



## Security

How do we know when we are investing wisely in security? Answering this question requires investigating what things are worth securing (and why); what threatens them; how best to protect them; and how to think about it. Is it possible to protect them? How best go about protecting them? What trade-offs are involved in allocating resources to security problems? This book responds to these questions by stripping down our preconceptions and rebuilding an understanding of security from the ground up on the basis of a common-sense ontology and an explicit theory of value. It argues for a clear distinction between objective and subjective security threats, a non-anthropocentric understanding of security, and a particular hierarchy of security referents, looking closely at four in particular – the ecosphere, the state, culture, and individual human beings. The analysis will be of interest not only to students and scholars of International Relations, but also to practitioners.

DAVID A. WELCH is University Research Chair and Professor of Political Science at the Balsillie School of International Affairs, University of Waterloo. His previous books include *Justice and the Genesis of War* (Cambridge University Press, 1993), which won the 1994 Edgar S. Furniss Award for an Outstanding Contribution to National Security Studies, and *Painful Choices: A Theory of Foreign Policy Change* (2005), which was the inaugural winner of the International Studies Association International Security Studies Section Best Book Award. He is currently co-editor of the Cambridge University Press journal, *International Theory*.

# Security

## A Philosophical Investigation

DAVID A. WELCH

*Balsillie School of International Affairs, University of Waterloo*



CAMBRIDGE  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press & Assessment  
978-1-009-27010-6 — Security: A Philosophical Investigation  
D. Welch  
Frontmatter  
[More Information](#)

---



**CAMBRIDGE**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge CB2 8EA, United Kingdom

One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA

477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre,  
New Delhi – 110025, India

103 Penang Road, #05-06/07, Visioncrest Commercial, Singapore 238467

Cambridge University Press is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment,  
a department of the University of Cambridge.

We share the University's mission to contribute to society through the pursuit of  
education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

[www.cambridge.org](http://www.cambridge.org)

Information on this title: [www.cambridge.org/9781009270106](http://www.cambridge.org/9781009270106)

DOI: 10.1017/9781009270113

© David A. Welch 2022

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions  
of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take  
place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press & Assessment.

First published 2022

*A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.*

ISBN 978-1-009-27010-6 Hardback

ISBN 978-1-009-27012-0 Paperback

Cambridge University Press & Assessment has no responsibility for the persistence  
or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this  
publication and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will  
remain, accurate or appropriate.

Cambridge University Press & Assessment  
978-1-009-27010-6 — Security: A Philosophical Investigation  
D. Welch  
Frontmatter  
[More Information](#)

---

*For Nathaniel, whose generation is paying the price for the  
sins of my own; with love and apologies.*

Contents

<i>List of Figures</i>	<i>page</i> ix
<i>List of Tables</i>	x
<i>Preface and Acknowledgements</i>	xi
Introduction	1
1 The Meaning of ‘Security’	10
Defining ‘Security’	10
Securing	15
Security, Securitization, and Threat Perception	18
<i>Securitization</i>	18
<i>Threat Perception</i>	25
2 What Is Worth Securing, and Why?	32
Two Kinds of Value	33
<i>Intrinsic Value</i>	34
<i>Extrinsic Value</i>	43
<i>Securitizing Value</i>	46
Anthropocentrism Reconsidered	47
Operational Implications	54
3 Ecospheric Security	57
The Value of the Ecosphere	62
Threats to the Ecosphere	67
Securing the Ecosphere	77
Toward a Genuinely Post-human Politics of Ecospheric Security	83
4 State Security	91
The Value of the State	95
Threats to the State	107
Which States Are Worth Securing?	115
5 Cultural Security	125
The Value of Culture	129
Threats to Culture	134
	vii

viii		<i>Contents</i>
	<i>Nonanthropogenic vs. Anthropogenic Threats; Genocide</i>	135
	<i>Cultural Appropriation</i>	139
	<i>Language Death</i>	143
	<i>Milieu Change</i>	148
	If Not Cultural ‘Security,’ What?	151
6	Human Security	159
	Individuals or Groups?	163
	Human Security and Human Rights	167
	Threats to Human Security	173
	Human Security in a Hierarchy of Needs	187
	Conclusion	191
	Security Interactions	196
	Providing Security in a Complex, Globally Networked World	202
	The Problems of Metaphysical and Value Pluralism	204
	<i>References</i>	208
	<i>Index</i>	273

Figures

0.1 Relative frequency of ‘national security’ and ‘human security’	<i>page 2</i>
3.1 Atmospheric CO <sub>2</sub> concentration	76
3.2 Environmental performance and GDP per capita	86
3.3 <i>Homo sapiens</i> , total population (billions)	88
4.1 Ethnic homogeneity/diversity for selected states, 2013	92
4.2 Postwar conflicts by type	111
4.3 Top 10 military budgets, 2020 (USD billions)	112
5.1 Languages by number of speakers (estimated) and net decline/uptake trends	146
6.1 Four possible relationships between human security and human rights	168
6.2 Hate-crime incidents in the United States	173
6.3 Human security and Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs	178
6.4 Freedom House scores, 2021	184
7.1 Stylized adaptive cycles within panarchy	199

*Tables*

4.1 State deaths, 1816–2020	<i>page 109</i>
-----------------------------	-----------------



## *Preface and Acknowledgements*

This book has been twenty years in the making. It had its origin in a course I taught at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, the purpose of which was to get students to radically question their understandings of security so that they could rebuild them from the ground up. I had the pleasure and privilege of discussing the issues that I engage with in this book with smart, motivated, creative students in intensive small-group discussions. I tortured them with hard questions about such things as what, if anything, can be said to have intrinsic (as opposed to merely extrinsic) value; whether our default anthropocentric understanding of security can be justified; whether it is more important to try to protect natural planetary systems or human social systems; what such things as ecospheric security, state security, cultural security, and human security really mean; whether any of the implicated security ‘referents’ that these concepts address can actually be secured from plausible threats; and how (or how far) we can know that we are allocating resources wisely in an attempt to secure them.

Of the nearly 200 students who took the course from me over the years at the University of Toronto, the University of Waterloo, and the Balsillie School of International Affairs, not one admitted to finding it easy. All found it somewhat frustrating. As far as I can tell, however, all also felt it worthwhile. A few have described it as life-changing (at least one, as a result of questioning his own anthropocentrism, became a vegetarian). For a teacher, there is nothing more gratifying – not the (single) conversion to vegetarianism, but the (general) deep engagement.

Every year, however, my students would ask me how I would answer my own questions. I always demurred. My job was not to tell them what *I* thought, I said, but to help them figure out what *they* thought. I think there may have been an element of cowardice in this. As a result of intense debates with smart students over the years, I found my views on these issues changing in response to arguments

they would make or challenges they would pose. I may have declined partly because I was unsure about where I stood. Eventually, however, I felt I should bite the bullet.

This book is my collected set of answers to my own questions. I offer it not as the final word on any of them, but in the spirit of encouraging others to seek their own answers by making the case for radically questioning preconceptions, self-consciously attempting to begin from philosophical first principles, and reconstructing an understanding of security grounded in an explicit theory of value.

I wish I could claim credit for the idea of the course, and thus also for this book. I cannot. The inspiration was that of Franklyn Griffiths, the inaugural George Ignatieff Chair of Peace and Conflict Studies at the University of Toronto, now retired, whom I succeeded in that role. Frank is someone with an extraordinary capacity to think outside the box. The course he designed was the capstone seminar for a genuinely interdisciplinary program that brought together literatures from fields as diverse as politics, sociology, anthropology, philosophy, physics, biology, chemistry, systems design engineering, and complexity theory. His syllabus included readings from all of these, and more. When Frank stopped teaching the course, Thomas ('Tad') Homer-Dixon stepped in. Tad brought experience with, and knowledge of, additional areas of research that made a rich course even richer. I was third in line. I don't know that I can claim to have brought any new expertise to the table, but one of the things that made the prospect of teaching it so appealing to me was that it would give me a chance to indulge my twin loves of international politics and philosophy, which I had studied in equal measure at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Early in my career, I had hoped that I would somehow manage to keep my feet in both camps. But, having been hired into a Department of Political Science and disciplinary pressures being what they are, this became harder and harder. Teaching the course would give me a chance to return to philosophy, at least in part. It would also give me a chance to honour Frank, who, twenty years earlier, had co-supervised my overly self-confident undergraduate thesis on what I rather grandiosely called 'the philosophy of nuclear deterrence.' A circle, I felt, would close.

While the idea for this book is not mine, the execution is. I doubt that either Frank or Tad would answer my questions in quite the same way. In fact, I *know* Tad would not, as he shared generous feedback with me on an early draft.

*Preface and Acknowledgements*

xiii

I am grateful to many people without whom this book would never have seen the light of day. They fall into two main groups.

The first group is the students who suffered heroically through my classes and who had such a profound effect on my own thinking: Noha Aboueldahab, Stéphanie Ah Tchou, Mana Alraddadi, Samuel Ameh, Farkhod Aminjonov, Greg Anastasopoulos, Solanna Anderson, Carla Angulo-Pasel, Justin Anstett, Alex Apostolopoulos, Linamaria Aristizabal, Cole Atlin, Betsy Aziz, Ioana Bala, Ali Bangi, Greg Baribeau, Hanae Baruchel, Sangarasigamany Bhahirathan, Farnam Bidgoli, Tuca Bihari, Allie Bly, Chris Bordeleau, Josh Bowen, Eric Boynton, Shanly Brennan, Skylar Brooks, Kristen Brown, Amelia Bulloch, Mark Carter, Marie-Adele Cassola, Isaac Caverhill, Jeff Chalifoux, Evelyn Chan, Moses Chan, Jerry Chang, Joelle Charbonneau, Andrew Chater, Kevin Cherry, Janet Chow, Evan Cinq-Mars, Warren Clarke, Vanessa Corlazzoli, Mary Crawford, Nikola Danaylov, Terry D'Andrea, Vincent Di Sciullo, Jonathan Diab, Jasmina Djikic, Quinton Doiron, Tristan Downe-Dewdney, Darlene D'souza, Stephanie Dudkowski, Dave Eagle, Isabelle Ekwa Ekoko, Inas Ettayebi, Asif Farooq, Julie Fellmayer, Mike Fleet, Aaron Francis, Patrick Fraser, Karen Frecker, Elayna Fremes, Anika Ganness, James Gardener, Vanessa Gastaldo, Ivana Gazibara, Jason Glasbergen, Ash Goertz, Marcos Gomez, Michael Gray, David Gudjonsson, Cassandra Haig, Tanzeel Hakak, Guy Halpern, Durre Hanif, Meghan Hanley, Kyle Harris, Brendan Heath, Venus Ho, Brett Hockley, Shani Hormozi, Aminah Husain, David Isern, Omar Ismail, Hazem Jamjoum, Fiorella Jaramillo, Amanda Joynt, Oliver Jull, Alesia Kachur, Filip Kedzior, Max Kelly, Sarah Kelsey, Safina Khan, Craig Kielburger, David Kim, Melanie Klein, Conrad Koczorowski, Maja Kokotovic, Andrew Koltun, Dan Koscinski, Bryony Lau, Denise Lau, Michael Lawrence, David Leach, Ah-Jung Lee, Rosita Lee, Jennifer LeFeuvre, Jee Yeon Lim, Victoria Long, Jennifer MacDowell, Rhys Machold, Katherine Mackenzie, Jesse Maclean, Titli Maitra, Sana Malik, Tina Mangat, Joanna Mantello, Adela Matejcek, Shane McCaughey, Jenna Meguid, Lars Meling, Manjana Milkoreit, Annahita Mirsalari, Trisha-Ann Mirza, Pallavi Misra, Sara Mojtehdzadeh, Mallory Motley, Zak Naimpoor, Emily Newcombe, James Nicol, Momoko Nomura, Liora Norwich, O. P. Onadipe, Sriram Pakeerathan, Sharon Peake, Ryan Phillips, Jinelle Piereder, Michael Poon, Alisha Preston, Caroline Price, Rebekah Pullen, Jenn Quito, Eleanor Rae, Sadia Rafiquddin, Aaron Rath, Matt Redding,

Crista Renner, Mark Richardson, Steven Richman, Zahra Rizvi, Timothy Rudd, Tania Rusque, Jessica Russell, Casey Sahadath, Justine Salam, Karina Sangha, Signe Scheid, Stefan Schilling, Sarah Segal, Daniel Sheppard, Nawroos Shibli, Jana Shoemaker, Sam Siew, Touseef Siraj, Hugh Smiley, Craig Smith, Charlotte Sobolewski, Chris Somerville, Liam Stockdale, Alex Suen, Alex Szaflarska, Danielle Takacs, Iris Tal-Halbert, Eric Tanguay, Saba Tariq, Carolyn Tateishi, Sonali Thakkar, Mathew Thijssen, Edward Thomas, Jessie Thomson, Mike Tierney, James Torrie, Ibi Turcsik, Cliff Vanderlinden, Jamie Vinken, Yong Hao Wang, Oksana Werbowy, Jessica West, Kimberly West, Julie Wilson, Peter Wilson, Chelsea Winn, Joe Yang, Kristen Yee, Asuka Yoshioka, Najib Yourish, and Zahra Ziaie Moayyed. My thanks to each and every one.

The second group includes those who read and commented on earlier drafts of the manuscript, in whole or in part (mostly in whole): Jacob Benjamin, Fred Bild, Jim Blight and Janet Lang, Leah Cabral, Mackenzie Cassels, Felicia Clement, Simon Dalby, David Dewitt, Hani El Masry, Randy Enkin, Ange Fangeat, David Fott, Alexandra Gheciu, William Gillam, Stefano Guzzini, Steve Haigh, Jarrod Hayes, Tad Homer-Dixon, Eric Hubberstey, Jacques Hymans, Peter Katzenstein, Alexander Lanoszka, Michael Lawrence, Ned Lebow, Michael Manulak, Stéphanie Martel, Lea Matheson, Kate Motluk, John Mueller, Harald Müller, Sarah Norton, Joseph Nye, Louis Pauly, Mark Raymond, Emel Seven Bozcam, Moe Soufan, Masayuki Tadokoro, Jason Thistlethwaite, Andrew Thompson, Doug Welch, Alexander Wendt, and two anonymous reviewers. While I cannot claim to have addressed everyone's concerns perfectly, their criticisms and suggestions have helped me greatly improve the text.

I would also like to thank Romona Morgan, Dayna Nelson, Nicholas Rance, and Steven Smith for answering various questions beyond my expertise and Melissa Williams for helping me solve the single most difficult challenge I faced writing this book: settling on a title.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the generous financial support of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, without which this book – and so much else – would not have been possible.

## A Note on the Russian Invasion of Ukraine

This book was already in production when Russia invaded Ukraine on February 24, 2022. Whatever the denouement, that invasion is likely ultimately to prove to be an event of world-historical consequence.

The question naturally arises whether my argument would have been different if I had written the book after the fact with the full benefit of hindsight.

Time will tell. But I suspect not. Ukraine certainly stands as a counterexample to my claims that ‘most states today can effectively address the threat of interstate war with a relatively small investment’ and that military spending ‘is in most cases best thought of as insurance against an increasingly unlikely peril’ (Chapter 4), but I suspect that the larger point will still hold. Russia’s aggression is indeed extraordinary. If Russia ultimately pays the material, moral, and reputational costs that it now seems likely to incur as a result, the event will probably bolster, not weaken, the global norm against territorial conquest and John Mueller’s 1989 argument about the obsolescence of major war.

Vladimir Putin’s evident disregard for the welfare not only of the Ukrainian people but also of the Russian people would certainly have inclined me to speak at greater length of him as a particularly powerful example of a leader whose actions undermine the case for the worthiness of the security of their own regime. Accordingly, he would have featured more prominently alongside (for example) Xi Jinping and the Communist Party of China in my discussions on this head (Chapters 5 and 6). I do not, however, see at the moment any reason to believe that his actions affect the substance of my analysis there or elsewhere.