to gain knowledge about the risks from the unpredictable, uncertain, and chaotic sources in the international arena characterized by technological advancement and change. The governance framework of homeland security is based on risk assessment and risk management. The use of highly advanced technology and computerized data mining for this purpose are essential features of security policies put in place by the state. Information technology (IT) is leveraged to come up with 'smart' policy solutions. Technology is one of the most important contents of the policies on homeland security governance. This new form of security governance is quite instrumental in propagating such a model globally to create similar systems with commonality in assessing threat perception and consequent investment in resources to address those threats or risks.

Homeland security is fast emerging as one of the prominent strands of security understanding. This article attempts to assess the impact of this development and the attendant security praxis (referred to as the homeland security moment after this) on security in international politics in general and the Third World security (predicament) in particular. This article aims to discuss how the different approaches to understand homeland security provided a dominant template for understanding security. It also looks into how homeland security moment impinges upon the challenges posed, particularly from the Third World, on the prevailing understanding of security. Limited research is available tracing the linkages between the US homeland security and international security or its implications on regional or country-specific security understanding. This article maps the journey of security as conceptualized at various points in time. It also analyses how the presence and absence of defining features of security have been shaped and reshaped by interventions from diverse locations and how the sculpted form resulting from such shaping and reshaping stands in the face of emergence of homeland security as an evolving paradigm. It is in this context of location that the question of the Third World becomes pertinent.

The article is divided into three sections. The first section deals with the debate on security as a field of analysis. It tries to look at the emergence of US homeland security as an extraordinary moment in the existing field of security. The second section shows how the US paradigm is being propagated as a global model through various policy initiatives. The third section looks into the implications of both these changes related to security: in the domain of theory as well as practice in case of the Third World countries.

### **‘Homeland Security Moment’ in the US and Emerging Security Praxis**

Today, security studies confront a distinct and challenging context. On the one hand, the world is more interconnected and has greater permeability for osmosis of ideas and concerns giving rise to discussions about what should be the meaning and content of security as conceptualized from different levels and for different referents (national security, human security, societal security, environmental security, and so on). On the other hand, there also seems a growing consolidation about the primacy of certain overarching threats and the emerging credibility of specific uniform mechanisms of addressing them. The discussion here pertains to the threat of global terrorism as defined after the September 11 attacks and the subsequent homeland security paradigm adopted in and propagated by the US in the wake of the former.

How has the security studies scholarship responded to these newer developments? How does the Third World security scholarship respond to the homeland security paradigm? As the homeland security paradigm and practices make their way into many developing countries, understanding the homeland security moment from the perspective of the latter is of crucial significance to gauge their security predicament in the newer context.

In security studies scholarship, homeland security was perceived as strongly reinforcing the state as the prime referent emphasized through the coinage of the term ‘homeland’. This response, mainly, was concerning some of the developments in International Security Studies (ISS) in the preceding decades where, of late, the traditional approaches to security have been subjected to serious scrutiny by critical approaches emerging from different locations—critical theories, peace theories and the Third World perspectives on security. The emergence of this diverse understanding of security also led to the incorporation of concerns of the Third World. The intra-state nature of challenges to security also gained prominence along with the state-centric notion. However, with the rise of homeland security and technological advancement, a new understanding of security is gradually becoming a more robust conceptual and policy phenomenon. Contextualizing homeland security in the larger understanding of security in international politics would require a look at the trajectory of evolution that this understanding has followed before assessing its impact on other countries.

### *Mapping the Evolution of 'Security' in International Politics*

The 9/11 attacks on the US led to the proclamation of the beginning of a new era in terms of how security needs to be defined and understood. The nature of the threat environment that the world was faced with resonated through the televised speeches reaching the living room of households across the globe in the days following 11 September 2001. The then US President George W. Bush declared GWOT in the process incorporating other states as well:

Today, our fellow citizens, our way of life, our very freedom came under attack in a series of deliberate and deadly terrorist acts... A great people has been moved to defend a great nation ... America and our friends and allies join with all those who want peace and security in the world, and we stand together to win the war against terrorism. (Bush, 2001a)

Addressing the predominant threat coined as a mission was subsequently declared:

Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists. (Bush, 2001b)

This was further accompanied by mobilizing of resources and an overhaul of the existing security structure in the US in order to meet the challenge of the changing threat environment as it was perceived:

All law enforcement and intelligence agencies are working aggressively around America, around the world, and around the clock.... We have called up Reserves to reinforce our military capability and strengthen the protection of our homeland. (Bush, 2001c)

The concept of security<sup>1</sup> is always of central importance in international politics, though its conceptualization has been less attended to. The modern state system came into existence with the rationale of guaranteeing security to its people. Since then, the state system's evolution has seen quite a few changes in the nature and contours of the concept. However, the degree of relevance of the idea has consistently retained a heightened level.

Security came to be established as the prime objective of the state—a condition of the state committed to resolution of problems identified as prone to causing damage to its territorial sovereignty. The national security state of the West has for long been the reference point of understanding on security in ISS. The above understanding constituted the 'value' outlined in Arnold Wolfer's definition of security

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. (Wolfer, 1952, p. 458)

Therefore, the instrumental aspect of security in International Relations (IR) has been the signifier of the security of the state and has been accordingly explored

and discussed in ISS. However, beginning in the 1980s, several alternative approaches in security studies emerged that tried to emphasize its linkage with actors and issues other than the state and territory.

Today, security is discussed by dividing the approaches to its study into traditional and non-traditional or critical.<sup>2</sup> However, this is only a simplified binary having utility for analytical purposes. The approaches, as they stand today, constitute a spectrum between this binary. However, this article aims to discuss how these different approaches provided a dominant template of understanding security and how does homeland security moment impinge upon the challenges posed, particularly from the Third World, on the dominant understanding of security.

The traditional approaches to the study of security are state-centric. They conceptualize security in terms of the state's survival, with military threats emerging at the interstate level, the means to address those threats again being the military. This dominant narrative belongs to political realism (both classical and structural) in IR and provides an understanding about security during much of the Cold War.<sup>3</sup> The liberal tradition in IR also conformed to the traditional military security frame of analysis, differing only with reference to peace prospects.

The traditional approaches to security establish the primacy of the state as an object of survival (referent object). Thus, a grid of analysis to understand security is provided in terms of what is to be secured (state), from what (external threat from other states), and how (through military means; adoption of emergency measures).<sup>4</sup> This frame of understanding security emerged from the US during the Cold War and was primarily used for policy interests, though conceptually it is located in the Eurocentric notion of the Westphalian state system.

From the 1970s onwards, security studies witnessed an expansion in the security agenda. However, as several scholars have pointed, security as a concept remained underdeveloped and unproblematised by the users and remained conceptually silent and taken for granted till the 1980s (Buzan & Hansen, 2009a, p. 13). Beginning from the efforts to include economics and environment as security issues, human security, societal security, food security, etc. came to be identified as crucial to understanding the nature of threats that needed to be confronted. Buzan (1983) identified five sectors of security—military, political, economic, societal, and environmental. The state-centric nature of security was still intact as state remained the most important level of analysis in Buzan's work. This take on security issues was instrumental in doing two things:

1. Challenging the 'given' in the security analysis by hinting towards the social construction of security agenda and
2. providing further scope to levels of analysis of security other than the interstate level. The issue of the referent object now saw a movement to sub and supra-state levels.

The end of Cold War witnessed a renewed rigour in the thinking about security and the frames for such analyses (Baldwin, 1997; Matthews, 1989; Tickner, 1992; Walt, 1991). While Stephen Walt's writing underscored the primacy and relevance of the realist frame for the post-Cold War reality, a number of other approaches

focused on the individual and societal dimensions of security (Baldwin, 1997; Booth, 1991; Buzan, 1991; Buzan et al., 1998; Kolodziej, 1992; Krause & Williams 1997; Sorensen, 1996). Booth (1991) highlighted the differences between the individuals' and governments' security concerns and argued the case of individual security and its linkage to human emancipation:

'Security' means the absence of threats. Emancipation is the freeing of people (as individuals and groups) from those physical and human constraints which stop them from carrying out what they would freely chose to do. War and threat of war is one of those constraints together with poverty, poor education, political oppression and so on. (Booth, 1991, p. 319)

The question *Whose Security?* was put forth as a frame of analysis where the referent could be individuals, social groups, or global society. The individual and societal dimensions of security were also reflected in the concept of *Common Security* coined by Egon Bahr, works of peace research scholars Johan Galtung (positive peace) and Kenneth Boulding (stable peace), and the emergence of Third World Security approaches (Bilgin, 2008). Each of these approaches expressed the traditional approaches' inability to resonate a common chord with their conceptualization of security concerns. Thus, the post-Cold War approaches to security highlighted the political and the sociological aspects instead of the threat defence and use of force emphasis of the traditional approach.

The concept of human security emerged as result of the debate about the role of governments in protecting the concerns of their citizens. Initially developed in United Nations Development Programme (UNDP's) 1994 *Human Development Report*, the concept of human security came to the forefront acknowledging the individual level of security: the importance of the individual in the overall scheme of things. It required 'a shift in the angle of vision' to analyse the transformative changes taking place in the international system where a whole breed of threats to human security exist apart from the traditional sources of threats like arms race and weapons proliferation (Human Development Report, 1994). This was an important step in enlarging the agenda of security, reaching out to the level of individuals, and reflecting the pressing concerns of Third World.

Further, the critical security studies attempted to unpack the concept of security to disinvest it of any settled meanings—an effort aiming at transformation. They challenge the privileging of state over other referents arguing for inclusion of issues encompassing human and societal dimensions that transcend or permeate the state. As Krause and Williams explain the nature of critical security studies:

Our appending of the term critical to security studies is to imply more of an orientation toward the discipline than a precise label.... If the objective (or at least the outcome) of much scholarship in security studies has to render the question and problem of security apolitical and largely static, critical theory takes the question of change as its foundation, in both an explanatory and evaluative sense. (Krause & Williams, 1997, p. xii)

In security studies, the role of critical security studies has been vital in terms of opening up an alternative site of conceptual engagement with security from a

diversity of locations in contrast to the realist framework's claim to universality. The acknowledgement of various sites of insecurity like gender and post-coloniality provided impetus to understand security from diverse lenses.

The above mapping of the trajectory of security should not be read in a linear fashion as one understanding does not automatically give way to other; rather, there are multiple developments and challenges to existing understandings from several quarters at various points in time and space. Hence, the understanding about security has travelled a long journey, inviting interventions from several locations and reflecting diverse concerns, witnessing dialogues and confrontations. It also highlights that the post-Cold War developments towards an understanding of security conceptually in security studies as well as the practices associated with security witnessed expansion and diversification. This development was significant as it gave rise to a dialogue among the traditionalists and the others.<sup>5</sup> Hence, beginning of the process of democratization of the security agenda is witnessed.

### *The Third World Security Dilemma*

One of the significant post-Cold War developments in security studies has been the highlighting of the absence of concerns of the Third World in the dominant security discourse. In case of the countries of the Third World, the introduction to security came during the Cold War in the form of depoliticized category enveloped in the logic of sovereignty and having certain predefined functions to be performed by these states through military build-up and defence upgradation. While these younger collectives' national interests were subsumed within the rationale of the powerful actors and their interests in the international system, the function of sovereignty to work out options that reflect the real objectives of security for these societies remained a work in progress.

Scholars from the Third World raised the discontent with their 'security predicament' (Ayoob, 1995). They spelt out how this part of the world, where the majority of the world's population resides, faces very different concerns regarding security due to the young stage of state-making and how these concerns remain largely ignored in the way security is understood in its traditional Western avatar. The search for alternative epistemes of security in the Third World seeks to highlight security concerns from the location of those categories which are left out or remain either untouched, and sometimes antagonized by the traditional security concerns. This, it is brought forth, leaves the mainstream language of security wanting of a holistic perspective.

These perspectives also underscore the primacy of the domestic variables as determinants of conflicts and highlight the linkage of the domestic and international that informs their security concerns. As Amitav Acharya argues

From the very outset, resource scarcity, over population, under-development and environmental degradation were at the heart of insecurity in the third world. These



essentially non-military threats were much more intimately linked to the security predicament of the third world than that of the developed countries. (Acharya, 1997, p. 54)

The unrest of the Third World security scholarship has been two-pronged. It is pointed out that, on the one hand, the practice of security in the Third World witnesses the struggle of performance of a model that has been designed on the basis of a different historical experience and uncritically imported. It is ill equipped to provide the security rationale for the non-Euro-American histories and geographies. On the other hand, it also does not create any scope of agency to define security problematic of the larger part of the world's population (Barkawi & Laffey, 2006).<sup>6</sup>

## US Homeland Security Goes Global

The concept of homeland security and the primary responsibility for global threat assessment and enforcement originated in and was assumed by the US government in the aftermath of 9/11 terrorist attacks:

After September 11, our government assumed a new responsibility to strengthen security at home and track down our enemies abroad. (*The Washington Post*, 2001)

In a world where the terrorist threat pays no respect to traditional boundaries, our strategy for homeland security cannot stop at our borders. America must pursue a sustained, steadfast, and systematic international agenda to counter the global terrorist threat and improve our homeland security. (NSHS, 2002, pp. xi–xii)

In the NSHS (2002), homeland security was proclaimed an 'exceedingly complex mission' involving 'efforts both at home and abroad'.<sup>7</sup>

Further, homeland security is not restricted to homeland or internal security; rather, it involves, as mentioned earlier, distinct security posture interlinking the domestic with the global. On several other occasions, the necessity of combating the threat 'out there' has been underscored. The strategy also explains the link between national security and homeland security, the latter being a more robust endeavour to augment the national security apparatus (NSHS, 2002, p. 5). Another important facet of this approach has been to assess the scope of homeland security as a global enterprise.

Policy research on homeland security is engaged in comparative studies of security models of various countries to measure the closeness of these models to the US model of homeland security. Nadav Morag, Deputy Director for policy research at the Center for Homeland Defense and Security and the author of *Comparative Homeland Security: Global Lessons*, makes a strong argument in favour of the preferability of US and its global allies viewing the problem of security in a similar manner and accordingly investing resources and devising



their strategies. To quote Morag, 'The homeland security mission is thus a global one, and a homeland security approach that ends at a nation's borders is not a homeland security approach at all' (Morag, 2011a, p. 362). Also, Kaunert et al. (2012) highlight how homeland security is a meaningful concept to analyse the recent developments in the European security. Though the term homeland security is not exclusively applied to these developments, they reflect influence of the homeland security ideas.

The homeland security effort was accompanied by the highest ever increase in budgetary allocation to it, which has been on an increase since then, including deployment of employees to several locations globally. In 2017, *The New York Times* mentioned that 'an estimated 2,000 Homeland Security employees-from Immigration and Customs Enforcement special agents to Transportation Security Administration officials- now are deployed to more than 70 countries around the world' (Nixon, 2017). The 'Homeland Security Enterprise' (Homeland Security, n.d.) is closely linked with the neo-liberal capitalism with significant role of private actors and close network with technology industry.<sup>8</sup>

There are homeland security exhibitions held in partner countries to showcase the latest sophistication devices instrumental in critical infrastructure protection, surveillance, and homeland security-related functions. Also, now there are initiatives like Global Society of Homeland and National Security Professionals which is an international organization comprising of homeland and national security professionals throughout the world, including government and private sector responders from all friendly nations of the US that offer certification programmes in training in Homeland Security practices. In the past decade and a half, homeland security research and education has grown at a very fast pace. There are degree and diploma courses in homeland security offered in several countries. Some scholars compare this development to the historical precedent of the Manhattan project during the World War II. In fact, homeland security is developing into a discipline in itself (Supinski, 2011).

In security studies scholarship, homeland security paradigm led to interesting debates around response to 9/11 and impact on understanding about security. While according to some it emerged as an assertion and reinforcement of the state-centric paradigm on security, others talked about the changes and departures from the past (Buzan & Hansen, 2009, p. 226). It also led to new thinking and research agenda in critical security studies (Peoples & Vaughan-Williams, 2010a).

Other responses are also emerging. Rasmussen (2004) attempted a mapping (academic cartography) of the manner in which security studies have responded (or not responded) to the war on terror. He highlighted the emergence of research programmes that draw insights from sociology mainly from Ulrich Beck and Anthony Giddens' works. He refers to these programmes as 'reflexive security studies', which try to apply theories of risk and reflexivity to conceptualize security in an environment characterized by technological advancement and the emergence of newer non-state actors in international politics. His argument highlights the need in security studies to understand and catch up with the change

in the rationality of security since the 9/11 terrorist attacks and how governments respond to policy terms referring to homeland security.

## **‘Homeland Security Moment’ and Its Implications for the Third World**

While the evolution and consolidation of the homeland security paradigm leads to questions about understanding security in the changing world environment and its consequences for different actors, it is relevant to explore its likely implications for the Third World. In this context, it is important to look at some of the concerns: Does the homeland security moment signify a resurgence of a more aggressive form of national security paradigm under the leadership of a western power? If yes, then given that homeland security is being pursued as a global enterprise, how does this impact the concerns of the Third World and their young quest for alternative security episteme and praxis? If no, then what are the changes and continuities that might concern Third World security predicament?

Since the setting up the Department of Homeland Security and its missions overseas, there have been Homeland Security Bilateral Dialogues with other countries including those of Asia and Africa. The US–India Homeland Security Dialogue was launched in May 2011 and US–Africa in 2016 focusing on homeland security and counter-terrorism co-operation. These dialogues seek to extend the US understanding of the ‘Homeland Security Enterprise’ to other countries aiming to pave way for specialized training programmes gradually building an army of experts who can handle new technologies and mechanism to deal with various kinds of threats and vulnerabilities. The homeland security model, therefore, is being replicated in different countries of the Third World with an effort to create a structured approach to homeland security through legislation and policy-level framework accompanied by a significant increase in the budgetary allocation for it. The global homeland security market size was estimated at US\$340 billion in 2019 and US\$355 billion in 2020.

Like in the Indian case, the US programmes will deal with four aspects of terrorism—‘global supply chain, transportation, port, border and maritime security’, ‘Megacity policing and sharing of information among federal, state and local partners’, ‘Illicit finance, smuggling of cash, financial fraud and counterfeiting’, and ‘Cyber security and critical infrastructure protection’ (Joshi, 2013). A homeland security overview report released by Associated Chambers of Commerce and Industry of India (ASSOCHAM) in 2010 with the purpose of generating awareness about homeland security in India drew attention to the significance of homeland security for a growing economic power like India as well as to the capital loss that might result in the event of lack of focus to it. Further, an ASSOCHAM-KPMG Klynveld Peat Marwick Goerdeler (KPMG) study, highlighted that capital expenditure by central and state agencies on homeland security estimated a potential of around US\$3 billion (*Business Standard*, 2018)<sup>9</sup> for the year 2018–2019.

Some of the key market actors in the field of homeland security are Lockheed Martin (the US), Raytheon Company (the US), Northrop Grumman (the US), General Dynamics (the US), Thales Group (France), and Elbit (Israel) among others. Third World countries are linked to this security market model into a security function carved out and defined by the US.

Behera (2014), argues that the paradigm of homeland security can be suited to the developed countries in the manner the US has been able to overhaul its security apparatus and undertake massive privatization of many security functions enhancing the market size of private security providers. However, for the most Third World countries, it will not only be a very expensive affair to afford but will also have serious implications on the power and functions of the weak states that struggle for affordable defence in a complex internal and external threat environment. He says 'No Third World State is in a position to raise that kind of physical infrastructure as envisaged in the concept to protect their homeland... (it will) hasten a process in which the market will dominate over many state functions' (Behera, 2014).

The homeland security rationale could be of particular concern for the Third World nations. First, Third World scholars have already pointed towards the linkages between domestic and external threats in their critique of the traditional approach to security; for example, Ayoob (1995, p. 128) argued that 'external threats to the state security in the third world are almost bound up with internal threats to state structures and regimes, often to the point where it makes little sense to speak of 'external' and 'internal' threats to the state in distinct terms'. However, the manner in which homeland security approach links the domestic and the global poses a particular challenge as the definition and parameters of these linkages again do not originate from the latter. Also, much like Cold War period, the agential capacity of these countries in deciding on what constitutes security for them is missing. Again, homeland security amounts to import of conceptualization of security as formulated in the context of American experience.

Second, even if the assumption of newer mechanisms to address diversity of threats in globalization and technological change is considered, the embeddedness of these security aspects in the security state again is problematic. The process of state formation itself in the Third World countries is something that has been, on many occasions, put under the scanner by scholars of international security in search of a meaningful conceptualization of security. In such contexts which threats and vulnerabilities get prioritized over others in the homeland security rationale will remain a crucial concern. The entire effort that conceptualized human and societal dimensions of security and which sought to benefit the cause of the developing world the most is likely to be adversely affected if homeland security swings towards the traditional security model.

Third, again, homeland security enforcement brings back to the critique by the scholars who point to the fact how various Western interventions of the West in the Third World are uncritically adopted without long-term assessment of their ramifications for these societies. In a globalizing world, the binary explanation of the West versus the rest might not be the objective. However, the manner in which

the process of globalizing homeland security paradigm is carried out seems to reinforce what has been a disadvantage in the past, that is, import of concept and models devised to suit other contexts. Even the demands for a more relational approach to security (Barkawi & Laffey, 2006) have been put to rest in favour of determination of threat perception and its redressal provided by the lens of the superpower. The declaration of the compelling urgency of a strong response applicable globally by the US glosses over several other unrests that find more meaning in specific contexts of the Third World.

Fourthly, while the 'security' in homeland security comprises policy instruments that rest on racial profiling and surveillance, homeland security also 'thirdworldifies', to use Priscilla Wald's phrase,<sup>10</sup> the threat environment. Quite a few policy stances of the Western countries on issues like conflict and migration, environmental damage, etc. are reflective of the thirdworldification of threat environment. While the model is sought to be actively exported to the Third World to meet the requirements of the threat environment in the face of non-state actors and networks, there is a dominant undercurrent of portraying the Third World a threat as a whole in terms of cultural and disease outbreak narratives.

This comes as a graver concern for the developing world as such an approach, instead of guaranteeing security, can lead to greater insecurity by intensifying several existing conflicts, stigmatizing populations, and having a foreign prism to their security problematique. It is an even stronger challenge to the quest for revisiting concept of security for a more meaningful intervention in these societies.

Finally, given the way in which homeland security has been conceptualized in the US and exported to the rest of the world as something that needs to be put in place in the states in order to meet the contemporary challenges to security, questions regarding the functionality of security become crucial. In this regard, homeland security presents an interesting case to look at from the securitization perspective<sup>11</sup> in case of the Third World. Securitization theory put forth by Ole Waever, while emphasizing the socially constructed nature of security, provides a framework to understand how issues make their way into the security arena (securitization). The securitization theory highlights two pertinent questions: *What does Security do* and *Who can Securitize*?

Both these questions are particularly relevant. This perspective believes that security does not have an 'independent, stable, context-free' or inherent/innate meaning understood universally and perennially. Thus, in response to the first question, it posits that treating an issue as a security issue brings with it threat defence image and emergency politics into non-military realms. Hence, instead of expanding the security agenda to include more issues, it argues the case of de-securitization, that is, bringing the issues back to the normal politics and finding a resolution there. Regarding the latter question, Waever argues that not everyone can securitize as embedded in this function is a certain power and agency criteria.

For the Third World countries, which of late, have been expressing their disquiet over how security has been defined for them in the past, the securitization debate has something to offer in the context of the homeland security moment. If the definition and conceptualization of the threat perception (securitization) does

not reflect and address concerns significant to their location and is imported from a different experience (coming from a remote securitizing actor), more of security in the 'form' of homeland security is something that needs further thought.

## **Conclusion**

Homeland security has emerged as one of the prominent strands of security understanding. Attempts have been made by the US to push homeland security as a dominant global security paradigm. The article looks at the globalizing homeland security moment on Third World security rationale. The homeland security paradigm in the developing world comprises an 'external' logic presented as a global necessity in the face of threats from transnational networks of crime and terrorism. However, this paradigm is not an outcome of a widely deliberated rationale organic to the diverse security-related concerns of these countries. If homeland security paradigm is to yield any desirable results, Third World countries need to be active participants in envisioning a long-term strategy around their concerns either as collective or as units.

## **Declaration of Conflicting Interests**

The author declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship and/or publication of this article.

## **Funding**

The author received no financial support for the research, authorship and/or publication of this article.

## **Notes**

1. The term 'security' has its etymology in the Latin word 'securus' which means carefree/fearless/ quiet/serene. However, subsequently, the term has undergone several changes in its meaning and in its versions in English and other languages.
2. The traditional in security studies is modern conventional as different from the general reference in social sciences where distinction is drawn between traditional and modern. Traditional approaches in international security studies comprise of the realist approaches that defined security from the beginning of the 20th century and specifically the conceptualizations that emerged after the end of World War II and the beginning of the Cold War and later.
3. The realist understanding of security comes attendant with the concept of power that states seek through military build-up in pursuit of their national interest (Morgenthau, 1948). Therefore, the state-centrism. Also, a distinction is drawn between the 'domestic' and the 'international' where the former is characterized by order guaranteed by the state within its boundaries protecting from external aggression while the latter by anarchy, given the absence of any authority at the international level (Waltz, 1979), hence the coinage 'national security' which posits state as the object of survival. However, the content of national security, in this school remained fuzzy as evident in the title of the article by Wolfers (1952).

4. The traditional approaches to security do not explain their tenets in the format of this frame; rather, this is explained as the logic of state action, functioning as rational actors to achieve their national interest. This frame implicit in the explanatory rationale is highlighted by the critical approaches.
5. For an in-depth analysis of this dialogue, see Mallavarappu (2008).
6. The post-Cold War world has witnessed a rich body of work from the Third World scholarship that picked up the momentum generated by the critique of the traditional understanding of security, with almost all of them challenging the nature and content of security so defined, some more robust than the others in their attack. They establish their distinctness both from traditional and critical schools (Ayoob, 1995, p. 2002). They point at the intra-state nature of threats in case of the countries of the Third World (Acharya, 1997; Ayoob, 1995). Also, there is flagging of the search for alternative epistemes that reflect the Third World security problematic (Behera, 2008).
7. NSHS (2002, p. 2). The strategy defined homeland security as 'concerted national effort to prevent terrorist attacks within the United States, reduce America's vulnerability to terrorism, and minimize the damage and recover from attacks that do occur'. The order of the objectives indicates the priorities of the USA to secure its homeland (NSHS, 2002, p. 3).
8. The NSHS (2002) mentions that the homeland security mission demands a range of government and private sector capabilities, and it calls for a coordinated and focused effort from many actors who are not otherwise required to work together and for whom security is not always a primary mission (p. 3).
9. For more projections of India's homeland security market visit : India Homeland Security Market (2020–2027) (Open PR, 2020)
10. Priscilla Wald in her book, *Contagious: Cultures, Carriers and the Outbreak Narrative*, uses the term to describe how the developing countries are stigmatized as sources and carriers of microbes responsible for disease outbreaks by the developed world. These are seen as locations where the threat emerges from (Wald, 2008, pp. 45–46). A lot of threat perception apart from the contagious diseases such as those about sources of conflict in the discourse of the Western world whether it is related to migration, networked crime, environmental damage etc. is seen to be located in the Third World. It can, therefore, be said that a large part of the contemporary threat perception is thirdworldified.
11. Priscilla Wald in her book, *Contagious: Cultures, Carriers and the Outbreak Narrative*, uses the term to describe how the developing countries are stigmatized as sources and carriers of microbes responsible for disease outbreaks by the developed world. These are seen as locations where the threat emerges from (Wald, 2008, pp. 45–46). A lot of threat perception apart from the contagious diseases such as those about sources of conflict in the discourse of the Western world whether it is related to migration, networked crime, environmental damage etc. is seen to be located in the Third World. It can, therefore, be said that a large part of the contemporary threat perception is thirdworldified.
12. Understanding of security emerging from the Copenhagen School is called the securitization theory, as put forth by Ole Waever. Securitization theory argues that the increasing list of issues that get hyphenated with security (like environmental security, political security, societal security) does not really change the substantive meaning of security in terms of identification of the nature and resolution of the problems/concerns associated with those issues. Waever contests the traditional as well as critical perspectives that argue the case for more security. He says that treating an issue as a security issue brings with it threat-defense image and emergency politics



into non-military realms which is not an improvement. According to Waever, 'security problems are developments that threaten the sovereignty or independence of a state in a particularly rapid or dramatic fashion, and deprive it of the capacity to manage by itself. This, in turn, undercuts the political order. Such a threat must therefore be met with the mobilization of the maximum effort.... In naming a certain development a security problem, the "state" can claim a special right' (Waever, 2011, p. 94). Also, the role of the securitizing actor (e.g., government, political elite, civil society and military) is important and involves power and agency criteria. This approach ventures to explore the instrumentality of security and opens up further questions on effectiveness of addressing issues through the instrument of security.

## References

- Acharya, A. (1997). The periphery as the core: The Third World and security studies. In K. Krause, & M. C. Williams (Ed.), *Critical security studies: Concepts and cases* (pp. 299–328). University of Minnesota Press.
- Ayoob, M. (1995). *The Third World security predicament: State making, regional conflict, and the international system*. Lynne Rienner Publisher.
- Baldwin, D. (January, 1997). The concept of security. *Review of International Studies*, 23(1), 5–26.
- Barkawi, T. & Mark, L. (April, 2006). The Post-colonial moment in security studies. *Review of International Studies*, 32(2), 329–352.
- Behera, A. D. (2014). Deconstructing the concept of homeland security: Its meaning and significance for the Third World. In A. K. Mehra (Ed.), *Public security in federal systems*. Lancer.
- Behera, N. C. (Ed). (2008). *International relations in South Asia: Search for an alternative paradigm*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Bilgin, P. (2008). Critical theory. In P. D. Williams (Ed.), *Security studies: An introduction*. (2nd ed., pp. 93–106). Routledge.
- Bilgin, P. (2008). Thinking past 'Western IR'? *Third World Quarterly*, 29(1), 5–23.
- Booth, K. (1991). Security and emancipation. *Review of International Studies*, 17(4), 313–326.
- Bush, G. W. (2001a, September 11). *Address to the nation on the September 11 attacks, the oval office Washington, D.C.* [https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/infocus/bushrecord/documents/Selected\\_Speeches\\_George\\_W\\_Bush.pdf](https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/infocus/bushrecord/documents/Selected_Speeches_George_W_Bush.pdf)
- Bush, G. W. (2001b, September 20). *Address to the joint session of the 107th Congress, United States Capitol Washington, D.C.* [https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/infocus/bushrecord/documents/Selected\\_Speeches\\_George\\_W\\_Bush.pdf](https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/infocus/bushrecord/documents/Selected_Speeches_George_W_Bush.pdf)
- Bush, G. W. (2001c, October 7). *Address to the nation on operations in Afghanistan, The treaty room of The White House Washington, D.C.* [https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/infocus/bushrecord/documents/Selected\\_Speeches\\_George\\_W\\_Bush.pdf](https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/infocus/bushrecord/documents/Selected_Speeches_George_W_Bush.pdf)
- Business Standard. (2018). *Increased government spending on infrastructure and modernisation need of the hour.* [https://www.business-standard.com/article/news-cm/increased-government-spending-on-infrastructure-and-modernisation-need-of-the-hour-118110500728\\_1.html](https://www.business-standard.com/article/news-cm/increased-government-spending-on-infrastructure-and-modernisation-need-of-the-hour-118110500728_1.html)
- Buzan, B. (1983). *Peoples, states and fear: The national security problem in international relations*. Brighton, Sussex. Wheatsheaf Books.
- Buzan, B. (1991). *People, states and fear: An agenda for international security studies in the post cold-war era*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.



- Buzan, B., & Hansen, L. (2009a). Defining international security studies. In B. Buzan, & L. Hansen (Eds.), *The evolution of international security studies* (pp. 8–20). Cambridge University Press.
- Buzan, B., & Hansen, L. (2009b). Widening and deepening security. In B. Buzan, & L. Hansen (Eds.), *The evolution of international security studies* (pp. 187–224). Cambridge University Press.
- Buzan, B., Weaver, O., & De Wilde, J. (1998a). Security analysis: Conceptual apparatus. In B. Buzan, O. Weaver, & J. De Wilde (Eds.), *Security: A new framework for analysis* (pp. 21–48), London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Buzan, Barry, Weaver, Ole, & Wilde, Jaap De (1998b) *Security: A New framework for Analysis*, London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Homeland Security. (n.d.). *Homeland security enterprise*. <https://www.dhs.gov/topic/homeland-security-enterprise>
- Joshi, S. (2013, August 18). *US to help India face new security challenges*. The Hindu. <https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/us-to-help-india-face-new-security-challenges/article5035558.ece>
- Kaunert, C., Pawlak, P., & Léonard, S. (2012). *European homeland security: A European strategy in making*. Routledge.
- Kolodziej, E. A. (1992). Renaissance in security studies? Caveat Lector!. *International Studies Quarterly*, 36(4), 421–438.
- Krause, K., & Williams, M. C. (Eds.). (1997). *Critical security studies: Concepts and cases*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Mallavarappu, S. (2008). *International relations theory and non-traditional approaches to security*. WISCOMP Perspectives 27. <http://wiscomp.org/Publications/141%20-%20Perspectives%2027%20-%20International%20Relations%20Theory%20and%20Non-Traditional%20Approaches%20to%20Security.pdf>
- Mathews, J. T. (1989). Redefining security. *Foreign Affairs*, Spring, 68(2), 162–177.
- Morag, N. (2011a). *Comparative homeland security: Global lessons* (1st ed.). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Morag, N. (2011b, September). Does homeland security exist outside United States. *Homeland Security Affairs*, 7(2). <https://www.hsaj.org/articles/69>
- Morgenthau, H. J. (1948). *Politics among nations: The struggle for power and peace*. New York, A.A. Knopf.
- Nixon, R. (2017). *Homeland security goes global. Not everyone is grateful*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/26/world/americas/homeland-security-customs-border-patrol.html>
- NSHS. (2002). *National strategy for homeland security. Office of homeland security*. The White House. <https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/nat-strat-hls-2002.pdf>
- Open, PR. (2020). *India homeland security market (2020–2027)*. <https://www.openpr.com/news/2154901/india-homeland-security-market-2020-2027>
- Peoples, C., & Vaughan-Williams, N. (2010a). *Critical theory and security*. In C. Peoples, & N. Vaughan-Williams (Eds.), *Critical security studies: An introduction* (pp. 17–32). Routledge.
- Peoples, C., & Vaughan-Williams, N. (2010b). Securitization theory. In C. Peoples, & N. Vaughan-Williams (Eds.), *Critical security studies: An introduction* (pp. 75–88). Routledge.

- Rasmussen, M. V. (2004). 'It sounds like a riddle': Security studies, the war on terror and risk. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 33(2), 381–395.
- Sorenson, G. (1996). Individual security and national security: The state remains the principal problem. *Security Dialogue*, 27(4), 371–386.
- Supinski, S. (2011). *Security studies: The homeland adapts*. Homeland Security Affairs 7. <https://www.hsaj.org/articles/65>
- Supinsky, S. (2011, September). Security studies the homeland adapts. *Homeland Security Affairs*, 7(2). <https://www.hsaj.org/articles/65>
- The Washington Post*. (2001, Nov 8). *President Bush's address in Atlanta, Ga., on homeland security and the ongoing war on terrorism*. [http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/nation/specials/attacked/transcripts/bushtext\\_110801.html?noredirect=on](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/nation/specials/attacked/transcripts/bushtext_110801.html?noredirect=on)
- Tickner, J. A. (1992). *Gender in international relations: Feminist perspectives on achieving global security*. Columbia University Press.
- United Nations Development Programme. (1994). *Human Development Report* (p. 23). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Waever, O. (2011). Securitization. In Christopher, W. H., & Lai, Y. M. (Eds.), *Security Studies: A Reader*, (pp. 93-98). London and New York: Routledge.
- Wald, P. (2008). *Contagious: Cultures, carriers and the outbreak narrative*. Duke University Press.
- Walt, S. M. (1991). The renaissance of security studies. *International Studies Quarterly*, 35, 211–239.
- Waltz, K. N. (1979). *Theory of International Politics*. Addison-Wesley Pub. Co.
- Wolfers, A. (1952). 'National Security' as an ambiguous symbol. *Political Studies Quarterly*, 67(4), 481–502.