Quo Vadis Human Security?
From Narrowing and Broadening to Biopolitics

Andrei YAMAMOTO ※

Abstract

Human Security resembles a breathing symbiotic organism which evolves and develops in multiple ways – some of which may able to be supported by its environment. The following is a review of developments of concepts and discourses within the realm of Human Security. Dominant discourses, camps of criticism and theoretical trends are identified and analyzed. It would be perhaps merely a minor exaggeration to claim that there are almost as many categorizations and conceptualizations of Human Security as there are Human Security scholars. It was found that, while many scholars implicitly simultaneously occupy multiple camps within the theoretical realm of Human Security such as feminism and development or threshold-critics and Copenhagen scholars, there are some curious tendencies and outliers which are worthy of further exploration. Those might lead to new pathways of *Critical* Human Security Studies.

Keywords: (Critical) Human Security; Biopolitics; Broadening & Deepening; Liberal Peace vs. Post-positivism; Emancipation

Introduction

There are almost as many concepts of Human Security (HS) as there are HS scholars. The contributions by scholars are often minor which, nonetheless, move the concept of HS along a spectrum with a broad notion of HS on the one extreme, and a narrow one, on the other. Given the usually minor departures from pre-existing HS conceptions, the revised concepts are particularly engaged by critical scholars and tackled in a manner similar to the more "mainstream" HS concepts. The result is a recurring number of déjà vus when reading existing accounts on HS

※ Doctoral Program in International Relations, Graduate School of International Relations, Ritsumeikan University, Japan. Adjunct Lecturer, Department of Global Studies, Ryukoku University, Kyoto, Japan

Ritsumeikan Annual Review of International Studies, 2019. ISSN 1347-8214. Vol.18, pp. 119-137

scholarship and their criticism. This, however, is fortunately not all there is to it. Novel accounts both within the critical and conceptual camps exist which are worthy of further exploration.

In regard to the methodology behind this literature review paper, this work focuses merely on the theoretical developments and manifestations within the Human Security realm. Therefore, HS country reports, case studies or policy recommendation papers have been categorically omitted from this review. Two exceptions to this are the inclusion of scholarly accounts on, first, human security in East Asia as it is indicative of the developments of Eastphalianism within the realm of HS; and second, Japan's and Canada's human security conceptions as they are key for a complete comprehension of the spectrum of various types of HS concepts. More generally, in addition to the conventional modes of literature search, the citation-ranking option of Web of Knowledge was consulted in order to ensure that key texts and oft-cited scholars are sufficiently (while not exclusively) considered within this paper.

The structure of this paper consists of three major sections: a conceptual debate; a critical debate; and, lastly, a philosophical debate. The conceptual section, after an account regarding HS's foundation and milestones, reviews Human Security manifestations in its various forms. Areas addressed here are the broadening versus narrowing debate; the nexus between Human Security, Human Rights, and Development; the threshold-based conceptualization of HS; and accounts concerning HS's departure from liberal values. The critical section addresses the links between Human Security and Critical Security Studies; the Copenhagen School of securitization; the Welsh School of emancipation; feminist accounts on human security (although these might be considered part of the realm of emancipation); as well as hybrid peacebuilding. Lastly, the philosophical part functions partially as a conclusion of this paper while, nonetheless, identifying and discussing novel developments within HS – particularly with regards to biopolitics.

The key arguments put forth in this paper are that 1) critical emancipation without additional or substituting indoctrination is not feasible; 2) in comparison to existing conceptions, psychological levels of analysis are a promising approach in ensuring sufficient consideration for matters of local contextuality while keeping proposed research findings and HS undertakings focused on the individual rather than society at large; and that 3) what is being said and not said, particularly in regard

to the HS concepts applied and referenced in academia, is the outcome of an underlying interaction of various powers.

The Conceptual Debate

Foundation and Milestones of Human Security

A myriad of scholarly accounts on Human Security appears to treat it as a rather novel phenomenon which emerged in the post-Cold War era given the, at that time, transregional post-realpolitikal momentum. It is important to bear in mind that this momentum itself might be, to some extent, the product of a chain of moral and ideological events that took place after World War II (Axworthy, 2001). A more specific and identifiable event with regards to the emergence of the concept of Human Security is the Brandt Commission's report 'Common Security' of 1981. It is said to have increased activists' focus and facilitated debates on less state-centric actors and models of security (Khong, 2001). A relatively influential report that has paved the way for the realm of Human Security itself was the United Nations' (UN) Human Development Report of 1994 (King and Murray, 2001). The 1994 report listed seven components of human security: economic security; food security; health security; environmental security; personal security; common security; and political security (United Nations, 1994).

While Mahbub ul Haq, the initiator of the Human Development Reports, initially perceived Human Security as a mere extension of, and supplement for human development (Tadjbakhsh and Chenoy 2011), the 2003 UN report 'Human Security Now' is a milestone in the development of HS as it creates a contrast between state security and human development (Gasper in Martin and Owen, 2014). This separation brings into focus a concern with the aspect of stability in regard to peoples' lives and the circumstances thereof. It also brings about a focus on the security of basic goods whereby 'goods', more generally, includes matters beyond the mere bodily security of the individual (Gasper in Martin and Owen, 2014).

It is noteworthy that already at an early stage of its emergence, the above rather broad conception of human security faced swift disagreement from key-figures such as Axworthy himself who supported and led the Canadian conception of human security which is based on a narrower interpretation. Axworthy (1997) considers the broad notion of human security incapable of enabling peace and security, as it

neglects human insecurity due to its focus on development (Acharya, 2001).

The Broadening and Narrowing Debate

Broadening the realm of Human Security refers to the inclusion of additional threats and insecurities underneath this umbrella-term. Doing so can include areas ranging from International Law to Sustainable Development. There is thus not only a multitude of conceptions of human security, criticism thereof is also accordingly extensive. The 'narrowing'-part of the debate, on the other hand, is relatively undisputed (see e.g. Paris, 2001; Newman, 2010). Narrowing refers to the various levels of agency within the realm of international relations. A deepening thereof thus translates into the increasing role of individuals as referents within the Human Security discourse. This has two connotations: First, the role of non-state actors as providers of human (in-)security; and second, the primacy of individuals as the focus of efforts of human security undertakings – i.e. the protection of the individual. Merely Thomas and Tow (2002) stand out as a categorical outlier in that they are reluctant to give up a state-centric focus and rather seek to fit human security into their Westphalian framework of state-centrism and trans-border politics.

The debate with respect to the broadening versus narrowing of Human Security conceptions can be circumscribed as the 'freedoms-debate' since a narrow notion of the term ultimately manifests into freedom from fear, while a broader interpretation results in support for freedom from want. The latter is occasionally broadened even further to include the freedom to live a life in dignity (Acharya, 2001).

Concerning the 'freedom from fear' debate, popular proponents include Axworthy; the Canadian government more generally; Paris, 2001; Krause and Jütersonke, 2005; and Newman, 2010. Proponents of the 'freedom from want' debate include the Japanese government; the Commission on Human Security; the United Nations; Leaning and Arie, 2000; Thomas, 2001; McKay, 2004; and Barnett and Adger, 2007. More of the latter will be introduced in this paper's section on HS's links to other realms such as the environment.

Although this broad-narrow divide remains largely unchallenged (Owen, 2004b; Burgess and Owen, 2004; Shani in Shani et al., 2007), at this stage, it is worth noting a critic who highlights the dangers of this conceptual constellation. Chandler (2012) asserts that this human-made divide/ framing is indicative of yet another

categorization, namely that between the use of force (freedom from fear) on the one hand, and a range of non-coercive measures (freedom from want), on the other. Chandler moreover links the former to the concept of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P). Through this framing, so he claims, military intervention is not precluded within the human security framework and, if undertaken within such, is posed as a means of empowering and capacity-building and thereby justified (Chandler, 2012)[1].

While support for a broad notion of human security centers primarily on the necessity of interdisciplinarity and concerted action as symbolized by the links between the seven fields of security (McDonald, 2002), Chandler does not stand alone with his criticism vis-à-vis a broad definition of human security. The absence of a clear and narrow definition is said to render the realm of human security a subject to potential misuse through securitization and framing (Paris, 2001). In this manner, military interventions may eventually be justified (see Copenhagen School). Another criticism is that broadly defined human security lacks analytical value as well as practical feasibility as it does not allow scholars or practitioners to prioritize any particular threat and thereby confuses dependent and independent variables (Newman, 2010)[2]. In addition, broad notions of HS are said to be uncritical as they lack the potential to uproot state-centric pillars of the contemporary system and even enable the contemporary liberal order to prevail (Christie, 2010). This point of view, however, misses the point that uprooting the state unavoidably merely results in the replacement of one oppressing system of power with another.

Causal Interrelationship, Stratification, and the Role of Human Security

Concerning the above interrelationship of matters related to human wellbeing, the positioning of (broad) HS within the chain of causal events of crises and conflicts is manifold. That is to say that as there are many proponents of a broad notion of HS, there are nearly just as many variations of broad HS and their relationship with other realms. While some prioritize some limited links such as that between Human Security and human health by underlining the negative impact of war on the latter (Iqbal, 2006), most connections are established between HS and

1. Similar remarks can be found within the camp of the Copenhagen school of securitization, which will be discussed at a later stage.

2. One example of this variable-confusion is that climate change is seen to exacerbate human insecurity which, in turn, intensifies environmental insecurities as, for instance, rebel forces may exhaust natural resources in order to fund their military undertakings (Barnett et al, 2010).

Sustainable Development. Here, however, what is interesting to note are the roles Human Security is being attributed in this regard.

For Barnett and Adger (2007), climate change is a cause of human insecurity, particularly due to the change in social systems as a consequence of climate change and the thereby resulting conflicts. While the role of HS appears to be on par with climate change in the eyes of Barnett and Adger (2007), for others, however, Human Security is subordinated to Sustainable Development and seen as part of a causal chain with the potential to spill over onto other issues within the more holistic area of Sustainable Development (Khagram et al, 2003; Barnett et al, 2010). Such a subordination of HS is also claimed to exist on a more positive ground in that Human Security is attributed the role of a contributor of additional merits to human development as HS 1) helps identify threats and vulnerabilities of individuals otherwise left undiscovered by Development alone; 2) helps prioritize human development needs through a focus on the bare minimum; and 3) helps prevent the neglect of minorities (Tadjbakhsh and Chenoy, 2011).

Even the realms of Human Rights and International Law have been linked to broad (and narrow) notions of Human Security. Howard-Hassmann (2012), for instance, considers a narrow interpretation of HS to be conducive to human rights as they help underline the primacy of the wellbeing of individuals to the minds of those in charge within the still state-centric realm of Human Rights. A broad notion of HS, on the other hand, is seen to disregard human rights regimes and to undermine the civil and political rights of individuals (Howard-Hassmann, 2012).

At this stage, too, does the complexity of Human Security become apparent. While Mahbub ul Haq's UNDP-conceptualization considers human security to complement human rights by considering the latter to be present merely within one of its seven categories, namely political security; Axworthy (1997), arguably a proponent of a narrow HS conception, also lists fundamental human rights to be a key component of human security. As such, the link between human security and human rights appears to not only be the sole domain of a broad conception of the former. An additional layer of conditionality is introduced by Acharya (2001) who underlines the pragmatism and added value of HS to human rights, as long as the former is operationalized in a non-colonial manner. In so doing, Human Security is said to have the potential of being an Eastphalian extension of Western human rights and the liberal peace project which it underpins (Acharya, 2001).

Likewise, international law is considered both a useful means as well as a hindrance to human security. International law has the potential to advance human security as the degree of congruence between the two is considerably high, particularly in regard to the objectives of the rule of law, law enforcement, and legal accountability (Von Tigerstrom, 2007). As such, international law is seen to provide a legal framework for securing human wellbeing such as through binding and non-binding agreements concerning infectious diseases. In certain instances, however, it is also a hindrance to the implementation of human security measures. Examples include the war on terror which, despite its at times noble objectives, increase the insecurity of many individuals (Von Tigerstrom, 2007).

Additional disagreement in regard to the stratification of HS's broadening is found in Gasper (2007) who sees a level playing field between Human Security, Human Rights and Sustainable Development, and proposes to subordinate those altogether under the overarching concept of Human Need. Through the need-based model, Gasper (2007: p.24) ranks the needs of human beings and categorizes those into 'drives, or strong wants, or things without which one suffers'; mere requirements; and additional means for fulfillment of certain needs such as dignity. Such a raking and categorization, however, is not natural and thus, if imposed, ultimately risks becoming neocolonial as some social contexts would treat, for instance, dignity as more crucial than others.

Threshold-based Human Security Conception

The conceptual impasse within the broadening-narrowing debate concerning Human Security is, in addition to Chandler's aforementioned criticism, further breached by an interesting debate which obviates the need for a horizontal exclusion of areas of insecurities such as environmental disasters or refugee contexts. This is enabled by a threshold-based concept of Human Security, firstly formulated by King and Murray (2001) and further advanced by Owen (2004b), as a quantification-attempt of human security in the form of the expected number of prospective years an individual is able to spend above the threshold of human insecurity. According to this logic, a wide range of variables can lead to human insecurity ranging from the narrow to the broad spectrum. This is to mean that factors such as climate change or human rights violations do not result in human insecurities *per se* – however, merely so if a certain threshold is reached (Liotta and Owen, 2006). The merit of the threshold-based HS conception is that a prioritization of

issues is no longer necessary. Rather, a focus on the severity of sources of insecurity is advocated (Owen, 2004b). It appears to increasingly become part of what is known as second generation Human Security with its contemporarily greatest proponent being the European Union (Martin and Owen, 2010).

This arguably creative approach, however, is also not without its flaws. According to Owen (2004a), the parameters for such a threshold are set by 'vital cores' and 'critical pervasive threats'. While it enables the accommodation of various sources of insecurity in a non-exclusionary manner, it merely shifts the problem from 'Who decides *what sources* count as insecurities?' to 'Who decides *what severity level* is to be considered an insecurity?'. In both cases, it is the states most powerful – usually within the West – (along with Western NGOs and international organizations) that get to decide and frame insecurities by setting thresholds and standards (Suhrke, 1999; Hoogensen and Stuvøy, 2006). Moreover, while Owen (2004a) does well to rely on factors such as regional relevance in determining the list of sources to be given a threshold, the problem remains that individuals in their very own contextually specific and culturally often very *un*Western social environment might disagree with the threshold created by policy-makers overseas. Related to this, Inglehart and Norris (2012) provide a welcome addition in that they recommend focusing on local perceptions of human (in)security.

Human Security – Despite or Thanks to Liberal Peace?

This aforementioned domination of the West in the realm of applied human security, as well as the development of the gap between Human Security and the liberal peace project itself is a matter worthy of consideration. Ironically, there is no scholar who would claim that *Human* Security represents a milestone-departure away from *state*-centrism and the Westphalian system. Even the rather optimistic account by McDonald (2002) merely considers that the Human Security wave might have set loose a force with the potential to alter the normative setting within which states operate and, in so doing, alter the liberal macrocosm of international affairs in the future.

In fact, one can almost always find a healthy degree of skepticism/ criticism – either in regard to the proponents of Human Security, or those who believe in the prevalence of Westphalianism. While, for instance, Thomas (2001) (uncritically) lauds the contributions of Human Security to the wellbeing of individuals by liberal means, he nonetheless notes that political leaders were the ones in support of

Human Security undertakings. Others attribute the prevalence of state-centrism to key-events such as 9/11 (Basch, 2004; Evans, 2004; De Larrinaga and Doucet, 2008), whereby Basch seems to imply that HS emerged only because states could afford to allow it to emerge[3].

Another group of scholars that can be identified are those who assert that the liberal order prevails or has even been further consolidated by Human Security. Christie (2010) has made the rather nuanced statement that Human Security has the potential of improving the liberal order while also possessing the risk of consolidating it. This danger has also been identified by others such as Chandler (2012) who fear that it might function as a means for disguising military interventions under the cover of human security. This might indicate that, while the voice of the nonWestern is still not significantly strengthened, post-liberalism appears to be further developed in theory, more than in practice (Christie, 2010). Others who support this position perceive Human Security to be an (orientalist) discursive tool which spatially divides the realm of international affairs into failed states, those in need of securing, and those who secure (Chandler, 2008; McCormack, 2008). Yet again others would circumscribe the existence of HS by considering it a culmination of the liberal project deeply rooted in the West and its traditions of enlightenment (Shani et al, 2007; Krause in Mary and Owen, 2015).

Owens' choice of words is more explicit as she seems to imply that Human Security is to some extent the making of Western states/ actors (in Paris' (2001) eyes it is the Middle Powers) powerful enough to influence transnational policy-making and theoretical discourse (see also Burgess and Owen, 2004). However, in an Acharyan (2001) manner, one might argue that the more human security measures are applied/ imposed onto target countries – usually in the global South – the more the nature of HS itself gets amended and marked by local/ nonWestern values and norms. Human Security thus has the opportunity of becoming less Western, the more it is applied, even if imposed.

---

3. There is eventually no clear answer as to whether the Human Security discourse prevailed despite, or perhaps even due to the post-9/11 international setting along with the interstate cooperation against terrorism, the alarming number of civilian casualties of drone-strikes, and Guantanamo. These can be said to provide nourishing ground for HS concepts (especially those critical in nature). The more interesting question is, will these nourishing grounds be tilled and cultivated by those in power or by ambitious but powerless conceptual dreamers?

The Philosophical Debate

Human Security and Critical Security Studies

The core of the above paragraph points to the direction of a critical inquiry into Human Security. In fact, the groundwork for such an endeavor (Critical Human Security Studies) can be said to be already given by the area of Critical Security Studies. Nonetheless, some claim that despite its attribution of a key role to the individual, Human Security does not possess any noteworthy critical potential for e.g. bringing about changes to the system of international security (Christie, 2010). Others tend to agree as they claim that the modes of critical inquiry to be found within the realm of Critical Security Studies have not (yet) significantly spilled over onto the area of Human Security. Possible reasons for this are 1) the already sufficient congruence between these two areas in consequence of which Critical Security Studies is deemed already capable of investigating human insecurities (Christie, 2010; Newman, 2010); 2) the aforementioned danger of HS to function as a hegemonic discourse used by states; and 3) the teleological differences whereby the objectives of HS are primarily normative and problem-solving, rather than critically revisionist. As such, more emphasis is placed by Human Security on policy-relevance than on academic scrutiny (Newman, 2010).

The Copenhagen School

Nonetheless, noticeable camps within the realm of Human Security have emerged with sometimes more, sometimes less visible traits of critical inquiry – either for the sake of the wellbeing of individuals, or against potential abuses of power by governments. One such camp, related to the latter, is the Copenhagen School (of securitization) which considers security and the process of its coming into being a speech act that enables political leaders to gain extraordinary political powers and even bypass democratic policy-making processes (Buzan et al, 1998; Shani in Shani et al, 2007).

What is ironic here, besides the sudden regard for liberal values such as democracy in the realm of Critical Security, is that, given the above suspicion, advocates logically argue for a carefully selected conceptualization of Human Security along with the exclusion of certain security-sectors such as migration and HIV/AIDS (Buzan et al, 1998). This act of dehumanizing security by narrowing the security sector in an exclusionary manner would, however, not only further consolidate the

state-centric notion of security, but moreover be neocolonial (Ewan, 2007). Furthermore, it is worth to bear in mind that there are indeed some interventions which require the use of military force as well as immediate, non-democratic policy-making in cases such as human health insecurities – arguably a potential component of HS – in order to quickly and effectively contain the outbreak of, for instance, epidemics. In such a case, the military could be put in charge of logistics.

The Welsh School

Another camp within the realm of Human Security with critical potential is the Welsh School and its emancipatory ambitions. It possesses a curious mixture of normative advocacy on the one hand, and the potential for critical Foucauldian revelations, on the other. Emancipation represents an endeavor of "freeing people, as individuals and groups, from the social, physical, economic, political, and other constraints that stop them from carrying out what they would freely chose to do" (Booth in Krause and Williams, 1997: p.110).

One noteworthy criticism in regard to this definition of emancipation is that Human Security is not overly conducive to this end as the securitization of the individual is seen to further underline the responsibility and agency of the state (Krause and Williams in Krause and Williams, 1997; McCormack, 2011). Others would disagree with this criticism as it is a matter of the manner in which Human Security along with its focus on the individual is put into action. In this regard, HS may be made considerably more critical through additional methodological tools such as that of Immanent Critique. MacDonald (2002) appears to make allusions to this Marxist approach in that he attributes to HS the ability of uncovering how traditional security practices are at times counterproductive to the security of individuals which would discredit the state and its practices and thereby contribute to emancipating the individual.

The standards of emancipation and empowerment are most likely created and imposed by those powerful enough to do so – usually states of the West. This point might be indicative of the aforementioned prevalence of the liberal order in the realm of international security, particularly if considering Richmond's (2007) statement that, despite the great potential of the emancipatory frame, it is usually put into action not by states, but by non-state actors such as nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). At this stage it is worth reminding the reader of the problem of donor-dependency and the usually Western origin of NGOs, which makes it

increasingly difficult to break the wall of liberal values.

Feminism and Human Security

A third critical camp which has positioned itself within HS and which has strong links to the above emancipatory camp is Feminism. Feminism has been very accommodative of the concepts of Human Security given 1) its emphasis on the individual and particularly the several non-traditional security aspects associated with it such as psychology, social integration, and human rights; and 2) the great parallels between the concepts of Human Security's emancipation and Feminism's empowerment (see e.g. Hoogensen and Stuvøy, 2006). By aiming to uncover and do away with exclusions, neglect, and oppressions, Feminism can be said to enrich the critical potential of Human Security.

Continuing the rhetoric of the broadening and narrowing of security, Feminism further deepens the referent of security beyond the individual-level by sub-dividing it into, amongst others, the security of women and children (Christie, 2010). In this sense, Feminism is not only critical vis-à-vis the empirical realm of policy-makers, but also in regard to debates concerning human security and its components such as emancipation. Concerning the latter, for instance, Feminism highlights that emancipation usually means selectively emancipating some people while neglecting others (Christie, 2010).

These 'others' are manifold. Some scholars appear to myopically apply Feminism in a literal manner by merely referring to women and girls (see e.g. McKay, 2004). Overall, however, Feminism presents researchers (and thus Human Security) with tools to engage in a sub-human level of analysis by applying it in ways conceptualized by scholars such as Hudson (2005) or Hoogensen and Stuvøy (2006). This analysis would include, in addition to women and girls, groups such as marginalized men, indigenous people and otherwise stratified individuals. Such additional layers of analysis presented to HS by feminism are exemplified by Fox's (2004) account on girl soldiers.

Hoogensen and Stuvøy (2006) pose the recurring but crucial question: 'Who decides what human security is?'. The Feminist perspective does indeed appear critical and postcolonial by finding answering to this question and, in so doing, demystifies current systems of domination. However, from an anthropological perspective one should bring up the arguably provocative question of whether the beneficiaries of

Feminist efforts wish to be empowered (and to which extent) as there are contexts and cultural factors that dictate certain roles of e.g. women in their respective communities, which are closely tied to their identities and not perceived as overly burdensome by them. This would bring the scholar back to the question of who is to decide which vulnerability deserves to receive which threshold and whether those in charge ought to be in charge at all. It furthermore links to the question posed by Gasper (2014) of 'security to what extent/ until when?'. To answer these questions and thereby decrease the potential *neocoloniality* underneath Feminism, Hudson (2005: p.155) proposes a "more fluid context-based interpretation of gender in human security".

Second Generation Human Security

Concerning such local-contextuality, a last (and rather new) form of Human Security which could be circumscribed as *pragmatically critical* is known as hybrid peacebuilding. Hybrid peacebuilding appears in scholarly debates also under names such as second generation human security (see e.g. Martin and Owen, 2010). It represents a form of humanitarian intervention which is based on a complementary relationship between Human Security and Peacebuilding. Second generation human security consists of limited Western values and has a considerable tolerance for local values and incompatibilities with the spirit of enlightenment. As it emphasizes local contextuality, the need for such a constellation is being increasingly called for by scholars in order for Human Security to avoid becoming labeled universalist and thus oppressive (Hudson, 2005). Human Security and peacebuilding are not only deemed compatible, it is moreover believed that the former's effectiveness can be raised through the integration of HS *into* peacebuilding – to be more precise, in areas such as micro-social, institutional, as well as socio-cultural areas of insecurity (Conteh-Morgan 2005; Newman, 2011).

Besides Human Security's changing internal composition (matters related to the spectrum and threshold of insecurities it ought to cover), another set of variables that influence the effectiveness of HS is its perception. While most human security measures (and debates) are still to some degree liberal (Thomas, 2001; Christie, 2010 etc.), the unquestioned/ unscrutinized attitude vis-à-vis e.g. democratization is less seen within second generation human security. The latter also allows for a way towards a more welcoming perception and towards greater legitimacy (and thus a decreased risk of spoilers of the peace project (Newmanm 2011)) as it ideal-typically shows a greater respect for local values and traditions – even more

so if it focuses on the aforementioned variables of local risk perception (Inglehart and Norris, 2012).
The earliest advocate of second generation human security appears to be Acharya (2001) as he calls for a transnational as well as transcultural "collective human security agenda" (p.443) whereby common conceptual ground between e.g. Asian and Western HS conceptions are expected to be achievable.

While Richmond (2007: p.460) underlines the importance of perceived legitimacy among the target population, he does not appear to question the liberal peace system and ironically even uses the "creation of a liberal and emancipatory social contract" as a benchmark for the undertaking of human security measures. Whilst setting a fixed ratio concerning local and foreign 'ingredients of peace' would be as hegemonic as non-hybrid multidimensional peacebuilding is liberal, a valid question at this stage is who should suffer whom – the host or the intervening powers, for effective hybrid peace? So far, there is no explicit research on this. An answer to this would require a greater empirical foundation. As it is a rather new conception, second generation human security is, so far, largely visible only in theory (Richmond, 2007) while the European Union (EU) is known to be its main driver (Martin and Owen, 2010) and, at the same time, apparently susceptible to direct insights from scholars such as Kaldor, Richmond, and Martin (Kaldor et al, 2016).

In Lieu of a Conclusion

As became visible from the preceding pages, Human Security is a phenomenon with multiple abilities, deficits, but also potentials. The wide array of sources of human insecurities along with the unique instances of local contextuality that change from case to case and bring with them a new microcosm of values and traditions against which Human Security measures its degree of enlightenment is at the same time a great chance for the further development of conceptions of Human Security. One such case in point is Feminism and the way it has contributed to the HS debate by adding to it a sub-human level of analysis.

Such sub-human levels of analysis could further develop into, for example, the thus far nearly untapped realm of psychological human security. The challenges for the Human Security debate posed by pressures to be as non Western as possible present partially culture-independent variables such as psychology with the

opportunity to constructively enrich the theoretical realm of Human Security. First leaps into this direction have already been undertaken although the use of (socio-) psychological insights for the sake of human security may still be considered a largely unaddressed area. Pioneering examples in this regard include Leaning and Arie's (2000) research on the importance of psychological and social variables for community stability and the latter's role within the frame of Human Security; the use of psychology in Feminist research concerning the psycho-social and physical insecurities of women and girls (McKay, 2004); as well as the importance of basic human needs from a psychological perspective for the effectiveness of human security measures (Pupavac, 2005).

A last note within this paper is dedicated to a more philosophical debate that appears to be ongoing in a sometimes rather explicit and at times implicit manner: Contemporary Human Security scholarship appears to focus on scrutinizing the prevalence of Westphalian and Western liberal values that underpin humanitarian interventions. The dilemma is how *not* to replace an illiberal oppressive power-structure with yet another hegemonic frame which Western enlightenment is at times referred to (see e.g. Acharya, 2001). Avoiding this scenario, however, is unattainable because a new set of values and a new frame for the implementation of HS measures merely implies that a new system of power prevailed over/ oppressed alternative systems. At the same time, non-intervention equally constitutes an oppression of alternatives.

Likewise, the selection of satisfactory emancipatory mechanisms is the result of a sequence of choice whereby not all stakeholder's needs can be satisfied – regardless of whether the Human Security conception is broad or narrow in nature. It thus appears as if critical change is predisposed to being oppressive. This does not only affect the empirical, but also the metaphysical level of Human Security:

No matter the discourse, it ultimately refers back to forces of power – powers that define security, as well as powers that resist intervention (Grayson, 2008). While, in practical terms, human insecurity results directly from existing structures of power that determine who is to enjoy which entitlement of security to which extent; on a metaphysical level, a thought is always in a symbiotic relationship with a power-structure that hosts and nourishes it. If this power structure faces another structure with another competing thought, the prevalence and/or growth of the first thought may be stalled or prevented[4].

One example of such as a thought-host is the Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA) – a body not unrelated to Japan's Ministry of Foreign Affairs and an institution that considers the Japanese conception of Human Security one of its core pillars of operation. Given instances such as the active distinction from Canada's conception of Human Security, undertakings such as those by the JICA Research Institute[5] appear to identify, reiterate, and thus consolidate the debate of broadening versus narrowing. In fact, JICA itself circumscribes it as "knowledge co-creation" (JICA, 2018). Thereby, efforts of pre-thinking and driving the scholarly debate into one direction instead of alternatives are discernable.

In this regard, scholarship tends to assume the theoretical primacy of the individual in human security undertakings and focus on the potential of various measures to this end. In actuality, however, it is not an overly daring assumption that Human Security is instead/also a mere currency of diplomacy. This focus of theoretical HS research endeavors such as those found in this paper on the feasibility and effectiveness of existing measures rather than on the potentially less altruistic teleologies behind HS concepts also permits the assumption of underlying powers impacting what is said and what is not said.

Phenomena such as this as well as the aforementioned dilemma of the naturalness of oppression and domination might be the cause behind the creation of a chain of thoughts of pragmatic criticism within the realm of Human Security in the form of biopolitics. In fact, the assertion that concepts of Human Security exist largely because states and other powerful actors wanted it this way and thus allowed for it to develop is by no means scarce (see e.g. Basch, 2004; Chandler, 2008; Grayson, 2008; Inglehart and Norris, 2012) – which is used by some to explain the prevalence

---

4. The most explicit account by a scholar who seems to support this thought is Neufeld (20041) along with the following quote:

> […] the intellectual project of redefining security in terms of human welfare must be coupled with an attentiveness to how expanded notions of security are used and to what purpose, as well as to how traditional notions of security can find new life in non-traditional venues. Such an approach has the merit of helping us to resist the pitfall of utopianism, by directing us to be attentive to the way in which the meanings and practices of security never float unattached, but are always embedded and embodied, always dependent on context for their content. It guards us against elitism as well, by helping us to remain cognizant of the way meanings are created and changed through a process of real people acting to make history, though, of course, not necessarily in the circumstances of their own choosing. (p.121)

5. www.jica.go.jp/jica-ri/about/message.html (Accessed September 15th, 2019).

of the liberal order within the realm of international security (De Larrinaga and Doucet, 2008; Christie, 2010).

Summa summarum, while under the influence of multiple forces, activists, leaders as well as scholars can engage in a debate (while with some constraints) to amend Human Security thus far evolved and, in so doing, the realm of international security, more generally – be it through additional anti-Westphalian criticism, emancipating/empowering in feminist and psychological manners, or through rather metaphysical debates about biopolitics and the subtle influence by forces behind the Human Security debate. Nonetheless, power-driven limitations and subjectivities always prevail and criticism of one thought or concept is likely to have an equally oppressive power-background.

References

Acharya, A. (2001). Human Security: East versus West. *International Journal*, (Summer), 442–460.

Axworthy, L. (1997). Canada and Human Security: the need for leadership. *International Journal*, (Spring).

Axworthy, L. (2001). Human security and global governance: Putting people first. *Global Governance*, *7*(1), 19–23.

Barnett, J., & Adger, W. N. (2007). Climate change, human security and violent conflict. *Political Geography*, *26*(6), 639–655. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2007.03.003

Barnett, J., Matthew, R. A., & O'Brien, K. L. (2010). Global Environmental Change and Human Security: An Introduction. In R. A. Matthew (Ed.), *Global environmental change and human security* (pp. 3–32). Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Basch, L. (2004). Human security, globalization, and feminist visions. *Peace Review*, *16*(1), 5–12.

Bellamy, A. J., & McDonald, M. (n.d.). 'The Utility of Human Security': Which Humans? What Security? A Reply to Thomas & Tow. *Security Dialogue*, *33*(3), 373–377.

Booth, K. (2011). Security and Self: Reflections of a Fallen Realis. In K. Krause & M. C. Williams (Eds.), *Critical security studies: concepts and cases* (pp. 83–121). London: Routledge.

Burgess, J. P., & Owen, T. (2004). Editors' Note. *Security Dialogue*, *35*(3), 345–346. https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010604047569

Buzan, B., Wæver, O., & Wilde, J. de. (1998). *Security: a new framework for analysis*. Boulder, Colo: Lynne Rienner Pub.

Caballero-Anthony, M., Emmers, R., & Acharya, A. (Eds.). (2006). *Non-traditional security in Asia: dilemmas in securitization*. Aldershot, Hamshire: Ashgate.

Chandler, D. (2008). Human Security: The Dog That Didn't Bark. *Security Dialogue*, *39*(4), 427–438.

Chandler, D. (2012). Resilience and human security: The post-interventionist paradigm. *Security Dialogue*, *43*(3), 213–229. https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010612444151

Christie, R. (2010). Critical Voices and Human Security: To Endure, To Engage or To Critique? *Security Dialogue*, *41*(2), 169–190. https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010610361891

Conteh-Morgan, E. (2005). Peacebuilding and Human Security: A Constructivist Perspective. *International Journal of Peace Studies*, *10*(1), 69–86.

De Larrinaga, M., & Doucet, M. G. (2008). Sovereign Power and the Biopolitics of Human Security. *Security Dialogue*, *39*(5), 517–537. https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010608096148

Evans, P. (2004). Human Security and East Asia: In the Beginning. *Journal of East Asian Studies*, *4*, 263–284.

Ewan, P. (2007). Deepening the Human Security Debate: Beyond the Politics of Conceptual Clarification. *Politics*, *27*(3), 182–189.

Fox, M.-J. (2004). Girl Soldiers: Human Security and Gendered Insecurity. *Security Dialogue*, *35*(4), 465–479. https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010604049523

Gasper, D. (2007). Human Rights, Human Needs, Human Development, Human Security: Relationships between four International 'Human' Discourses. *Forum for Development Studies*, *34*(1), 9–43.

Grayson, K. (2008). Human security as power/knowledge: the biopolitics of a definitional debate. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, *21*(3), 383–401.

Hoogensen, G., & Stuvøy, K. (2006). Gender, Resistance and Human Security. *Security Dialogue*, *37*(2), 207–228. https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010606066436

Howard-Hassmann, R. E. (2012). Human Security: Understanding Human Rights. *Human Rights Quarterly*, *34*, 88–112.

Hudson, H. (2005). 'Doing' Security As Though Humans Matter: A Feminist Perspective on Gender and the Politics of Human Security. *Security Dialogue*, *36*(2), 155–174.

Inglehart, R. F., & Norris, P. (2012). The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse: Understanding Human Security. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, *35*(1), 71–96.

Iqbal, Z. (2006). Health and Human Security: The Public Health Impact of Violent Conflict. *International Studies Quarterly*, *50*, 631–649.

JICA - Japan International Cooperation Agency. (2018, October 1). *JICA Research Institute - Message from the Director*. Retrieved from https://www.jica.go.jp/jica-ri/about/message.html (Accessed September 15, 2019).

Kaldor, M., Rangelov, I., Selchow, S., Solana, J., Andersson, R., Arnould, V., … Vlassenroot, K. (2016). *From Hybrid Peace to Human Security: Rethinking EU Strategy towards Conflict*. Brussels: European Research Council.

Khagram, S., Clark, W., & Raad, D. F. (2003). From the Environment and Human Security to Sustainable Security and Development. *Journal of Human Development*, *4*(2), 289–313. https://doi.org/10.1080/1464988032000087604

Khong, Y. F. (2001). Human Security: A Shotgun Approach to Alleviating Human Misery? *Global Governance*, *7*, 231–236.

King, G., & Murray, C. J. L. (2001). Rethinking Human Security. *Political Science Quarterly*, *116*(4), 585–610.

Krause, K., & Jütersonke, O. (2005). Peace, Security and Development in Post-Conflict Environments. *Security Dialogue*, *36*(4), 447–462. https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010605060449

Leaning, J., & Arie, S. (2000). *Human Security: A Framework for Assessment In Conflict and Transition*. USAID & CERTI.

Liotta, P. H., & Owen, T. (2006). Why Human Security? *The Whitehead Journal of Diplomacy and International Relations*, *7*, 37–54.

Martin, M., & Owen, T. (2010). The second generation of human security: lessons from the UN and EU experience. *International Affairs*, *86*(1), 211–224.

Martin, M., Owen, T. (2015). *Routledge handbook of human security*. London; New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

McCormack, T. (2008). Power and agency in the human security framework. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, *21*(1), 113–128. https://doi.org/10.1080/09557570701828618

McCormack, T. (2011). Human security and the separation of security and development. *Conflict, Security & Development*, *11*(02), 235–260.

McDonald, M. (2002). Human Security and the Construction of Security. *Global Society*, *16*(3), 277–295.

McKay, S. (2004). *Chapter 7, Women, Human Security, and Peace-building: A Feminist Analysis* (IPSHU English Research Report Series No. 19; pp. 152–175). IPSHU.

Neufeld, M. (2004). Pitfalls of Emancipation and Discourses of Security: Reflections on Canada's 'Security With a Human Face. *International Relations*, *18*(1), 109–123.

Newman, E. (2001). Human Security and Constructivism. *International Studies Perspectives*, *2*, 239–251.

Newman, E. (2010). Critical human security studies. *Review of International Studies*, *36*, 77–94.

Newman, E. (2011). A Human Security Peace-Building Agenda. *Third World Quarterly*, *32*(10), 1737–1756. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2011.610568

Owen, T. (2004a). Challenges and opportunities for defining and measuring human security. *Disarmament Forum*, 15–24.

Owen, T. (2004b). Human Security - Conflict, Critique and Consensus: Colloquium Remarks and a Proposal for a Threshold-Based Definition. *Security Dialogue*, *35*(3), 373–387. https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010604047555

Owens, P. (2012). Human security and the rise of the social. *Review of International Studies*, *38*, 547–567.

Paris, R. (2001). Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air? *International Security*, *26*(2), 87–102.

Pupavac, V. (2005). Human security and the rise of global therapeutic governance. *Conflict, Security & Development*, *5*(2), 161–181.

Richmond, O. P. (2007). Emancipatory Forms of Human Security and Liberal Peacebuilding. *International Journal: Canada's Journal of Global Policy Analysis*, *62*(3), 459–478. https://doi.org/10.1177/002070200706200302

Shani, G., Satō, M., & Pasha, M. K. (Eds.). (2007). *Protecting human security in a post 9 / 11 world: critical and global insights*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Suhrke, A. (1999). Human Security and the Interest of States. *Security Dialogue*, *30*(3), 265–276.

Tadjbakhsh, S., & Chenoy, A. M. (2011). *Human security: concepts and implications* (Nachdr.). In *Routledge Advances in International Relations and Global Politics*: *Vol. 51* (Nachdr.). London: Routledge.

Thomas, C. (2001). Global governance, development and human security: exploring the links. *Third World Quarterly*, *22*(2), 159–175. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436590120037018

Thomas, N., & Tow, W. T. (2002). The Utility of Human Security: Sovereignty and Humanitarian Intervention. *Security Dialogue*, *33*(2), 177–192.

United Nations. (1994). *Human Development Report 1994*. Retrieved from Oxford University Press website: http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/reports/255/hdr_1994_en_complete_nostats.pdf

Von Tigerstrom, B. (2007). Human Security and International Law. In *Studies in International Law*: *Vol. v. 14*. *Human security and international law: prospects and problems* (pp. 59–90). Oxford; Portland, OR: Hart Pub.