

The Relationship between Risk Analysis and Security Studies

Dr. Asif Ali

Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Bacha Khan University, charsadda-Pakistan.

Email: drasifsalim@bkuc.edu.pk.

Abstract: There had been little interaction between the risk analysis and security studies academic communities a few decades ago. But now, these two research areas fall under a different school of thought in international relations (IR), including security studies and sociology, economics, and the natural sciences for risk studies. The growing attention paid to major disasters, such as violence, global warming, etc., has provided security studies and risk analysis disciplines with a unifying factual subject and underlined the importance of a shared study objective. This paper's main topic of discussion is to explore how risk analysis is interlinked with security studies. The second part outlines the ideas of risk and what are the practical illustration from different perspectives. The third part demonstrates the historical background of risk in security studies. The paper's final section addresses the role of risk in security studies and discusses the approaches that make risk a part of security studies.

Keywords: Risk Analysis, Securities Studies, International Relations

Introduction

Risk has emerged as a powerful term in security studies to describe current developments in the administration of safety in the US and British, as shown in the handling of transnational ultimatums, including terrorism, global warming, criminal gangs, and energy crisis. But how precisely do security studies, risk, and these allegedly novel forms of governance relate to one another? And how do these ideas differ from how security and risk are often understood?

The only common thread across these ideas and discussions is a preoccupation with the unknown, the fresh danger, the hazy destiny, and the ensuing challenge of control and prevention. In current approaches to risk, Ulrich Beck and Anthony Giddens discuss a rising "ambiguity of knowing," Zygmund Bauman discusses the perception of unidentified and unannounced threats, and Frank Furedi discusses the "loss of causation" and a subsequent vocabulary of terror (Baumann 2006: 11; Beck 1992: 183; Furedi 2009: 202; Giddens 1992: 85; Peterson, 2016).

Every academic attempt to comprehend the shifting causality fluctuating perception of the relationship between the current and the coming in the handling of threats. The idea is that conventional risk management techniques are invalid because we can no longer forecast, regulate, or even predict the future. Due

to the recent blends between risk management and security approaches, adaptability and care have emerged as the most common slang used to describe the difficulty of feasible management.

Moreover, the risk in security studies appears to focus on how to deal with emerging, potentially devastating dangers. It also is about rising concerns over how federal security monitoring governance is in the routine daily operations of government entities, nonprofit organizations, and private corporations. This discussion explores how risk analysis is interlinked with security studies.

The second part outlines the ideas of risk and what are the practical illustration from different perspectives. The third part demonstrates the historical background of risk in security studies. The chapter's final section addresses the role of risk in security studies and discusses the approaches that make risk a part of security studies.

Overview of Risk**Risk - A Broad Perspective**

The economists, administration, and policyholders all are familiar with the idea of lender's risk. If upcoming hazards and threats will not be "observable" through data analysis and computational

mathematics, as the recent economic crisis starkly illustrated, managing business risk is not an art or a science. Investigations are increasingly being conducted in IR that use technological risk evaluation and management techniques from the corporate world to address global security problems.

Conversely, the risk is examined differently in sociology. Investigating how these processes influence and are influenced by socio-political interactions is more important than improving the current fact of risk evaluation. For instance, the heart of Ulrich Beck and Anthony Giddens' "instinctive modernization" thesis, a hugely significant impact of rapidly rising growth, industrialization, and thus more lately, worldwide, have produced a new category of "debounded" risk (Peterson, 2016). De-bounded hazards lack the protection of geographic boundaries or quantifiable periods and have a low likelihood but a disastrous outcome.

As a result, these hazards challenge established strategies for public and commercial managing risk, which depend on quantitative tests and, where required, identify the finances. They may need to understand the effects of their actions thoroughly. But according to Beck and Giddens, de-bounded dangers are not just unintentional consequences of industrialization and scientific advances. Many challenges share similar characteristics, including bacterial infections and terrorist threats linked to organizations like al-Qaeda (Hameiri & Kühn, 2015).

The concept of introspection is essential to Beck and Giddens' conceptual foundation, even though they identify as "present purposes," which means they think outside the box to be genuine rather than influenced by society. They contend that societal and political structures alter due to individuals being conscious of new de-bounded threats. New forms of responsive cognition that strive to consistently recognize possible risks and respond in time to avoid devastating results are emerging in place of the sequential development concept created by industrial modernism. This late modern circularity challenges numerous pillars of economic present society's formal organizations and convictions.

Most crucially, Beck and Giddens contend that de-bounded risks disregard racial, racial, and social divides, making these distinctions more outdated. Beck has further suggested that because of new dangers,

experimental social knowledge must abandon its underlying analytical patriotism, which views the country as a standard interpretive framework.

Furthermore, there is a need to be done thus far to assess the importance of risk and risk-handling services if international politics, as William Clapton contends in his work, which precedes this brief introduction. Globalization, strategy, and counter-terrorism are the three main topics that Clapton addresses in the IR risk literature. According to Clapton, further research is still necessary to determine the circumstances that favor or work against "riskisation," the procedure by which specific problems are deemed to be dangerous, as well as the elements influencing how it affects state structure, inter-state interactions, and the connection between sovereignty and nonplayers (Peterson, 2016). As a result, there are still important issues about whether adding sociocultural philosophies to IR improves our knowledge of modern democracy and, if so, how to move forward with this study program.

Practical Examples of Risk

Risks have been a part of human history. Thus, it is necessary to consider both the advantages of these breakthroughs and the hazards associated with their application. Man must understand how to cope with them and consider dangers a normal part of life. Let's look at some practical examples of technological advancements in order of when they occurred.

As the earliest form of transportation and commerce, ships came with risks. Submarines were fitted to it afterward. Crashes and sinkings have frequently been key factors in tragedies throughout the lengthy maritime past. Before her first voyage, the deluxe cruiser Titanic was thought to be unsinkable. In addition, there have been numerous engine problems, other tech difficulties, etc. The biggest challenge is having access to maintenance while at sea. Oil leaks from gas pipelines put aquatic life and the environment at risk.

The Chernobyl tragedy was the deadliest nuclear power plant incident. In this regard, 31 individuals perished, and 203 more were hospitalized with intense heat injuries and radioactivity. A 30 km zone all around the plant saw about 1,35,000 people move. The State lost roughly 1.6 million acres, or 20%, of its agriculture and one million acres of its woods due to the nuclear radiation,

which also exposed 1/5 of Byelorussia's inhabitants to nuclear irradiation of significant variations (Misra, 2008).

On May 26, 1954, 103 individuals on airplane Bennington perished in a fire and blasted, near Quonset Point, Rhode Island, in the United States. Once more, a blaze on the American ship Forrester off the coast of North Vietnam on July 29, 1967, claimed 134 lives. Dec. 18–21, 1982, saw 128 people killed in a power station disaster in Caracas, Venezuela. At least 187 people were killed, and 500 more were hurt when a fire broke out on May 10, 1993, in a doll manufacturing close to Bangkok, Thailand. It was the bloodiest manufacturing fire ever recorded.

In Coalbrook, South Africa, on January 21, 1960, a mining sites blast claimed 437 lives. In Omuta, Japan, a coal mine exploded on November 9, 1963, killing 447 people. Three hundred seventy-two people were murdered on December 27, 1975, in a coal mine collapse accompanied by floodwaters in Dhanbad, India (Misra, 2008). One of China's most dangerous businesses is mining, where it is reported that more than 5,000 people died in accidents associated with mining in 2001.

These historical occurrences are merely a tiny portion of the scenario that warns us that we should build them to be sufficiently safe for safety design for the acceptance of risk and minimal environmental and economic effects.

Risk and Security Studies

Contemporary times saw the development of risk, as we currently know it, roughly coinciding with the establishment of the sovereign state as the primary federal entity. Risk evolved as a potent rational substitute for religious conceptions of destiny, just as national development was a response to recurrent religious warfare. Risk stands for the concept that early childhood and influence over destiny are possible in a world where fate might influence the outcome. The risk was once seen as the opposite of fate (cf. Bernstein 1998; Douglas 1990; Giddens 1991; Luhmann 1991).

The Civil conflict arguments on security in International Relations essentially eliminate this managerial discussion. International relations mainly dealt with governance, citizenship, and the societal system, emphasizing the analysis of conflict and national defense. Ambiguity was the foundation of any decision-making and the basis that the global order functioned.

The one certainty in the "equilibrium of strength scenario" was the return of conflict. The "administration" of security was tied closely to the concept of a social state, to the concept of national purpose and politics, in contrast to the microeconomic ontology reflected in the majority of risk theory even during the 20th century.

Although risk and security studies as a decision practice still heavily emphasize command and the administration of possibilities, unpredictability has taken over as the risk design's most distinguishing opponent. Risk studies have extensively used a 1921 paper by Frank Knight that clarified the difference between risk and ambiguity. He distinguished between risk and ambiguity, defining the former as the "given opportunity" and the latter as the unexplained. Ambiguity is thus defined as the difficulty of categorization, measurement, and, to some degree, even avoidance (Best 2008; Knight 1921: 245; Runde 1998). ambiguity relates to an imprecision between the acts of now and the occurrences of the future, although sensible actions can assist us in controlling or potentially reducing hazards.

Nearly concurrently with this advancement in security studies, economists and historians highlighted the sociopolitical form of risk. They critiqued the mostly experimentalist approach to risk reflected in traditional risk management techniques. Most notably, Ulrich Beck (1992) connected various risk concepts to the advancement of industrial society. Mary Douglas concentrated on the political decisions made during the social choice of which dangers to prioritize (Douglas and Wildavsky 1982). The disciplinary consequences and neoliberalism nature of the predominate economic structures of the risk analysis were cited by academics in the French post-structuralist camp (Ewald 2001; O'Malley 2004; Rose 1993). These academics all shared an interest in the geopolitics of risk analysis and its anthropological and historic legacies.

The understanding that risk management is federal and security is also about the "inner" management of security brought the arguments around each other, even though the ideas of risk and security are influenced by their distinct academic traditions. This shared concern in managing emerging, ambiguous, and frequently disastrous dangers is also made apparent by the limitations of the two curricular views. The concept of security continually battles figuring out how to

conceptualize security as a governmental practice of state bodies, social groups, and private corporations, despite the federal character of risk management and the reality that security is more than "simply" armed defense. The same is valid for risk studies, which find it more difficult to comprehend "security matters" threats not defined by geography or time (cf. Beck 2003).

Role of Risk in Security Studies

The social conservatives and wideners conflict was almost resolved during the 1980s and 1990s in safety discussions (Buzan and Hansen, 2009; Buzan et al., 1998). During a period when problems over environmental damage, the impact of economic, drug smuggling, and perhaps other issues rose to the forefront of public view, this argument concentrated on the quantity and severity of issues that could pose a security risk (Buzan et al., 1998: 2–5; Nye, 1988; Tickner, 1992; Ullman, 1983). As discussed later, "risk studies" can occur within this expanding discussion.

Yet, it is crucial to understand that these risk studies do not focus only on foreign diplomacy but aim to provide insight into socio-political life broadly. The discussion of risk tries to expand the purview of security studies and transcend the traditional difference among the different fields of studies. However, with such integrative objectives, it is crucial to comprehend how the larger area of risk studies transformed into security studies.

The next part will address how the topic of risk studies fits into the fields and the assertions to understanding and political implications that each of these theoretical practices entails. Moreover, it will be going to describe the areas of political risk studies and critical risk studies of risk analysis in today's security studies.

Risk Studies and Politics

Political-specific studies are frequently linked to economic research and concepts and are not just a branch of international relations. Additionally, in contrast to the other approaches, this one explicitly attempts to solve issues and does not make an effort to analyze risk management strategies. Political risk, frequently known as "country risk," is a unique type of risk that businesses or authorities take when establishing investment flows abroad (Peterson, 2011). Political risks are frequently defined as shifts in the controlling environment of foreign businesses brought on by political processes, whether

immediately via battle, insurrection, or personal interest or indirectly through shifts in governmental policies that have an impact on the company's equity and actions (Haufler, 1999: 204).

Risk becomes politically charged when the good governance and environment of the home country come under examination. The political risks include things like extortion, trade restrictions, stiff administrative structures, and bribery. Consequently, it also appears paradoxical that this thinking body is emerging during globalization. This change is not supported as an academic decision, but instead as expressing enhanced business foreign investment to emerging economies following the Cold War and then a ramp up in company regard to financial emergency and invasions. However, political risk studies are typically preoccupied with approaches to risk's geography and regional aspects and serve as their primary arguments rather than time and chronological development.

Even though most political risk theorists recognize the problem of evaluating and categorizing political risk (Jarvis, 2004, 2007), they do attempt to achieve the goal of monitoring by recommending several approaches for getting these risks: a few identify all of the political rallies that may lead to flawed contest or limit the capacity of businesses to behave as they anything else would (Hashmin and Guvenli, 1992; Weston and Sorge, 1972); some also view political risk as challenging to identify and evaluate (Hashmin & Coyle, 2003).

Though most political risk academics recognize the difficulties of evaluating and categorizing political risk (Jarvis, 2004, 2007), they do attempt to achieve the goal of monitoring by recommending a number of approaches for getting these risks: a few identify all of the political developments that may lead to flawed contest or restrict the ability of businesses to behave as they anything else would (Hashmin and Guvenli, 1992; Weston and Sorge, 1972); some also view political risk as challenging to identify and evaluate (Hashmin and Coyle, 2003). However, critics of this view of risk have noted how unstable this computable perspective of risk truly is. Risk as a Critical Analysis

Critical risk studies aim to demonstrate how security and risk management choices create specific definitions of democracy and government forces using the 9/11 events as their primary starting point. The goal of

this research is not a dilemma but instead to be analytical, in contrast to the alternative techniques. Aradau, Lobo-Guerrero, and van Münster sought to describe this type of thinking in their role as publishers of a "Security Dialogue" particular problem of risk. The authors argue that "the risk approach" is a theoretical and conceptual replacement for, the famous "old-fashioned" security studies, that security studies are entrapped. (Aradau et al., 2008; Peterson, 2011). As an alternative, a study of risk governance and technology that goes beyond the previous divisions of internal-external, battle, and armed services is proposed. Consequently, these academics want to release security studies from emphasizing nations and unique dangers.

Risk culture is the practical center in the everyday activities of federal and businesses (Amoore, 2004; Aradau and van Münster, 2007, 2008; Kessler and Werner, 2008; Lobo-Guerrero, 2006, 2008; Salter, 2008). Such as include cell genetics, protection against terrorist attacks, migrations, extortion, and female slavery. The crucial attention is frequently concentrated on the economic and libertarian risk assessment practices used in modern security controls like Salter's job on airline security, Aradau and van Münster's essay on terrorist activity health coverage, and Amoore's collaboration on private security firms. The Foucauldian literary works on risk heavily influence these practices.

When viewed from the angle of the traditional risk fields of study, the Social constructionist method of institutionalism is used as a foundation for the conceptual method, frequently highlighting the constraining influence of the capitalist ideology dictating the economic practice of risk analysis (Amoore, 2004; Amoore and De Goede, 2005; Salter, 2008). Although these academics are skeptical of the risk society discussion, they also share Beck's criticism of the practice of "economizing" risk in their criticism of international security and their efforts to imagine alternative political control.

Global Risk Management

Ulrich Beck's thesis on the Risk Society served as a significant source of inspiration for the concept of "global risk management," exemplified in security studies by people like Christopher Coker, Yee Heng, Mikkel Vedby Rasmussen, and Michael J. Williams (Peterson, 2011). Despite their disagreements, these academics concur that the idea of risk has replaced other concepts in

our understanding of security, notably in war and tactics. They demonstrate how risk management techniques have evolved into a new way of coping with a security environment constantly evolving from the standpoint of finding. Risk is specified for them as well as for its opposite idea, security, via their relationship.

This method of assessing risks draws heavily on the writings of sociologists Ulrich Beck and Anthony Giddens. These authors' views are very similar to Beck and Giddens in heavily emphasizing the past and adaptation. There are multiple options that duration manifests itself. First, the prior and tomorrow are described as a macro-historical shift from the initial to the 2nd modernities, from security and national identities to risk and globalization. The current type of governance naturally contributes to this growth (Beck, 1999). 14 The other is that hazards of now are seen as self-created. They are a result of our actions, either intentionally or accidentally (Beck, 1996: 11).

As risk is viewed as the primary factor influencing the shift from initial to secondary modernism, a process distinguished by the unexpected consequences of earlier decisions, even this interpretation of chronology is strongly related to specific knowledge of history. Rasmussen and Coker make the same argument as Beck about how critical reflection has characterized the post-9/11 world, a society where there is no one to deliver official answers, and a society that ceases to be contemporary becomes reflexive about its modernity. Overall, the conceptual goal is to depict the change from one type of administration to a different one to clarify the context of risk management rather than to expose the political systems implicit in the dark practices of risk.

Therefore, it is claimed the idea of risk is gaining over as the dominant idea in security studies, much like critical risk studies, and will soon surpass "security" and "threats." According to Christopher Coker's analysis of NATO states, "we construct security in terms of risk itself." The expression "language of risk" has replaced "language of peril" (Coker, 2002: 60). Williams continues, "The issue is that, in contrast to a threat-rely approach, where evident capacities and purpose make it easy for policy-makers to establish where risks lie, a risk-based perspective implies that politicians must respond with significantly less data" (Williams, 2008: 66).

As a result, knowing the difference between threat and risk is the first step in comprehending this strategy. Threats are quantitative, particular, tied to intents, and tend to mean logic, whereas risk is unforeseeable and unrelated to a detailed incidence (Heng, 2006: 12; Rasmussen, 2006: 1; Williams, 2008: 65–68). These analysts assert that we are currently confronted with hazards far less visible than previous "threats," risks addressed by prevention and mitigation or proactive measures. In this setting, Coker, Heng, and Williams investigate how risk management strategies are used more frequently to address unique security challenges.

References

Amoore L (2004) Risk, reward and discipline at work. *Economy and Society* 33(2): 174–196.

Aradau C and van Münster RV (2007) Governing terrorism through risk: Taking precautions, (un)knowing the future. *European Journal of International Relations* 30(1): 89–115.

Aradau C and van Münster RV (2008) Insuring terrorism, assuring subjects, ensuring normality: The politics of risk after 9/11. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 33(2): 191–210.

Aradau C, Lobo-Guerrero L and Münster RV (2008) Security, technologies of risk, and the political: Guest editors' introduction. *Security Dialogue* 39(2–3): 147–154

Baumann

Beck U (1996) World risk society as cosmopolitan society. *Theory, Culture & Society* 13(4): 1–32.

Beck U (1999) *World Risk Society*. Cambridge: Polity.

Buzan B and Hansen L (2009) *The Evolution of International security studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Buzan B Wæver O and de Wilde J (1998) *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner

Erasmus Law Review, 2(2): 197–220.

Furedi, F. (2009) 'Precautionary culture and the rise of possibilistic risk assessment',

Conclusion

Risk Analysis in "Risk" has emerged as a top strategy for tendency analysis and design management in interlinked, complicated, and dangerous environments, according to researchers and choices in public administrations, the armed forces, international organizations, and corporate firms (Habegger, 2008). By always remembering the formidable challenge of striking a proper balance between possibilities and risks to cope with unpredictable upcoming incidence, the concept of risk reflects some of the essential properties of the current world.

Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and Self-identity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Giddens, A. (1992) 'Risk, trust, reflexivity', in U. Beck *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*, New Delhi: Sag

Habegger, B. (2008). *International Handbook on Risk Analysis and Management | ETH Zurich*. The Web site cannot be found. https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/47029/hb_riskanalysis&management.pdf

Hameiri, S., & Kühn, F. P. (2015). Introduction: Risk, Risk Management and International Relations. *International Relations*. https://sci-hub.hkvisa.net/https://www.researchgate.net/publication/241651636_Introduction_Risk_Risk_Management_and_International_Relations

Hashmin MA and Guvenli T (1992) Importance of political risk assessment function in US multinational corporations. *Global Finance Journal* 3(2): 137–144.

Haufler V (1997) *Dangerous Commerce*. Ithaca, NY and London: Cornell University Press. Haufler V (1999) Self-regulation and business norms: Political risk, political activism. In: Cutler

Heng Y (2006) *War as Risk Management: Strategy and Conflict in an Age of Globalised Risks*. New York: Routledge.

Jarvis D (2004) *International relations and international risk: Method and technique in political risk analysis*. Paper presented at the International Studies Association, Montreal, 17 March.

Jarvis D (2007) Risk, globalization and the nation state: A critical appraisal of Ulrich Beck and

the world risk society thesis. *Global Society: Interdisciplinary Journal of International Relations* 21(1): 23–46.

Jarvis D and Griffiths M (2007) Learning to fly: The evolution of political risk analysis. *Global*

Society 21(1): 5–2

Kessler O and Werner W (2008) Extrajudicial killing as risk management. *Security Dialogue*

39(2–3): 289–308.

Lobo-Guerrero L (2006) Biopolitics of specialized risk: An analysis of kidnap and ransom

insurance. *Security Dialogue* 38(3): 315–334.

Lobo-Guerrero L (2008) ‘Pirates’, stewards, and the securitization of global circulation.

International Political Sociology 2(3): 219–235.

Misra, K. B. (2008). Risk Analysis and Management: An Introduction.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/241003133_Risk_Analysis_and_Management_An_Introduction

Nye JL-J (1988) International security studies: A report of a conference on the state of the field.

International Security 12(4): 5–27

Peterson, K. L. (2011). Risk analysis – A field within security studies? *European Journal of International Relations*.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066111409770>

Peterson, K. L. (2016). Risk and Security. *Danish Institute for International Studies*.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/350108266_Risk_and_Security

Rasmussen MV (2006) The Risk Society at War: Terror, Technology and Strategy in the

TwentyFirst Century. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Salter MB (2008) Imagining numbers: Risk, quantification, and aviation security. *Security*

Dialogue 39(2–3): 243–266.

Tickner A (1992) Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global

Security. New York: Columbia University Press.

Ullman R (1983) Redefining security. *International Security* 8(1): 129–153.

Weston FW and Sorge BW (1972) *International Managerial Finance*. Homewood, IL: Richard D.

Irwin

Williams MJ (2008) (In) security studies, reflexive modernization and the risk society.

Cooperation and Conflict 43(1): 57–79.

How to Citation: Ali, A. (2020). The Relationship between Risk Analysis and security studies. *Journal of Strategic Policy and Global Affairs*, 01(01), 24–30.