The Concept of Securitization and the Existing Problems of Liberalism

Moqing Jia

Faculty of International Relations, University of Liverpool, UK

`17709208598@163.com`

Abstract. Different authors analyze the same theory differently. This paper will look at Moffette and Vadasaria's and Lazell's articles on the core theories of liberalism and compare and further interpret the different perspectives they hold as well as the style of writing of the two articles. At the same time, this paper utilizes critical theory to examine and further analyze two articles. In the end, it is found that M&V use a clearer article structure to explain that current liberalism lacks a focus on race and needs to be supplemented, whereas L's article favors a traditional style in its framing, arguing that securitization studies need to apply liberal theory to governance at the global level as a means of using the doctrine to be widely applied and disseminated. Different authors analyze the same theory differently.

Keywords: Liberalism; Security theory; Critical thinking.

1   Introduction

The expansion of the scope of security and the development of the concept of global security is inevitable in the context of the increasing risk of threats at the global level. In the field of securitization, the theory of securitization is currently used to analyze a wide range of security issues, examples include immigration issues and the impact of liberalism on global stability. With the end of the Cold War, the implementation of security as an issue is gradually expanding in the face of different types of threat problems around the globe and efforts are being made to promote in-depth critical research on it by various scholars. In this context, securitization theory, the process of considering a problem or object as a security threat and taking action, is being widely applied to a variety of real-world threat problems. This essay aims to conduct a comparative analysis of two scholarly articles that delve into the intricate concept of securitization, while employing critical thinking to provide insightful commentary.

Articles by Lazell and Moffette & Vadasaria address different theses of the concept of securitization and analyze the themes discussed through critical thinking. The article by Moffette and Vadasaria suggests that the existing securitization conceptualizations of immigration and race are flawed and need to be supplemented.[1] Alternatively,

Lazell illustrates that although the concept of securitization is developed, the central element of liberalism is not explicitly employed and needs to be revisited.[2]

This essay will analyze the two articles side by side in several ways. Firstly, it will interpret the specifics of securitization theory, and after introducing the key concepts, the titles and introductions of the two articles will be examined. This will be followed by a close reading of the body of the two articles and the application of critical thinking to identify their similarities and differences. Finally, the insights given by the two articles will be discussed in the conclusion section.

2   Theoretical analysis

Securitization theory emphasizes security as a relative, multidimensional concept, defining threats as security problems and the process of taking measures to address them. In the securitization theory, the state first defines the threat as a security problem, so that a wide range of people are aware of the security threats around them, and on the basis of which security strategies are formulated. Some scholars have conducted relevant research and pointed out the link between securitization theory and threat, i.e., through securitization, an issue is perceived by the subject as being threatened. [3]

How the securitization theory can be applied to real threats, there are two examples here to demonstrate the practical connection between securitization and threats. First, in terms of the securitization theory, migration may threaten the social security order in the destination country, thus triggering multiple security factors that need to be securitized and measures taken to address new security challenges. Some scholars argue that there are four main perspectives on the security threat posed by immigration: concerns at the social and economic level in the destination country, border security and illegal immigration, culture and identity, and anti-immigrant discourse at the political level, with many political elites always defining immigration as a threat in terms of national security. After being threatened by the influx of migrants and transforming it into a security issue, many countries have introduced new immigration policies to address national security concerns. [4]

On the other hand, the threat posed by terrorism to the security of the State, society and citizens also defines it as a security issue. Other scholars have argued that the process is rationalized and securitized by first describing terrorism as an existential threat to the region, and then introducing counter-terrorism measures after it has been widely perceived at the societal level as a security problem that needs to be urgently addressed. [5] Based on the seriousness of the threat posed by terrorism to national security, the securitization theory defines it as a security problem that generates more attention at the societal level, in order to facilitate the subsequent introduction of a series of policies to address it.

Therefore, securitization theory is an important theoretical guide for threat identification, perception and response, and provides assistance to national and international organizations in formulating effective security policies.

3   Article Comparison

3.1   Title and Abstract

In terms of titles and abstracts, M&V's article is concisely expressed, while L's article favors a traditional format. Notably, the titles of the two articles diverge significantly in their expression.

The title of the M&V's article uses the term "Uninhibited violence" in conjunction with the issue of immigration and race, explicitly stating in the title that there may be some flaws in the topic of securitization that is to be discussed. L's article, while pointing out liberalism in the title, does not directly state the theme and main content of the article, and the title as a whole is relatively general and not as creative as M&V.

Moreover, the introduction serves as a crucial avenue for encapsulating the essence of the topic and outlining the research journey. The introduction to M&V's article is organized around its theme, first mentioning a few real-life examples of how the existing concept of securitization explains race and immigration, then suggesting the need to fill in the gaps, and finally describing the process of argumentation throughout the article, with a clear and well-structured logical framework.

In contrast, L's introduction is marked by its relatively expansive nature. L's article's introduction, on the other hand, is relatively lengthy overall, beginning with an introduction to the development of the study of securitization, and then explaining how liberalism, which is central to the development of securitization, has not been widely applied in global political governance, followed by a lengthy account of three existing interpretations of liberalism in the development securitization literature, and concluding with a number of suggestions for fixing the current state of affairs that does not delve deeper into liberalism, with a relatively ambiguous structure that makes it difficult to capture the main points.

Thus, comparing the headings and beginnings alone, M&V's article is relatively concise, whereas L's article explains the relevant information in more detail, making the total length difficult to recognize the structure.

3.2   Argument

When it comes to argumentation, M&V's article utilizes examples and expert analysis to make an objective statement that immigration and race expose the vacancy of securitization on related topics. M&V's article examines the history of the development of racism and points out that due to the colonial modernity, the issue of race has always been covered up, and at the same time, reinforces the thesis of the article by combining a lot of examples to prove that there are still a lot of problems of immigrants nowadays, most of which are related to racism, with a clear and logical logic as a whole, and the presentation of the thesis in a clear and concise manner, and the expert analysis and examples used are detailed to prove the argument.

Indeed, there are real-life examples of liberalism being controversial on race, and some scholars have shown that in recent times there have been white liberals who have

attempted various forms of institutions to combat the black protest movement, and that the doctrine has continued to be flawed in terms of its racial controversiality.[6]

On the other hand, L's article delves into the pivotal role of liberalism in global political governance and its potential to facilitate development. L's article explores the core concept of how liberalism can engage in global political governance and truly securitize development by analyzing three interpretations of liberalism and incorporating a number of real-life examples in the argumentation process, which the article suggests, emphasizing that the use of liberalism should be taken seriously. Although the argumentation process is relatively complex, it combines a large number of examples and professional analysis to make the argument throughout the text.

In addition to this, the use of liberalism in global governance, as proposed in the L's article, is not a nonsense in reality, but has the potential to be realized, as in the case of the African country Namibia, which, in its participation in regional peace activities, has utilized its foreign policy within the framework of liberalism to promote peaceful co-existence in the region.[7]

It can be seen that the two essays have their own styles based on the arguments as well as from the point of view of the argumentation steps, while also describing the arguments completely and giving a rigorous process of argumentation.

3.3   Content of the Article

In terms of the main content of the two articles, M&V's article describes how race has been under-researched in the concept of securitization and has been used to explain various migratory situations. M&V's article from the content of the existing literature for the study of securitization of the lack of racial perspective, and various scholars of the point of view that racial violence is the exception to the study of securitization, and then through the study of racial issues of the historical process to support, and at the same time, with the status quo of the colonial modernization to explain, the Western-centered civilization denies racism and regarded as the exception, and finally, with the immigrants to emphasize the issue of its links with race, the article argues that the securitization of the study of the process of the race component of the influence of the attention should be paid to.

On the other hand, L's article attempts to examine how liberalism fits into global governance through three readings. The first uses the example of the contradictions between international organizations regarding policies on the securitization of development to highlight the fundamental problem with the approach that the view that liberalism promotes free development to reach global stability cannot be unified, leading to the inability of liberalism to reach a global consensus; the second reading combines the analysis of experts in the discussion of the core of global governance with the idea that liberalism as a state of domination makes countries gradually care about autonomy and participation, and tend to be self-reliant, which would help implement development policies; the third statement of the argument focuses on the transformation of liberalism, which many scholars have analyzed as participating in global governance alongside the second reading, helping to explain the core of the securitization of development debate.

Both articles meticulously detail their respective arguments and exhibit a logical organization of ideas. M&V's piece meticulously unpacks the nexus between race and securitization, while L's article navigates the complex terrain of liberalism within the realm of global governance, offering diverse interpretations and analyses.

4   Using Critical Theory to View the Shortcomings of the Two Articles

Both articles offer critiques of liberalism's persisting deficiencies and highlight shortcomings within the concept of securitization.   However, while L's article endeavors to propose potential solutions, M&V's article primarily focuses on substantiating its arguments.

The article by Moffette and Vadasaria argues that liberalism was born out of colonial modernization and is too tolerant when it comes to racial violence.[8] Lazell suggests that some of the interpretations of liberalism in existing research on the securitization of development are fundamentally problematic, failing to identify points of ambivalence in various policies, while some interpretations as neo-liberalism can be applied to global governance networks.[9] Both articles are pointing out that liberalism is still flawed, and indeed, liberalism itself is controversial due to the diversity of ideas, and thus inevitably subject to controversy and revision in the application of the concept of securitization.[10] Trying to address the shortcomings of liberalism itself requires getting to the root of what is really problematic about liberal theory and providing a satisfactory way out.[11]

Lazell analyzes the origins of liberalism while suggesting that liberalism needs to be transformed in order to be accepted by the global governance network, while arguing that the problems with the securitization of development are rooted in the structural inequalities created by global capital, exploring in detail the root causes of the deficiencies of liberalism and conducting further research on securitized development.[12]

In contrast, Moffette and Vadasaria also suggest that liberalism has been too permissive on race and illustrate the need to revisit the role of securitization in colonial modernization, they do not thoroughly analyze the origins of liberal theory and are unable to make any substantive proposals to revise the status quo of the race issue and develop the concept of securitization.[13]

Both essays adopt a critical stance, delving into the complexities of liberalism and securitization. They underscore the importance of addressing fundamental issues to effectively tackle existing security challenges.

5   Conclusion

In conclusion, this paper compares two articles discussing the concept of securitization and uses critical thinking to analyze the differences and commonalities. In terms of conclusion, M&V's article emphasizes that the problems posed by racism should be taken into account in securitization studies and racial violence should not be considered

as an exception, while L's article gives suggestions for reasonable liberalism applied to global governance, which can be a better aid to securitization development.

In comparison, M&V's article is more rigorous and structured, with a clear and concise argumentation process and a large number of examples, but from a critical point of view, it does not discuss the concept of securitization and the origins of liberalism, and is unable to give reasonable suggestions for revision. L's article is more traditional and ambiguous in its framework and does not capture the arguments clearly, but it explores in detail the roots of liberalism and the securitization of development, and makes suggestions for the application of liberalism to global governance in the study of securitization.

Each article contributes valuable insights to the discourse, highlighting the multifaceted nature of securitization and the complex interplay of race, liberalism, and global governance.

Reference

1. Moffette David and Shaira Vadasaria, "Uninhibited Violence: Race and the Securitization of Immigration." *Critical studies on security* 4, no. 3 (2016): 291.
2. Lazell Melita, "Liberalism(s) and the Critical Securitization of Development Debate." *Globalizations* 13, no. 4 (2016): 361.
3. Howell, Alison, and Melanie Richter-Montpetit. "Is Securitization Theory Racist? Civilizationism, Methodological Whiteness, and Antiblack Thought in the Copenhagen School." *Security Dialogue* 51, no. 1 (2020): 5.
4. Ogbonna, Confidence Nwachinemere, Nsemba Edward Lenshie, and Chikodiri Nwangwu. "Border Governance, Migration Securitisation, and Security Challenges in Nigeria." *Society* 60, no. 3 (2023): 299.
5. Mwangi, O.G., and C.W. Mwangi. "Securitisation and Spaces of Terrorism in Kenya's National Police Service Counterterrorism Discourse." *Critical Studies on Terrorism* (2024): 74.
6. Nocera Amato, "Negotiating the Aims of African American Adult Education: Race and Liberalism in the Harlem Experiment, 1931–1935." *History of education quarterly* 58, no. 1 (2018): 32.
7. Mushelenga Peya, "Namibia's Foreign Policy and Its Impact on Peace and Security in the Southern Africa Region: A Framework of Liberalism as a Theory of International Relations Studies." *India quarterly* 76, no. 4 (2020): 584.
8. David and Vadasaria, "Uninhibited Violence: Race and the Securitization of Immigration." 302.
9. Melita, "Liberalism(s) and the Critical Securitization of Development Debate." 362.
10. Bell Duncan, "What Is Liberalism?" *Political theory* 42, no. 6 (2014): 684.
11. Beiner Ronald, *What's the Matter with Liberalism?* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2023), 17.
12. Melita, "Liberalism(s) and the Critical Securitization of Development Debate." 364.
13. David and Vadasaria, "Uninhibited Violence: Race and the Securitization of Immigration." 303.