Introduction

This book is about the evolution of International Security Studies (ISS), in the beginning as an independent field of study, but quite quickly absorbed as a sub-field of International Relations (IR), which was developing rapidly alongside it.[1] Like IR itself, ISS is mainly a Western subject, largely done in North America, Europe and Australia with all of the Western-centrisms that this entails. ISS is one of the main sub-fields of Western IR. Wherever IR is taught, ISS is one of its central elements. There is an antecedent literature extending back before the Second World War which can largely be characterised as war studies, military and grand strategy, and geopolitics. This includes much discussed writers such as Clausewitz, Mahan, Richardson and Haushofer, whose work still remains relevant. But we are not going to cover this literature both for reasons of space, and also because a distinctive literature about security developed after 1945 (Freedman, 1981a; Wæver and Buzan, 2007). This literature was distinctive in three ways. First, it took *security* rather than defence or war as its key concept, a conceptual shift which opened up the study of a broader set of political issues, including the importance of societal cohesion and the relationship between military and non-military threats and vulnerabilities. The ability of security to capture the conceptual centre of ISS dealing with defence, war and conflict as well as the broadness of the term was famously condensed in Wolfers's definition of security as an ambiguous symbol. In laying out the ability of security policy to subordinate all other interests to those of the nation, Wolfers stressed the rhetorical and political force that 'security' entailed despite having very little intrinsic meaning (Wolfers, 1952: 481). Second, this literature was distinct because it addressed the novel problems of both the Cold War and nuclear weapons. How to deploy, use and not use military means

---

[1] 'ISS' is not universally used as the designator for the sub-field. We use it as an umbrella label to include the work of scholars who might refer to themselves as being in 'international security', or 'security studies', or 'strategic studies', or 'peace research', or various other more specialised labels. We set out the scope of ISS in detail in chapter 1

1

were quite different questions in the conditions of the nuclear age, and it was from those questions that the sub-field of ISS mainly arose. Third, and related to both the total war mobilisations of Britain and the US during the Second World War, and the peculiar strategic conditions created by nuclear weapons, ISS was much more a civilian enterprise than most earlier military and strategic literatures. Strategic bombing and nuclear weapons transcended traditional military warfighting expertise in ways that required, or at least opened the door to, bringing in civilian experts ranging from physicists and economists to sociologists and psychologists. As shown during the Second World War, strategic bombing required knowledge about how best to disable the enemy's economy and infrastructure, not just how to defeat his armed forces. Nuclear deterrence quickly became the art of how to avoid fighting wars while at the same time not being militarily defeated or coerced. The centrality of the civilian element also reflects the fact that ISS has largely flourished in democratic countries, while strategic thinking in non-Western countries generally remained more firmly in the grip of the military.

Although security was a new lead concept in the post-Second World War world (Yergin, 1978; Wæver, 2006), its implications for a wider, not exclusively military–political understanding of the subject were not fully felt until quite late in the Cold War. During most of the Cold War, ISS was defined by a largely military agenda of questions surrounding nuclear weapons and a widely embedded assumption that the Soviet Union posed a profound military and ideological threat to the West. From the 1970s onwards, as the nuclear relationship between the superpowers matured, the original breadth carried by the term security began to re-emerge, opening up pressure to widen the international security agenda away from the military–political focus. Economic and environmental security became established, if controversial, parts of the agenda during the later years of the Cold War, and were joined during the 1990s by societal (or identity) security, human security, food security and others. Much of this literature stayed within the predominant national security frame of the Cold War, but some of it began to challenge the emphasis on material capabilities as well as state-centric assumptions, opening paths to studies of the importance of ideas and culture and to referent objects for security other than the state. These moves were accompanied by more critical and radical challenges to state-centrism, with the result that instead of flowing as a single river within one set of quite narrowly defined banks, ISS has broadened out into several distinct but inter-related flows of literature. In addition to the more traditionalist, military-centred Strategic Studies and

Peace Research, there is also Critical Security Studies, Feminist Security Studies, the Copenhagen School, Poststructuralism and Constructivist Security Studies.

Given that ISS has both undergone some radical changes and maintained some core continuities, and has done so quite visibly in interaction with changes in its environment, evolution is an appropriate concept for understanding its intellectual history. Our understanding of evolution is a Darwinian one that defines it as about how things adapt (or not) to the environment they inhabit, and to changes in that environment. Evolution is not teleological. It exposes the logic of change without either supposing any particular outcome or offering any prediction. It charts the successes, but also the failures and extinctions. In chapter 3, we set up a framework of five driving forces as a way of identifying the main environmental pressures on ISS and how it adapted to them and sometimes influenced them. A non-teleological view of evolution also leaves open the question of how to evaluate progress: evolution as a process can move towards lower levels of complexity and diversity as well as higher ones. We return to the question of progress in our summing up of ISS in chapter 9. But along the way it is not our aim to identify the best or only theory of international security, or to integrate all of the various literatures spawned within ISS into one 'master theory'. Rather our goal is to tell a thorough intellectual history of how the various approaches define positions within the debates about ISS.

Nye and Lynn-Jones (1988) noted twenty years ago that no intellectual history of ISS had yet been written, and this book is a belated attempt to fill that lacuna. Our longer historical perspective distinguishes our project from the current standard textbook way of presenting the sub-field of ISS. To take some recent examples, Collins (2007) is organised thematically, and most chapters focus on the substance of particular approaches or themes, while not devoting much attention to the historical context in which these arose. The book as a whole is quite aptly summed up by the first word of the title: it is *Contemporary* rather than *Historically Contextualised*. Dannreuther (2007a), Sheehan (2005) and Hough (2004) take a similar, largely post-1990, approach. Paul D. Williams (2008) is notable for taking a longer view, and like the others frames the subject through IR approaches (Realism, Liberalism, Critical Theory, etc.) along one dimension and thematic security concepts and issues along another. These textbooks are good representatives of how the field of ISS is presented, or used as a taken for granted springboard for empirical or theoretical analysis. There is no perceived need to include a section

on how ISS came to have its present structure, and for new entrants ISS might almost have begun in 1990.

To approach ISS in this manner has the advantage that many different thematic and empirical areas can be covered, but it misses some of the advantages of a more historical approach. These advantages are first that an ahistorical perspective may lead to the forgetting of past knowledge which in turn makes contemporary scholars work hard to reinvent the wheel. Since ISS is a sub-field built on conceptual, normative and empirical contestation, to point to the value of past knowledge is not to say that there is one objective truth which can be uncovered. Past literatures identify a series of pros and cons of adopting a particular policy or conceptualisation of security. To take the example of George W. Bush's resurrection of anti-ballistic missile defence (Strategic Defence Initiative or SDI), there is a rich literature on the advantages and disadvantages of this policy written in the early 1980s that should be consulted, particularly before one accepts the claim by the Bush administration that such a policy entails no threatening or escalating elements (Glaser, 1984). The value of the 'past knowledge' uncovered is thus more accurately described as 'past contested knowledge'.

The second advantage of a historical perspective is that it questions commonly held assumptions about a field's development. One such myth is to tell the story of the widening approaches as caused by the ending of the Cold War. In reality there was a significant 1980s literature that laid the groundwork for the growth of widening and deepening approaches in the 1990s. The point here is not only that a historiography may correct such myths and thus give us a better understanding of what actually took place, but that it brings critical attention to the role that these myths have in the self-understanding of a discipline (Wæver, 1998). For example, the standard account of IR as having gone through three or four debates grants more legitimacy to those approaches coined as the winners and implicitly argues that the themes of each specific debate are the significant ones for understanding the substance of IR.

The third advantage of a history that 'trace[s] the political consequences of adopting a particular concept' (Hansen, 2000b: 347) is that it allows for an examination of the deeper political and normative implications of both the core concept of ISS, 'security', and three categories of concepts that are spun off from security: complementary concepts (deterrence for example), parallel concepts (like power) and oppositional concepts (such as peace). The complementary concept of containment, for example, originated in early Cold War American policies that were designed to

counter what was believed to be an aggressive and uncompromising Soviet
threat. Embedded in this central concept was a particular understanding
of the identity of the opposing enemy, what the relationship between the
American and Western Self and the Communist, Soviet East could be, and
hence how security should be pursued. When 'containment' resurfaces
in contemporary security discourse as a way in which terrorism should
be fought, it comes with these historically constituted understandings of
both enemies and the strategies to fight them. As IR-political theorists
such as R. B. J. Walker (1987, 1990, 1993) and Michael C. Williams (1998,
2005, 2007) have laid out, since concepts of security are at the deeper level
particular 'solutions' to a long list of important questions that concern the
identity of Self and Other, boundaries (territorial and social), authority,
legitimacy and sovereignty, alternative conceptualisations need to engage
these political structures of meaning and to offer alternative conceptions.
A historical approach can help us show how these deeper structures were
formed, how they have been reproduced or challenged and why such
challengers succeeded or failed.

The fourth advantage of a historical analysis is that it allows for a more
dynamic conception of how a discipline, field or sub-field develops than
one which organises ISS along thematic lines. Bluntly put, an account
of ISS that does not have a historical dimension would not give a very
good idea of why particular approaches appear on the agenda, what their
relationships were to previous and contemporary approaches, and why
some disappeared. The framework laid out in the following chapters
is dynamic in two respects. First, it is designed to study a process of
change and evolution. Second, it holds, as we will discuss in more detail
below, that no single factor can explain the evolution of ISS. Neither
political events nor material forces nor, for that matter, academic theories
can single-handedly explain the evolution of ISS as an academic field.
Epistemologically, our framework thus does not seek to make a causal
claim. Indeed, we believe that the historical development of ISS proves
the impossibility of explaining it in such terms, whether the explanatory
variable is internal or external, material or ideational. From the point of
view of those who make causality the definition of proper social science
(Keohane, 1988; King *et al.*, 1994), this is obviously a weakness of our
framework, but not only is the status of causality itself challenged within
IR and ISS (Kurki and Wight, 2007), it is a 'price' we are willing to pay,
since a model with several interacting driving forces allows us to capture
the dynamic nature of academic disciplinary evolution in a way that a
monocausal framework would not. It also opens a more structural view

of ISS, hopefully allowing those within it to see their own environment more clearly.

The fifth and final advantage of a historical approach is directly related to our normative view of how ISS should ideally develop at the level of sociology of science. Our normative position, to which we will return in chapter 9, 'Conclusions', is that ISS is well suited by being home to multiple perspectives. This end is served by the processes of institutionalisation which have given everybody from rational choice Neorealists to Poststructuralist Feminists places to publish and foundations to apply to (although the balance may not be an even one!). With our belief that ISS is and should be home to several perspectives, follows a normative commitment to debate and engagement not only within but between ISS approaches. Several security scholars have recently observed that ISS develops along increasingly separate tracks, on distinct European and American ones (Wæver, 1998, 2004a; Wæver and Buzan, 2007) or along the lines of Realism, Poststructuralism, Feminism and so on (Sylvester, 2007b). Assuming that this picture of ISS is correct, that the sub-field is branching out but that the branches (no longer) come together at the trunk of the tree, a historical analysis allows us to trace when particular approaches were formed and what their connection was to the central questions of the sub-field of ISS. An intellectual history facilitates the uncovering of conversations that were once there, and by bringing them back together a renewed engagement and dialogue may be generated.

For all of these reasons, this book offers something different from, but complementary to, the current crop of introductory textbooks to ISS. Our hope is that they will be read in conjunction.

Chapter 1 provides a more detailed account of the challenges involved in defining ISS. We argue in favour of including literature that self-identifies as ISS or as one of the many specific Security Studies approaches regardless of whether all other ISS perspectives agree that they should be included. We then suggest that the delineation of ISS and the substantial debates within it can be understood through four questions (referent object, location of threats, security sector and view of security politics) and that the concept of security is supported by three adjacent forms of concepts: complementary, parallel and oppositional. The last part of the chapter turns to the relationship between ISS and other academic disciplines, particularly IR. Chapter 2 looks at the central concepts at the heart of ISS: the state, government, sovereignty and authority and how they were produced historically. The chapter also introduces the importance of epistemology and the main ways in which it has influenced ISS. Part

of our purpose is to describe how ISS unfolded, but we also want to understand why it evolved in the way it did, and chapter 3 looks at the five driving forces that shaped the formation and evolution of ISS. These three introductory chapters set up the framework that we use in chapters 4 to 8 to trace and explain how the subject has evolved.

Chapters 4 and 5 cover the Cold War period. Chapter 4 surveys the traditionalist perspective, looking at the 'golden age' of Strategic Studies and its decline. Chapter 5 looks at those who challenged it, whether from Peace Research and Arms Control, or from the beginnings of the widening (economic and environmental security) and deepening (Feminism, Poststructuralism) perspectives that began to emerge during the 1980s. Chapters 6 and 7 cover the period from the end of the Cold War to the terrorist attack on the US on 9/11. Again, we start with the traditional military–political perspective, and then look at the widening and deepening challenges to this, some of which move onto quite different ground from those during the Cold War. We are aware that the chronological structure of chapters 4 to 7 might reinforce the idea of a great divide between pre- and post-1990, but we hope that the continuities show through as strongly as the changes. Chapter 8 looks at the short period since 9/11 and tries to assess the impact of that benchmark event on all the strands of ISS. Chapter 9 sums up the main conclusions about the changing shape of ISS, it reconsiders the utility of the driving forces framework for explaining the evolution of ISS, and reflects on the outlook for ISS.

Since we are, among other things, providing a history of the ISS literature, our referencing will favour citing first editions rather than later ones. We certainly have not cited everything in the literature, and even so our list of references is enormous. We have tried to take on board all of the landmark writings and authors, and beyond that to give fair representations of all the significant lines of literature. When we group a set of references under a given topic this may include things that both represent and criticise a given position, school or point. We chose the Harvard system of referencing because of its economy of wordage and its placement of author information at the precise relevant points. Even without trying to include everything, in later chapters the citations sometimes become sufficiently dense that they interfere with the smooth reading of the text. Where this happens, we put the references into footnotes.

1

Defining International Security Studies

International Security Studies (ISS) grew out of debates over how to pro-
tect the state against external and internal threats after the Second World
War. Security became its watchword (Wolfers, 1952; Yergin, 1978), both
distinguishing ISS from earlier thinking and the disciplines of War Studies
and Military History, and, as it evolved, serving as the linking concept
connecting an increasingly diverse set of research programmes. Look-
ing back on more than sixty years of academic writing on international
security, the first pertinent question for an intellectual history of ISS is
to define what makes up the sub-field and where the boundary zones
between it and adjacent academic disciplines are located.

To delineate ISS is unfortunately not as straightforward an exercise as
one might wish. The label 'international security' was not adopted from
the outset, but only gradually became accepted, and there is no univer-
sally agreed definition of what ISS comprises, and hence no accepted
archive of 'ISS-documents' that define our object of study. As this book
will demonstrate, not only is there a large body of ISS literature, it is one
whose themes, discussions and participants change across time and place.
The composition of ISS has mainly been taken for granted, with the con-
sequence that little self-reflection on what made up ISS or its boundaries
has been produced. The absence of a universal definition of what makes
up ISS means that ISS has at times become a site for disciplinary politics
with different perspectives arguing that they should be included while
others (usually different sorts of widening perspectives) should not.

The delineation of ISS is complicated by the fact that as time goes
by we get a different perspective on what falls in and what does not.
To paraphrase Foucault's genealogical understanding of history as always
being told from the point of the present, the fact that we tell the story of
ISS from a 2008 perspective means that we look at a field which has some
strikingly different preoccupations, both substantive and epistemological,
from those that dominated it in, say, 1972. And it would have been easier
to delineate ISS had it always been explicitly centred on the concept

of security. Unfortunately, this has not been the case. Indeed, after its first decade of explicit theoretical and conceptual innovation, the field's mainstream carried out its work without much conceptual reflection (Baldwin, 1997). During the 'golden age' of Strategic Studies it would have been easy to think that 'strategy' was the dominant concept, albeit strategy now dominated by civilian rather than military thinkers. Thus in 1983, Buzan (1983: 3) could point out that security was an 'underdeveloped concept' and 'seldom addressed in terms other than the policy interests of particular actors or groups, and the discussion has a heavy military emphasis'. 'Security' is, as this and the next chapter will lay out, about crucial political themes such as the state, authority, legitimacy, politics and sovereignty, but even today the majority of articles and books that fall within the discipline of ISS do not contain lengthy meta-theoretical or philosophical discussions, but speak from within an implicit position on the conceptual terrain.

Our solution to the problem of delineating ISS starts from understanding conceptual security debates as 'the product of an historical, cultural, and deeply political legacy' (M. C. Williams, 2007: 17), not as something that can be solved through references to 'empirical facts' (Baldwin, 1997: 12). This means that we take the power of inclusion and exclusion seriously. We cast our net widely and include the work of those who self-identify as participants in ISS (mainly in terms of how they title their work, who they seem to regard as their appropriate audience and, up to a point, where they publish) regardless of whether all others who self-identify with the sub-field accept them as 'members' or not. Our ambition is not to find the ISS-winner, but to provide a rich and structured account of ISS that shows how multiple perspectives connect to a set of shared discussions on security. Since our point of reference is the (contested) disciplinary history of ISS, rather than the elaboration of what we think should be the theory or concept of security, we do not follow Kolodziej (2005) in coming up with suggestions for new concepts or dimensions to be included. Nor do we offer free-standing discussions of Hobbes, Clausewitz and Thucydides or other pre-ISS Classical figures. Clearly these and other early Realist and Liberal writers have been important to the foundation and development of IR, but our concern is with the evolution of modern ISS and the use to which Classical political and military theorists have been put in the post-1945 literature, rather than with these classics in their own right.

Our specific way of delineating ISS is set out in the rest of this chapter. The next section argues that despite the surface appearance of being pre-occupied with policy debates, underneath, ISS can be seen as structured

by engagement with four questions: whether to privilege the state as the referent object, whether to include internal as well as external threats, whether to expand security beyond the military sector and the use of force, and whether to see security as inextricably tied to a dynamic of threats, dangers and urgency. To see ISS as structured by these four questions allows us to see how deeper theoretical and political themes are implicated in ISS, and as a consequence to point out how perspectives share common conversational ground. The third section addresses the problem that far from all ISS literature goes directly through 'security'. We suggest that ISS can be understood through 'security' itself plus three 'adjacent' concepts that support it in different ways: by being complementary and more concrete; by being more general and linking to larger literatures; and by being oppositional challenges to 'security'. The fourth section discusses the disciplinary boundary zones between ISS and other established areas of academic study, particularly IR. The fifth section lays out the Western-centric nature of ISS and discusses the ways in which this bias can be addressed by granting retrospective attention to Post-colonial criticism.

Four questions that structure ISS

There are four questions which have, either implicitly or explicitly, structured debates within ISS since the late 1940s. These questions can have different answers, but that is not to say that they are always explicitly discussed: a large part of the ISS literature simply takes particular answers/concepts as givens. The four questions are analytical lenses or tools through which to read the evolution of ISS; they are the deeper, substantial core that defines what 'international security' is about and what brings the literature together. Explicit discussions usually happen when established approaches are contested and their answers cannot be taken for granted. Viewing ISS through these questions makes it clear that there are fundamental political and normative decisions involved in defining security and that this is what makes it one of the essentially contested concepts of modern social science. Security is always a 'hyphenated concept' and always tied to a particular referent object, to internal/external locations, to one or more sectors and to a particular way of thinking about politics.

The first question is whether to privilege the state as the referent object. Security is about constituting something that needs to be secured: the nation, the state, the individual, the ethnic group, the environment or