



# State Security VS Human Security: Which Should Prioritize the State or the Individual?

Zaihan Harmaen Anggayudha<sup>1\*</sup>, Jody Imam Rafsanjani<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*National Research and Innovation Agency (The National Research and Innovation Agency), Indonesia.*

<sup>2</sup>*The National Research and Innovation Agency, Indonesia.*

\*Corresponding author email:zaih001@brin.go.id

---

## Abstract

Nowadays, the concept of human security is an issue that is often discussed, especially when issues regarding policies or how a country deals with the Covid-19 pandemic make headlines in every news report. The concept of human security shifts the focus point of security which previously focused on the state to become towards individuals. Often various discussions collide these two concepts under the pretext of finding the best way for the state to make an appropriate policy, especially during emergencies such as problems caused by the Covid-19 Pandemic. So to solve this problem it is necessary to re-understand the priorities in the security of a country in an emergency situation, especially in Indonesia. This paper aims to find out what is prioritized by the state in the event of an emergency. Literature study or desk research becomes a research method, accompanied by a conceptual and regulatory approach, then secondary data is analyzed descriptively. Based on the research, it was concluded that the concept of state security or human security should not be made as if they are contradictory but instead complement one another and become a thinking construct for the state to determine a priority in order to achieve common interests through an insecurity faced in an emergency situation. The state as the shelter of an individual certainly needs to be a top priority without neglecting the security of every individual in it. The difference in focus on the concept of state security and human security should not make both of them an option.

**Keywords:** Human security, state security, emergency state, Covid-19 pandemic.

---

## 1. Introduction

The Covid-19 pandemic has had a significant adverse effect on various sectors. Not only at the national level but also globally. During the Covid-19 Pandemic the world was preoccupied with thinking about what strategies should be used to overcome the crisis caused by the Covid-19 Pandemic. Not a few countries in the world have taken dramatic steps to suppress the spread of Covid-19 in their countries, for example through the Lock Down scheme and even deploying military force. Indonesia is no exception, various policies and regulations have been issued by the Government to suppress the spread and impact of the Covid-19 Pandemic.

The complex problems that have arisen as a result of the Covid-19 Pandemic have not only rocked the health and economic sectors but also touched the defense and state security sector (Muhyiddin & Mau, 2022). This is inseparable from the nature of the terrible impact of the Covid-19 Pandemic which has made health issues a security issue because they are considered to be a threat to national stability. This fact makes the discourse related to the concept of security come to the fore again, especially when people start talking about and are aware of the Emergency State Law which previously might have been a topic that was not much discussed before. So that discussion began to emerge which led to the issue of national security.

Until now, debates and polemics about the concept and definition of national security have not resulted in an agreement. The difficulty of producing a clear and objective understanding of national security has a significant effect on the difficulty of producing regulations on the National Security Act as expected. For some members of the military, the understanding of national security is still limited from the perspective of the function of administering the state. Defense is understood as one of the elements of national security. In contrast to the police, the understanding of national security departs more from a functional conception. National Police high-ranking officers and thinkers start from the understanding that "defense" is an effort and "security" is an outcome of this effort (Sussex, et al., 2017).

The polemic about the term and concept of national security has attracted the attention of experts and practitioners. The term national security developed in the post-World War II period. With the experience of various wars between countries, the security of a country is placed in relation to and overcoming threats from other countries. According to Agus Widjojo, the emphasis on security is placed on the State and the goal is sovereignty which is felt as the right of a State. In simple terms, national security consists of defense and internal security. Defense is a country's effort to maintain the continuity of relations and sovereignty from military threats from abroad. Meanwhile, domestic security is a country's efforts to overcome threats from within the country that threaten its survival. Because the State has a national legal system, every threat that comes from within the country is essentially an act of violation of the law which is responsive to law enforcement efforts. The problem is, a good country does not guarantee the enforcement and protection of citizens' human rights, so the concept of human security emerges. In this concept, the perception of State sovereignty is changed as the obligation of a State to protect and uphold the human rights of its citizens. Meanwhile, the notion of collective security and regional security is at the interstate level. the perception of State sovereignty is changed as the obligation of a State to protect and uphold the human rights of its citizens. Meanwhile, the notion of collective security and regional security is at the interstate level. the perception of State sovereignty is changed as the obligation of a State to protect and uphold the human rights of its citizens. Meanwhile, the notion of collective security and regional security is at the interstate level.

In addition, the concept of security and national security is also inseparable from discussions on the concept of state security and human security. As if it were a trend, the two concepts often made headlines in seminars at both the national and international levels, especially those related to human security issues. The concept of human security seems to be a security model that must be accepted by all countries in the world with its various aspects. These two concepts are also a reference for rulers to make policies related to security. However, in Indonesia itself, it seems that it is not yet clear what kind of concept is used as a guide in making a policy that is truly ideal regarding the security system, especially when dealing with emergencies. So that the government seems to have difficulty in determining the priorities that must be taken,

Through a literature review, the authors try to see how far issues regarding security, both related to the concept of state security and human security, are raised and discussed. There is some literature that is quite relevant to the topic raised in this article which the author will describe in detail.

Burke (2001) in her article entitled *The Idea of Human Security and Indonesia's National Security Policy*, stated that Indonesia has put the idea of human security into its national security policy, but its implementation is still imperfect. Individuals or humans or citizens in the concept of human security in Indonesia are defined as social beings who are bound by their community. Hartati, (2020) in her research report stated that the human security approach needs to be the main approach in dealing with health crises, instead of a state-centric security approach. Meanwhile, Lee & Park, (2017) in his article entitled *Regionalism Responding to Human Security (ASEAN case studies on Human Security issues)*, discusses more problems and cases that occur in the ASEAN region using a human security approach.

Glasius (2008) is of the view that the security discourse is an ad infinitum study. Understanding the idea of security is placing the issue of security in political studies. Security is a dynamic concept following the battle of discourse over what is agreed to be a common threat. Meanwhile, Made Burke, A. (2001) argues that the concept of human security places more emphasis on humans as the subject of security studies, trying to replace the position of the state as the subject of security. Several studies have tried to separate these two concepts, the concept of state and human security. But apparently, these two concepts have a strong relationship with each other. The state has an important role in providing security for its citizens. Through a social contract and social security protection, the State is obliged to make the security of its people the ultimate goal of state security policy.

Prameswari & Husna, (2022). through his article entitled *Insurgency, Counterinsurgency and Human Security: A Case Study of Armed Violence in Papua during the COVID-19 Pandemic* tries to discuss the human security perspective at a practical level associated with the dynamics of insurgency and counter-insurgency during the COVID-19 pandemic, especially in Papua with situations of armed violence between the TNI-Polri and the West Papua National Liberation Army (TPNPB). Hama, (2017) stated that because the concept of human security is considered an extension of development programs on security issues, this concept challenges the traditional paradigm that has been used in security studies.

Ardiyanti & Anwar, (2018) in their article entitled *The Dilemma of Human Security on Palm Oil Plantation in Indonesia*, try to look at environmental problems through a human security approach and state that the seven ideas in the concept of human security have a correlation with one another. Jati & Sunderland, (2018) through her article entitled *Playing with Words: The Securitization Construction of 'Refugee' in ASEAN Politics*, gives us an understanding that politics plays a role in the securitization of humanitarian issues. Dwinantoaji & Sumarni, (2020) in their article entitled *Community Empowerment During the Covid-19 Pandemic in a Human Security Perspective*, described how perspective, human security is at the implementation level and stated that one of the efforts to prevent Covid-19 is by empowering the community, especially in health services.

Based on the results of the research above, the authors can understand how the concept of security is in various perspectives, both at the theoretical level and at the implementation level and its dynamics. In addition, it can also be seen that there has been no study related to how the concept of state security and the concept of human security have tried to be confronted with one another in order to examine how priorities should be set when making policies related

to security for the state or individuals. So it is necessary to conduct research related to the concept of state security in the face of the concept of human security in determining priorities between the state and individuals.

## 2. Methodology

This article was compiled based on qualitative research. Aims to provide an in-depth explanation regarding the concept of security, especially human security and state security. The approach used in this study is a conceptual approach in which the analysis is built on concepts that are relevant to the issues raised in this article. The data was obtained through a technical literature study, which means that the data used is based on secondary data obtained by the author from various related and relevant literature. Then the data were analyzed using descriptive techniques.

## 3. Results and Discussion

### 3.1. Comparison of the Concept of State Security Vs Human Security

Security issues receive less attention with much focus being directed towards the term state security. The state's vulnerability to certain threats and its military capabilities have been at the forefront of security issues in many cases. However, the emergence of concepts related to the notion of human security does introduce a broader view of security from a different perspective (Hama, 2017).

State security, which is also known as traditional security, basically contains the tendency of a country to comply with its own set of demands related to security policy issues (Baylis, 2020). Traditional security also involves a few other aspects defined by subordination. Describe the problem further; which reveals that in state security the main thing is the protection of institutions, ethics or values that exist in a country, and especially humans who live within its boundaries. In other words, the idea of guarding one's borders, especially from external aggression, stands out among the possible priorities (Brauch, et al., 2010).

Thus, state security can also be assessed based on how well a state can stop attacks, and at the same time defeat external threats. Apart from protecting the people and their values from external threats, it is important to note that an important aspect that emerges in the security of the state is the need to protect the dignity of the state. The state remains the main center of activity and the main player; where the focus is clearly directed to national stability. This means that security fulfills the requirements as a top priority obligation for the state in terms of protecting its own country (Vallet & David, (2012). This requires strengthening military capabilities and formulating mechanisms that can assist in establishing national supremacy (Leese & Wittendorp, 2018). Common steps taken by countries in increasing the scope of activities include: equipping their military factions, expanding their logistical capacity, and generally implementing a strategy, to check the boundaries. This was included in the Australian Defense Policy in the white paper, in which they intended to expand their national security policy by maximizing the amount of military equipment. They include submarines, helicopters, and aircraft for the Armed Forces (Hama, 2017).

Therefore, state security requires important guidance, but the size of the activity remains minimal in terms of players and the scale of the business involved. This is one reason why critics regard traditional security as a "means and not an end" when it comes to security policy. Leese & Wittendorp, (2018) People are involved in state security on very few occasions because the state invests in its capabilities and mileage. Consequently, human security is different because people do not get the opportunity to participate in decision-making (Brauch, et al., 2003). In addition, traditional security tends to lead to the principle of sovereignty, whereby the state operates under total freedom from international influence. This implies that the state is the last entity in matters concerning its own security.

Human security first appeared in 1994, in a human development report by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP). Its main aim is to straighten out the shady concentration and definition given to the security aspect through a combination of several concepts. As a result, giving birth to a combination of human rights and human development, in addressing human and social security. In contrast to state security, human security emphasizes individual security in terms of two basic approaches (Robin, 2021). The first approach is basically applicable in a country like Canada, and involves protecting individuals from political animosity. However, relying on this approach seems to attract instability, as other aspects of human security are neglected. A familiar situation witnessed in the Arab world, especially in countries such as Egypt and Libya. Citizens should be denied aspects of human security that address their participation in important decision-making (Hama, 2017). This situation led to rebellions and certain governments were overthrown. Concepts such as economic security, food security, and political security, among others, form the basis of human security and help define the second approach. This requires a fusion of several concepts to produce a robust strategy on Security and a call to rethink state sovereignty as an important part of human security.

Human security also aims to promote security not only in terms of physical violence but extends in cases of man-made or natural disasters (Robin, E. (2021). The prospect of human security has since narrowed down to a simplified form concentrating on the security of refugees in society. Since most manifestations of insecurity result in the displacement of people, especially women and children, human security seeks to resolve this problem peacefully (Zwierlein & Graf, 2010). Aspects such as the recruitment of child soldiers, in African countries, and their effect on women are prioritized in this case. Therefore, human security differs from state security in that it addresses many

issues and involves the wider public. Therefore, the issue of security involves many aspects compared to the elimination of physical violence (Robin, 2021). It involves addressing poverty, disease, violence and the personal safety of individuals in a given country. The scope of engagement also extends to other countries and non-governmental organizations. Fundamentally human security involves recognizing “freedom from fear and freedom from want.” It emphasizes the ability of individuals and communities to be liberated from various non-military threats such as poverty, disease, and environmental degradation. It is also clear that if the above aspects are not handled clearly, it will result in an insecurity crisis.

The emergence of human security gives a new meaning to the whole issue of security on a global scale. This is evident in the different perspectives and additional dimensions it brings. In contrast to state security, it fully involves the people and gives them the opportunity to participate in important decision-making. The state is known to operate independently, but human security invites the participation of several institutions, including foreign countries. Both approaches are subject to some criticism for certain shortcomings, but they certainly serve their intended purpose. Above all, human security comes with heavy statements and reinforces previous assumptions that can easily lead to insecurity.

The Pakistani economist, Mahbub Ul Haq, gave an interesting statement regarding the concept of human security, namely that human security means small children who do not die, diseases that do not spread, ethnic violence that does not erupt, women who are not raped, poor people who do not starve, dissidents who are not silenced, the human spirit that is not destroyed. Human security is not a gun issue. This is concern for human dignity. The point is that human security is a state in which death at an early age, rapidly spreading disease, sexual harassment of women, inter-ethnic violence and war, silencing of critics, and humiliation of human dignity are not found in a society. Furthermore, he stressed that this situation could not be realized by military forces and efforts to achieve it were based on concern for human dignity (Tadjbakhsh, 2013).

However, as mentioned earlier, this concept has generated a lot of controversy. According to Roland Paris, Human Security has two problems that limit its use for academics and practitioners of international politics. First, the definition lacks precision. Second, there are some strong proponents who keep the definition of Human Security broad and vague. They argue that although the use of this concept is difficult to apply in academic research and policy making, it is still as effective as a campaign.

In addition, even though this concept is constructive because it can become a campaign slogan and unite a number of other concepts, it still has an unresolved problem, namely the concept is too broad and includes everything. From an academic point of view, human security obscures the notion of security and makes it even more difficult to analyze. Human security also has constraints in its application as a government policy. Almost all problems are considered human security issues so that various issues that are basically not the realm of security, such as the environment, economy, and health are seen as included in security issues (securitization). Meanwhile, the meaning of securitization is generally seen in a traditional way, namely handling real threats through military force.

There is rejection of the concept of human security from several countries. The rejection was initiated by the southern states (developing countries) which were members of the G-77 organization in 1995. They were skeptical of the effectiveness of the concept in its implementation and were afraid of violations of their sovereignty by Western countries under the pretext of Human Security. They suspect that developed countries will control it indirectly through imposing their liberal values and orders and see the Responsibility to Protect principle as just a justification for intervention in their domestic affairs.

In contrast to the perceptions of opposing countries, some developed countries such as Canada, Norway and Japan consider it important to implement Human Security both as a global and national policy objective. This concept has become a meeting point to justify interventions against other countries that are solely based on concern for human suffering, not national interests. Then, the United Nations in its 2012 resolution strengthened it by emphasizing that Human Security actions must not use coercive or military action. Furthermore, various experts are trying to revise the concept of human security so that it can be applied in research and policy making. Garry King and Christopher Murray in their human security project try to narrow the concept of human security into basic elements consisting of five main indicators, namely: poverty, health.

In addition, an expert named David Baldwin contains important components for the concept of human security in the form of questions. These components can become benchmarks or boundaries of a very broad concept of human security. The questions in question are: Security for whom?, Security for which values?, Security from what threats?, and Security by what means?. There are two approaches to understanding the concept of security using these components, namely the UNDP and Canadian School approaches. UNDP's approach was contained in the 1994 UNDP report based on Padmi, (2015) idea, that human security is security for individuals and society; its value for the welfare of all human beings; the threats are in the form of disease, drugs, poverty, terrorism, and especially an unbalanced world order; and addressed in five ways, namely.

Meanwhile, in the Canadian School's approach, human security is security for individuals; the value held is an acceptable quality of life and guarantees that fundamental human rights are fulfilled; the threats come from the high income gap between the rich and the poor, internal conflicts and state failures, transnational crime, development of weapons of mass destruction, ethnic and religious conflicts, environmental degradation, population growth, migration, repressive states, use of landmines, violence against children, economic backwardness, and an unstable and protectionist trading system; and can be overcome by peacebuilding, peacekeeping, disarmament, protection of

children's rights, and economic development. In summary, the development of the concept of human security, started as an idea in the 1970s, then appeared as a concept in 1994 in the UNDP report. A year later, in 1995, it experienced various rejections from the G-77 countries. The 1996-2000 period began to be implemented by some middle power countries. Furthermore, until 2013, it is progressing towards acceptance by all countries by clarifying legal interventions and support from various international organizations.

### 3.2. Priority: State and Citizens

It's interesting when talking about two entities, namely the state and individuals, there are many opinions and views about who is actually more important and has more control between the two. These views are certainly motivated by various aspects, one of which is the political and economic doctrine that is adhered to.

In the context of the concept of national security, the two entities can of course be linked to the development of the concept of security itself, especially with the concept of state security and human security. Basically assessing which needs to be prioritized through further approaches and studies of the two concepts can be done by reflecting on how the two concepts emerged and what the purpose of these concepts emerged. It is possible that these concepts are not directly related and have an impact on how a country with its government system determines a scale of priorities in the context of achieving security goals that are mutually agreed upon by all elements within a country.

In simple terms, it can be explained that the concept of state security as mentioned earlier is the efforts and strategies of the state in safeguarding its sovereignty, based on territoriality and also having a tendency to defend and protect the dignity of the state, with all the potential that can support the creation of objectives either with military strength or natural resources. that can be used by the state. In other words, in this concept the subject being discussed is indeed the state as an entity that must be protected along with all the forces that exist.

As for the era of the development of the concept of state security, there have been many violations by the state against its citizens or individuals within it with the pretext that the state has the right to do whatever it takes to create state security and to protect state sovereignty, that is a different matter. The concept of the state exists to ensure that the country remains intact and free from threats, while the violations or deficiencies that accompany it purely lie from the perspective of the authorities interpreting and implementing the concept. While the concept of human security exists as a concept whose subject is humans, for this reason it is given the name "human security", with an emphasis on humans as an entity that refers to fulfilling the needs of every individual as a human being who has basic rights.

The concept of human security refers to a shift in the focus of development and traditional security which focuses on formal figures and statistics. In relation to development, this concept supports the goals of development as implemented by countries in the world to improve the standard of living of their people. However, the development paradigm adopted by many countries in the world tends to reflect a traditional view that is oriented towards growth and prosperity (Padmi, 2015).

Human security is an important concern in contemporary international politics. This can be seen from the increasing attention of the international community not only in scientific studies on human security but also on how this issue is applied in international relations. There are several fundamental problems in this paper that can explain human security in international politics. The first is a security issue that has experienced several shifts in practice, or is it easier for us to understand as traditional and non-traditional security. The second is human security as a concept which is still debatable. The third is how to see human security issues being responded to by developments in regionalism (Hama, 2017).

Judging from its substance, the idea of human security is not new in the discipline of International Relations. That threats do not only come from other countries in the form of threats of military power have been realized by several analysts and policy maker decades ago, for example the concept of insecurity dilemma and some concern for the security of children and women is shown by the work of Caroline Thomas, Sorensen, JT Matthew, Norman Myers, Neville Brown, interdependence theorists, and cosmopolitanists in human rights. The substance of human security can also be found in the concept of security put forward by proponents of critical theory who question the building of the state as a patriarchal order which often ignores the human factor as individuals whose security must be protected.

Such security issues change the concept of national security from state centered security to people centered security. Consequently, security becomes comprehensive security and security management requires cooperation between security actors and institutions. In this context, national security is interpreted as a basic need to protect and safeguard the national interests of a nation by using political, military and economic power to deal with both domestic and foreign threats. This view supports the argument that national security in democratic countries generally includes state security, public security and human security (state security, public security and human security) (Melissen, 2005).

By understanding which of these concepts a country adheres to in determining and formulating its security policy, in the end we can conclude who is prioritized by the state, its citizens or the state, especially when facing an emergency. However, what is the question remains to be answered. The concept of state security with all its weaknesses gives the idea that the state is an entity that needs to be protected by all of its bloodshed as the communal identity of every individual within it. Dignity is at stake when the sovereignty of the country is not maintained in such a way.

Apart from the view that these two concepts are tools of political power for the world's rulers, if only one could think more neutrally and see these two concepts as ideas that could actually be implemented within the state and for the state's rulers to make security policies along with their priority scale. in an emergency or under normal circumstances. The state is an entity that must be jointly guarded by all its citizens and individuals, which are important elements that collectively form a state. So both are like two sides of a coin that cannot be separated from one another. In other words, the priority for a ruler or leader in making policy is of course both. Both can be accommodated as a priority by making the concept of state security a tool to protect oneself from all threats to sovereignty by making national stability the main objective of the national security system strategy. While the concept of human security becomes an approach in achieving the goal of national stability so that the steps used to achieve the goal of national stability and security are still oriented towards the interests of each individual and are still carried out in a humane manner.

In the end, both the state and individuals must go hand in hand, remaining in their respective roles and functions. When the State transcends its proper function of maintaining law and order within the country and providing protection against foreign aggression, and assumes the role of universal provider and regulator, it never knows when to stop. One arrogance of power led to another, and the planned economy quickly developed into a totalitarian state (Pringle & Pringle, 2019).

## 4. Conclusion

In responding to national security issues, especially when facing an emergency, national stability as the key to the level of state security must remain a top priority while still considering the aspects contained in the concept of human security as an indicator that determines the level of national stability and state security. This means that the two entities between the state and individuals in terms of their citizens are like two sides of a coin that cannot be separated from one another. Both sides are meaningful and both must be a top priority so that the goals of the state can be achieved without having to sacrifice one side. The best way is to get together and sit down again with the country's security experts in order to re-conceptualize Indonesia's security system by clarifying definitions and interpretations of general security concepts that are widely understood. By making the two concepts namely the concept of state security and human security in different functions so that their functions can be clearly seen with each other. The concept of state security is used as the basis of the state for the doctrine of sovereignty and national defense by making it the main goal of the state is stability and national security. Meanwhile, the concept of human security is used as a means and approach used by the state in achieving this goal. In other words, state security is the goal, while human security is the way. By making the two concepts namely the concept of state security and human security in different functions so that their functions can be clearly seen with each other. The concept of state security is used as the basis of the state for the doctrine of sovereignty and national defense by making it the main goal of the state is stability and national security. Meanwhile, the concept of human security is used as a means and approach used by the state in achieving this goal. In other words, state security is the goal, while human security is the way. By making the two concepts namely the concept of state security and human security in different functions so that their functions can be clearly seen with each other. The concept of state security is used as the basis of the state for the doctrine of sovereignty and national defense by making it the main goal of the state is stability and national security. Meanwhile, the concept of human security is used as a means and approach used by the state in achieving this goal. In other words, state security is the goal, while human security is the way. the concept of human security is used as a means and approach used by the state in achieving this goal. In other words, state security is the goal, while human security is the way. the concept of human security is used as a means and approach used by the state in achieving this goal. In other words, state security is the goal, while human security is the way.

Indonesia needs to have a clear conception of security, it needs to clarify the definitions and provisions regarding defense, security, national security, public or general security, and human security in a rule of law. In other words, hastening the National Security Bill to be ratified is a necessity. However, by reviewing the draft regarding the relevance of the substance of the provisions contained therein with the current developments in security and defense studies.

## Acknowledgments

Thank you to the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research and Technology of the Republic of Indonesia for funding the research team of the author through the Higher Education Basic Research Grant Program (PDUPT) for the 2022 period, until finally making it the material for writing this paper.

## References

Ardiyanti, D., & Anwar, A. (2018). The Dilemma of Human Security on Palm Oil Plantation in Indonesia. *Jurnal Hubungan Internasional*, 7(1), 60-68.

Baylis, J. (2020). *The globalization of world politics: An introduction to international relations*. Oxford university press, USA.

Brauch, H. G., Liotta, P. H., Marquina, A., Rogers, P. F., & Selim, M. E. S. (Eds.). (2003). *Security and environment in the Mediterranean: conceptualising security and environmental conflicts*. Berlin: Springer.

Burke, A. (2001). Caught between national and human security: Knowledge and power in post-crisis Asia. *Pacifica Review: Peace, security & global change*, 13(3), 215-239.

Dwinantoaji, H., & Sumarni, D. W. (2020). Human security, social stigma, and global health: the COVID-19 pandemic in Indonesia. *Journal of the Medical Sciences (Berkala Ilmu Kedokteran)*, 52(3).

Glasius, M. (2008). Human security from paradigm shift to operationalization: Job description for a human security worker. *Security dialogue*, 39(1), 31-54.

Hama, H. H. (2017). State security, societal security, and human security. *Jadavpur Journal of International Relations*, 21(1), 1-19.

Hartati, A. Y. (2020). COVID-19 Issues in the Context of Human Security. *Wahid Hasyim University Semarang*.

Jati, I., & Sunderland, E. (2018). Playing with Words: The Securitization Construction of “Refugee” in ASEAN Politics. *Jurnal Hubungan Internasional*, 6(2), 233-240.

Lee, S. W., & Park, C. Y. (2017). Korea's Middle Power Diplomacy for Human Security: A Global and Regional Approach. *Journal of International and Area Studies*, 21-44.

Leese, M., & Wittendorp, S. (2018). The new mobilities paradigm and critical security studies: exploring common ground. *Mobilities*, 13(2), 171-184.

Melissen, J. (2005). The new public diplomacy: Between theory and practice. *The new public diplomacy: Soft power in international relations*, 3-27.

Muhyiddin, A., & Mau, M. (2022). Journalistic Photography as a Communication Media for President Jokowi to Spread Covid-19 Vaccination Information. *International Journal of Science and Society*, 4(4), 10-16.

Ogata, S., & Cels, J. (2003). Human security-Protecting and empowering the people. *Global Governance*, 9, 273.

Padmi, M. F. M. (2015). Nation State as Security Provider in Human Security Issue. *Jurnal Hubungan Internasional*, 4(1), 97-104.

Prameswari, S. S., & Husna, N. A. (2022). Insurgency, Counterinsurgency and Human Security: A Case Study of Armed Violence in Papua during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Jurnal Hubungan Internasional*, 11(1), 19-31.

Pringle, R., & Pringle, R. (2019). The Jealous State and the Future of Money. *The Power of Money: How Ideas about Money Shaped the Modern World*, 195-212.

Robin, E. (2021). City benchmarking, globalized urban scholarship and the view from above: reflections on a few absences. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 45(2), 378-380.

Sussex, M., Clarke, M., & Medcalf, R. (2017). National security: between theory and practice. *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 71(5), 474-478.

Tadjbakhsh, S. (2013). In defense of the broad view of human security. In *Routledge handbook of human security* (pp. 43-57). Routledge.

Vallet, É., & David, C. P. (2012). Introduction: The (re) building of the wall in international relations. *Journal of Borderlands Studies*, 27(2), 111-119.

Zwierlein, C., & Graf, R. (2010). The Production of "Human Security" in Premodern and Contemporary History/Die Produktion von Human Security in Vormoderne und Zeitgeschichte. *Historical Social Research/Historische Sozialforschung*, 7-21.