Gilder, Alexander ORCID logoORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8861-1433 (2022) Human security. In: Richmond, Oliver and Visoka, Gëzim (eds.) The Palgrave Encyclopedia of Peace and Conflict Studies. Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 494-503. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-11795-5_191-1 Available at https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/101397/

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

Human Security

Alexander Gilder

Royal Holloway, University of London, Egham, UK

Definition

A contested concept such as human security is not easily defined in concrete terms. Instead, human security has two key elements: (1) it aims to shift the referent object of security from the state to the individual giving the individual intrinsic value and placing the interests of the individual ahead of the state; (2) it gives rise to a broader view on what can cause insecurity and that many threats are interconnected and reinforcing.

Introduction

Human security has been the subject of fierce academic debate since it was coined by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in 1994 (UNDP 1994). During the 20th century, security as a concept has been liberalised to become denationalised and both globalised and individualised (Daase 2010). Following the Second World War the referent object of security was argued to be the state with the international community protecting itself from nuclear attack. However, in the 1970s liberal theorists argued that the referent object should be society where "a collective of citizens lives in safety and freedom so that it can develop its productivity and wealth" (Daase 2010, pp 27-8). Later the concept of human security was suggested to instead give the individual intrinsic value (UNDP 1994). Under a human security approach, where the individual's interests compete with that of the state or society, the individual should be given priority. This entry recounts some of the early development of the concept of human security and its initial purposes for the UNDP and the states who took an active interest in its advancement. Second, some of the definitional issues will be discussed by looking at the broad versus narrow conceptions of human security. Lastly, the entry will cover some instances where the concept of human security has been used, as an analytical tool, in interdisciplinary studies.

The Emergence of Human Security

Human security stems from "the erosion of the nation-state and the fact that fewer and fewer decisions that affect our lives are taken at the level of the nation-state" (Kaldor 2011). Although human security gained mainstream attention in the 1990s its origins can be found earlier in the 20th century as states, and consequently the international community, became more concerned about the individual. Following the Second World War there was a growing critique of national security and the traditional focus of the state being the referent object of security. The critique was based on the state being unable to provide the level of security desired and the reclaiming of rights that had previously been traded upwards to the state (MacFarlane and Khong 2006, p.109). The post-war international system that emerged balanced state sovereignty under the Westphalian order with the increased recognition of human rights and human dignity. However, the state-based system and its focus on national security continued to prevail during the Cold War.

The Palme Commission in 1982, chaired by former Swedish Prime Minister Olaf Palme, used the term 'common security' when reporting on key international security concerns. The report considered nuclear-weapon free zones and regulations on conventional weapons sales, but importantly

for human security, there was investigation into insecurities in developing countries. For example, the Commission notes how developing countries build up armaments to defend themselves but without effective and reliable regimes for their security their vulnerability will increase (Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues 1982, pp.128-9). It recognised that in all countries, security needs to consider both economic progress, linked to the freedom from want, and the freedom from fear in military terms. The report suggested that security should be viewed globally and not only from the viewpoint of states. However, the position of the state was enshrined with the report reiterating "all states have the right to security", but states must cooperate to be secure and not seek security at each other's expense through war and arms build ups (Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues 1982, pp.138-9).

The Brundtland Commission in 1987 followed, headed by former Norwegian Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland, with a focus on development. The Commission coined the term 'sustainable development'. Sustainable development is "not a fixed state of harmony, but rather a process of change in which the exploitation of resources, the direction of investments, the orientation of technological development, and institutional change are made consistent with future as well as present needs" (United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development 1987, para 30). The report examined the environment with analysis of available resources for the population, food security challenges, different energy sources, and the environment as a cause of conflict. The Brundtland Commission built on the Palme Commission by introducing elements of humanity into their concept of sustainable development where previously development was focused on triggering

industrialisation and measuring growth through indicators like gross domestic product (GDP), investment, savings, and industrial outputs (Tadjbakhsh and Chenoy 2007, p.101). Brundtland was part of the shift to 'human development', which argues "economic growth does not automatically trickle down to benefit the well-being of people, and other approaches, such as basic needs, did not hand over the reins of decision making to the beneficiaries themselves." (United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development 1987, p.104). The Palme and Brundtland Commissions laid important groundwork on securitisation and development that contributed to the emergence of human security.

The concept of human security entered the scene in 1994 as part of the UNDP's 1994 Human Development Report. The UNDP is not a body primarily concerned with 'security', but security became a concern because the needs of people during different forms of emergencies, be it a natural disaster, war, or humanitarian crisis, were understood to be inseparable from development (Murphy 2006, p.277). The 1994 Report expresses dissatisfaction with traditional practices of development focusing solely on increasing gross national product (GNP) and uses language such as, "safety from chronic threats such as hunger, disease and repression" to direct attention away from prevalent physical threats that were focused on during the Cold War (UNDP 1994, p.23; Acharya 2014, p.449; Owen 2004, p.382). This led to human security effectively 'securitising' what were traditionally development issues to increase awareness of new, non-traditional threats of insecurity (Zwierlein and Graf 2010, p.8).

The team behind the 1994 Report sought to create an approach that "focuses on building human capabilities to confront and overcome poverty, illiteracy, diseases,

discrimination, restrictions on political freedom, and the threat to violent conflict" (Acharya 2014, p.449). The Report attempted to change security from its national focus to people's security and from security through armaments to security through sustainable human development (UNDP 1994, p.24). The 1994 Report includes a non-exhaustive list of seven dimensions of human security which are as follows: economic, health, personal, political, food, environmental, and community security (UNDP 1994, pp.24-5). The UNDP Report encourages that resources be directed towards the most prevalent threats regardless of the source, be it a state or non-state actor, and that the international community should work towards prevention rather than intervention. The UNDP Report represents a "broader normative shift leading to the strengthening of the position of individual human beings at the international scene" (Bílkova 2014, pp.30-1). However, there are concerns with the 1994 Report and its securitisation. For instance, Gasper and Gómez call the seven categories of threats a 'rough starting point' and critics have lamented human security as a reductionist idea (Gasper and Gómez 2014, p.14; Buzan 2004).

In 2000, UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan reiterated the call for freedom from fear and want in his Millennium Report. Annan said that the UN was founded on seeking freedom from fear and want, and that achievement still eludes the international community (Annan 2000, p.17) Annan elaborated that the UN Charter "reaffirms the dignity and worth of the human person, respect for human rights and the equal rights of men and women, and a commitment to social progress as measured by better standards of life, in *freedom from want and fear* alike." (Annan 2000, p.6 (emphasis added)). After the publication of the report, Annan created the Commission on Human Security co-chaired by Sadako Ogata and Amartya Sen. The Commission published its *Human Security Now* Report in 2003 (Commission on Human Security 2003). The report identified that human security should have a distinctive focus on humanitarian crises as opposed to underdevelopment that is largely addressed by human development (Farer 2011, p.47). Importantly the Commission emphasises "[t]he idea is for people to be secure, not just for territories within borders to be secure against external aggression. And unlike traditional approaches that vest the state with full responsibility for state security, the process of human security involves a much broader spectrum of actors and institutions—especially people themselves" (Commission on Human Security 2003, p.6).

Human security efforts within the UN continued in this period with the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security (UNTFHS), which was established in 1999, tasked with furthering the efforts towards freedom from fear and want. Following the *Human Security Now* Report an Advisory Board on Human Security was created in 2003 to liaise with the UN Secretary-General and manage the UNTFHS. In 2004, the UNTFHS was transferred to work under the auspices of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs and a Human Security Unit (HSU) was created (Thérien 2012, p.208). The HSU's purpose is to help adapt the UN to consider human security activities. Nevertheless, the use of human security terminology has waned within the UN in recent years.

The 2005 General Assembly World Summit decided to commission work on creating a definition of human security and a General Assembly resolution in 2012 outlined the UN's interpretation of the concept (UN General Assembly 2005, para 143; UN General

Assembly 2012a). The resolution uses the definition:

> "The right of people to live in freedom and dignity, free from poverty and despair. All individuals, in particular vulnerable people, are entitled to freedom from fear and freedom from want, with an equal opportunity to enjoy all their rights and fully develop their human potential" (UN General Assembly 2012a, para 3(a)).

Narrow vs Broad Human Security

Following the 1994 Report the UNDP continued to use human security's seven categories when creating new Human Development Reports, but definitional issues have remained (Gómez et al. 2013, p.62). In the late 90s and early 2000s various middle powers including Canada, Norway, and Japan adopted human security approaches in their foreign policies with differing interpretations (Farer 2011, p.46). Much of the literature on human security unpicks these definitional differences and includes debates that cut to the core of what the concept encompasses. The definitions put forward can be broken into two broad categories: narrow and broad. It should also be said that some authors have attempted to use human security in their work with no concise definition to attempt to operationalisation the concept and move the debate forward (Benedek et al. 2011).

In the narrow conception, a human security threat exists where there is the risk of *physical* violence, no matter the root cause be it economic disaster or health epidemic. This

approach is argued to be academically useful and manageable for actors due to the limiting of the type of threats. An illustrative example of the narrow definition in practice is Canada who notably adopted a human security approach based on pervasive violent threats which undermine the rights, physical safety or lives of people (Moher 2012). Canada deemed the UNDP articulation 'unwieldy' and criticised the 1994 Report for ignoring insecurity resulting from violent conflict (Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade 1999). Canada took the approach that the UN Charter, Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and Geneva Conventions embody the core of human security to focus on violent conflict and physical security (Acharya 2001, p.445). The definition used by Canada is human security as "a condition or state of being characterized by freedom from pervasive threats to people's rights, their safety, or even their lives" (Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade 1999). Further examples of what Canada sees as progress towards human security are, the Ottawa Convention on Anti-personnel Landmines, the Rome Treaty creating the International Criminal Court, UN prioritisation of women and children in armed conflict, and the prevention of small-arms proliferation (Acharya 2001, pp.445-6; King and Murray 2002, p.590).

The Canadian definition, despite being characterised as narrow, does not only include safety from violence. Axworthy explains the Canadian position as follows,

> "human security is much more than the absence of military threat. It includes security against economic privation, an acceptable quality of life, and a guarantee of fundamental human rights. This concept of human security recognizes the complexity

of the human environment and accepts that the forces influencing human security are interrelated and mutually reinforcing. At a minimum, human security requires that basic needs are met, but it also acknowledges that sustained economic development, human rights and fundamental freedoms, the rule of law, good governance, sustainable development and social equity are as important to global peace as arms control and disarmament. It recognizes the links between environmental degradation, population growth, ethnic conflicts, and migration. Finally, it concludes that lasting stability cannot be achieved until human security is guaranteed" (Axworthy 1997, p.184).

Importantly though, King and Murray argue that while Canada do accept some broader notions of human security, they instead split the concept into human security as the freedom from fear and human development as the freedom from want (King and Murray 2002, p.590). The core of Canada's approach is to use preventative measures, whether it be strengthening legal norms, intervention, or soft diplomacy, to avoid violence that causes physical insecurity. (Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade 1999).

Proponents of the narrow definition have a distinct focus on violence. One narrow advocate, Sverre Lodgaard, argues that "[s]ecurity concerns arise when the threat of violence is present, but not all cases of socio-economic disaster lead to violent action; hence they should not be placed under the rubric of

human security"(Acharya 2001, p.447). Proponents argue that a focus on the freedom from want side of human security detracts from serious threats individuals face in times of war and conflict (MacFarlane and Khong 2006, p.164). Threats under the narrow approach are largely traditional including, armed conflict, human rights violations, organised crime, and public insecurity (Tadjbakhsh and Chenoy 2007, p.40). Linking security with violence then retains many notions of state-based security. Rebuttals to the necessity of violence in human security include the narrowing of the concept being "grossly out of step with the reality of the globalized threats we face" (Owen 2004, p.379). Liotta and Owen argue an almost exclusive focus on violence will "do little to protect the millions who will die this year from nonviolent preventable human security threats" (Liotta and Owen 2006, p.52).

It is argued by others that a narrow definition is favourable because it is analytically and practically useful (Bajpai 2003). Conversely, a broad definition is "nothing more than a shopping list" of wants and desires (Krause 2004, p.367). Krause claims that there is nothing to be gained by linking issues on the shopping list such as education and public health. Krause also feels that perceiving items on the shopping list like HIV/AIDS and migration as threats builds walls rather than bridges. However, it has also not been proven that narrowing down the broader notions of human security would provide the desired clarity and analytical usefulness. For example, Paris points out that authors often arbitrarily narrow human security, without providing "a compelling rationale for highlighting certain values" (Paris 2001, p.95). Bajpai includes bodily safety and personal freedom in his narrow view of human security as they are 'the most important' but why other aspects are not as important is not elaborated upon (Bajpai 2000). King and Murray base their

narrow definition on the expectation of years an individual will live without experiencing generalised poverty (King and Murray 2002, p.594). The arbitrariness of narrowing can be based on a host of different factors, for example, where authors argue one threat is the most important without discussion of the competing threats (Alkire 2003, p.22) Some choose their criteria for what are deemed to be critical and pervasive threats based on the probability of the threat occurring while others assess the perception of the individuals affected for what they qualitatively feel are the most critical threats (Alkire 2003, p.22).

Advocates of narrow definitions point to UN support as crucial evidence of its usefulness as opposed to broad definitions not being widely adopted. For instance, The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) based its 1997 annual report on human security noting that everyone has a right to security and freedom (MacFarlane and Khong 2006, pp.171-2; UNHCR 1997). The report also highlights non-military sources of instability but overall, the report focuses on violence. Likewise, the UN Secretary-General's 1999 report on the legal protection of civilians in armed conflict resulted in two resolutions from the UN Security Council. In one the UN Security Council indicated "its willingness to respond to situations of armed conflict where civilians are being targeted or humanitarian assistance to civilians being deliberately obstructed, including through the consideration of appropriate measures at the Council's disposal" (UN Security Council 1999, para 10). Furthermore, the UN Security Council recognised that abuses of humanitarian and human rights law in armed conflict could be deemed threats to international peace and security and so could obstruction of humanitarian assistance (UN Security Council 2000, paras 5, 8). The UN Secretary-General

emphasises that "minimum standards of security are a precondition for development" which arguably supports Canada's narrow split of freedom from fear and want (UN General Assembly 2000, para 50). These examples show a historic use of human security in terms of violent conflict but it is noted that the General Assembly's definition, quoted above, includes both freedom from fear and want, specifically mentioning poverty and the development work that tackles broad, root causes of insecurity.

The broad conception of human security is distinguished by its recognition that a threat to human security can take many forms, from a multitude of sources, and it is more than violence that can do irreparable damage to human life. The contrasting emblematic example is that of Japan who adopted a broad approach to human security in their foreign policy. Initially however Japan did focus on conflicts and the starvation and genocide surrounding them (Acharya 2001, p.446). Later, Japan's approach altered and it did not wish to think of human security as solely a concept that protects the lives of individuals in armed conflict (Acharya 2001, p.446). Instead it wished to pursue survival and dignity on equal platforms. Dignity can be seen as the broadening factor where development progress equals an increasing life of dignity. Japan viewed human security as "comprehensively cover[ing] all the measures that threaten human survival, daily life, and dignity—for example, environmental degradation, violations of human rights, transnational organized crime, illicit drugs, refugees, poverty, anti-personnel land- mines and other infectious diseases such as AIDS— and strengthens efforts to confront these threats" (Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs 1999, Chapter 2(3)). Japan also recognised the importance of collaboration between providers of vertical and horizontal protection

in encouraging cooperation of states, international organisations, and civil society (Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs 1999, Chapter 2(3)). Japan's interest in broad notions of human security led to the Japanese government making a sizeable financial contribution to help create the UNTFHS.

The root why broad definitions believe the freedom from fear and freedom from want are inseparable is found in the UNDP's 1994 Report: "Without peace, there may be no development. But without development, peace is threatened" (UNDP 1994, p.iii). The freedom from fear and want are therefore interdependent (Abass 2010, p.3). Human security also "refers to the condition that enables people to exercise these choices safely and freely, and be relatively confident that the opportunities they have today will not be lost tomorrow" (Tadjbakhsh 2014, p.50). This means that instead of setting overly ambitious goals, broad applications of human security seek to address threats and vulnerabilities to establish minimum standards of life and dignity.

Generally speaking, proponents of broad definitions argue that due to the fact human security changes the referent object of security away from the state, inclusion of the issues beyond violent conflict are necessary. Axworthy says that there must be a recalibration to combat the wider range of harms that have been securitised, essentially suggesting it is time to move away from, traditional, realist, notions of security (Axworthy 2004). By considering non-violent threats, broad definitions recognise that national security forces cannot solely resolve insecurity and new actors are needed to cooperate with the state on a multitude of fronts. Consideration of more than violence best reflects postmodern security's inclusion of non-military threats and the need for regional and global security synergy.

What can be securitised as a broad threat to human security can vary. For Leaning the broad notion of human security includes psychological, political and economic vulnerabilities to promote the protection of the individual through time (Leaning 2004). Alkire aligns with the Commission on Human Security's approach where human security concerns the 'vital core' that is the essence of life determined by those affected by insecurity (Alkire 2004). The Commission on Human Security gives a range of examples of what may be deemed human security threats that can then be prioritised by those facing insecurity, including, economic harm, health crises, crime, post-conflict instability, and poverty (Commission on Human Security 2003).

Thakur claims human security is "the quality of life of the people of a society or polity. Anything which degrades their quality of life – demographic pressures, diminished access to or stock of resources, and so on – is a security threat" (Tadjbakhsh and Chenoy 2007, p.49). Thakur goes on to limit security threats to only be those which create a crisis (Thakur 2004, p.347). This includes where environmental disaster or massive migration becomes a crisis. Likewise, Bajpai limits his broad definition by requiring threats to come from 'identifiable human agents' and not from structural or natural causes (Bajpai 2004, p.360). Winslow and Eriksen broaden the interdisciplinary outlook of human security by considering anthropological aspects. They claim cultural and social contexts are important because when people have to work together to rectify a threat or vulnerability, their cultural identity and social structures play a role (Winslow and Eriksen 2004, p.362). Lastly, Hampson claims that vulnerability is naturally broad and dependent on structural issues and must address threats and build society's capabilities to combat vulnerability (Hampson 2004, p.350).

Two features of broad definitions deserve further elaboration. First, most broad approaches have a focus on structural, root-causes of conflict emphasising empowerment building alongside physical protection. In 1992, the UN Secretary-General, Boutros Boutros-Ghali, highlighted how undermining economic and social development could threaten international peace and security (UN Secretary General 1992, para 26). Boutros-Ghali requested an early warning system which triggered new discussions on how to promote conflict prevention. Subsequently, Amartya Sen advanced 'protective security' that would prevent catastrophic crises (Sen 1999). Sen argued that there must be protection against structural threats, such as sudden deprivation or starvation, to live securely and well (Sen 1999, p.188). Sen's capabilities approach and development ideas that subsequently became 'development as freedom' clearly played a part in the development of human security in the 1994 UNDP Report. Following this view, if structural issues are only addressed when they trigger violent conflict, under a narrow approach, and not if they simply cause mass deprivation or destruction, then human security fails in the purpose of its title. Second, proponents of a broad approach argue that having a precise definition is not necessary. Using an open-ended, flexible approach which takes into consideration a range of threats that cause more suffering than only violent conflict is a challenge to current power structures in the international sphere. Tadjbakhsh says that, "[i]f security is ultimately a feeling, then human security must be a felt experience" (Tadjbakhsh 2005, p.7). The broad approach allows actors to build a feeling of security through the avenues most relevant to the people experiencing insecurity.

Interdisciplinary Uses of Human Security

Human security has been argued to provide better ideas for conflict prevention "because it is more realistic and nuanced in terms of its interdisciplinary approach" (Hanlon and Christie 2016, p.11). Harnessing the concept's interdisciplinary nature, research in a variety of disciplines has used human security as a lens with which to understand peace and conflict in new lights. By applying the various precepts of human security to a peace and conflict issue or different disciplinary context human security can uncover new linkages and deepen our understanding (Gilder 2020a p.3). This section recounts some of the many examples of where human security has been used as an analytical lens in a variety of interdisciplinary studies, focusing on examples of international law and human rights.

How human security is utilised, "all depends on what human security is understood to be: a political agenda for governments, a rallying cry that forges *ad hoc* or sustained coalitions of states on single issues, a common concern that brings together single-issue civil society groups under a uniting umbrella, an academic problem, or a new research category" (Oberleitner 2005a, pp.592-3). Human security is described as a concept by most literature. Therefore, human security is a collection of interrelated ideas and can be a guide to interpretation. Specifically, as an *agenda-setting* concept, it determines what are the most relevant issues and brings to the forefront neglected problems that have previously not been included in national and international security debates or have been on the periphery (Gilder 2020b). As an agenda-setting concept human security can cross disciplinary boundaries and reshape how researchers view disciplinary issues. Hanlon and Christie have restated the importance of human security for other disciplines noting human security is intimately linked to human rights and "[i]nternational law serves as a basic

criteria with which to strengthen work on human security's objectives" (Hanlon and Christie 2016, p.30, 55).

In one of the first studies of human security and its relationship with international law, Gerd Oberleitner claims that "a human security approach to international law can reinforce and strengthen attempts to bring international law into line with the requirements of today's world" (Oberleitner 2005b, p.186). Oberleitner argues that most of the values represented by human security are not new to international law and the application of human security to the law can help bring international law closer to meeting the demands of modern crises. He says that implementation of human security, "requires overcoming the compartmentalization of security, humanitarian, human rights, and development strategies by focusing on the protection and empowerment of people" (Oberleitner 2005b, p.188). The current law is not always able to flawlessly interact in unison and therefore Oberleitner suggests further research is needed to see if human security can fill the void between humanitarian law and human rights law during conflicts.

In a 2007 study on human security and international law, Barbara von Tigerstrom said that human security is "a concept that is designed to be used in a variety of ways, including in the interpretation and development of legal norms" (von Tigerstrom 2007, p.42). von Tigerstrom found that there is not a linear evolution of international law from a law of co-existence to a law of cooperation that enshrines human security (von Tigerstrom 2007, p.89). Instead, the older, state-centred elements and new human-centred elements coexist in the law. von Tigerstrom highlights that various international legal regimes that 'on the face of it' seem human-centred have been argued to be in fact state-centred and designed to protect state interests.

Following on from the arguments of von Tigerstrom and Oberleitner, Shireen Daft argues that human security can be a 'synthesised overarching framework' for international law (Daft 2017, p.33). Daft says that human security can have legal character by serving as a framework for the expression of existing norms with human security providing a principled future direction for how international law tackles security threats (Daft 2017, p.33, 125). Daft believes this is possible if clear principles of human security are articulated with roots and relevance in existing international law. Daft's argument lends well to the current position of states since many believe human security should be pursued under existing international legal frameworks and not through new legal obligations. For instance, Australia has already advanced the view that human security can provide a normative framework which can ensure collective actions are providing preventative protection, empowerment to build resilience, and direct benefits to populations (UN General Assembly 2012b, p.10). Other states agreed with, for example, Qatar arguing that by using a framework for human security states will be compelled to be proactive (UN General Assembly 2012b, p.2). Likewise, India stated that human security can be implemented and used as a framework to respond to current challenges, not only as a policy goal (UN General Assembly 2012b, p.14). If human security is not to be a legal concept in its own right, Math Nortmann and Cedric Ryngaert have suggested what it can do is harness existing international law to pursue human-centric operational goals (Noortman and Ryngaert 2014, p.198).

Also applying a human security lens, but specifically in relation to human rights and vulnerability, Dorothy Estrada-Tanck's study concerns the synergies between human security and international human rights law

(Estrada-Tanck 2016). Case studies in the book include violence against women and undocumented (female) migrants. Estrada-Tanck conceptualises that human security can first promote action on threats and vulnerabilities that do not fall under the traditional grave categories of genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity. Second, human security can contextualise threats and responses for specific populations (Estrada-Tanck 2016, pp.38-9). Estrada-Tanck sees human security as a method for identifying where additional human rights protection is needed. Conversely, Rhoda Howard-Hassmann suggests human security threatens the indivisibility of human rights by suggesting "that there are some human rights that society need not acknowledge, safeguard and promote because they do not address basic insecurities" (Howard-Hassmann 2012, p.106). Yaniv Roznai has related concerns when assessing human security in relation to international human rights law in that human rights may be diluted down to *needs* that require fulfilling rather than *rights*, which could detract from state responsibility for domestic human rights violations (Roznai 2014, p.124).

This section has only been able to touch on some of the many interdisciplinary discussions surrounding human security. The synergies, or lack thereof, between the issues covered by human security and other disciplines can further be developed through inter- and multidisciplinary work that tackles security concerns in a more holistic way.

Conclusion

Human security has suffered from definitional indeterminacy since the proliferation of literature on the concept in the 1990s and 2000s. What this entry has attempted to do is highlight key features of the concept and the two distinct categories of definitions, broad and narrow. Regardless of which category is

subscribed to, human security can be said to advance two main tenets: (1) it aims to shift the referent object of security from the state to the individual giving the individual intrinsic value and placing the interests of the individual ahead of the state; (2) it gives rise to a broader view on what can cause insecurity and that many threats are interconnected and reinforcing. Even without agreed definitions authors have operationalised the concept in interdisciplinary research, of which a few are described above, showcasing the usefulness of human security as an analytical tool for enhancing our understanding of peace, conflict and more.

Cross references

Civil Society Inclusion in Peace Mediation

Conflict and Hunger

R2P and Prevention

Security-Development Nexus in Peacebuilding

References

Abass A (2010). Protecting Human Security in Africa. Oxford. Oxford University Press.

Acharya A. (2001). Human Security: East Versus West. International Journal, 56(3), 442-460.

Acharya A. (2014). Human Security. In Baylis J, Smith S, Owens P (Eds.), The Globalisation of World Politics (pp. 448-462). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Alkire S. (2003). A Conceptual Framework for Human Security. CRISE Working Paper #2. http://www3.qeh.ox.ac.uk/pdf/crisewps/workingpaper2.pdf

Alkire S. (2004). A Vital Core that Must Be Treated with the Same Gravitas as Traditional Security Threats. Security Dialogue, 35(3), 359-60.

Annan K. (2000). 'We the peoples': the role of the United Nations in the 21st century. New York: United Nations.

Axworthy L. (1997) Canada and Human Security: The Need for Leadership. International Journal, 52(2), 183-196.

Axworthy L. (2004). A New Scientific Field and Policy Lens. Security Dialogue, 35(3), 348-349.

Bajpai K. (2003). The Idea of Human Security. International Studies, 40(3), 195-228.

Bajpai K. (2004). An Expression of Threats Versus Capabilities Across Time and Space. Security Dialogue, 35(3), 360-1.

Bajpai K. (2000). Human Security: Concept and Measurement. Kroc Institute Occasional Paper No. 19:OP:1, https://www.cusb.ac.in/images/cusb-files/2020/el/psc/4-Abhay%20Kr-MA%20II%20Sem.pdf

Benedek E, Kettemann M and Möstl M. (eds) (2011). Mainstreaming Human Security in Peace Operations and Crisis Management. Abingdon. Routledge.

Bílkova V. (2014). Ensuring Human Security in Armed Conflicts: The Role of Non-State Actors and its Reflection in Current International Humanitarian Law. In Ryngaert C, Noortmann M (Eds.) Human Security and International Law (pp. 29-51). Antwerp. Intersensia.

Buzan, B. (2004). A Reductionist, Idealistic Notion that Adds Little Analytical Value. Security Dialogue, 35(3), 369-370.

Commission on Human Security. (2003). Human Security Now. New York https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/91BAEEDBA50C6907C1256D19006A9353-chs-security-may03.pdf

Daase C. (2010). "National, Societal", and "Human Security": On the Transformation of Political Language. Historical Social Research, 35(4), 22-37.

Daft S. (2017). The Relationship Between Human Security Discourse and International Law: A Principled Approach. Abingdon. Routledge.

Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade. (1999). Human Security: Safety for People in a Changing World.

http://www.summit-americas.org/Canada/HumanSecurity-english.htm

Estrada-Tanck D. (2016). Human Security and Human Rights under International Law: The Protections Offered to Persons Confronting Structural Vulnerability. Oxford. Hart.

Farer T. (2011). Human Security: Defining the Elephant and Imagining Its Tasks. Asian Journal of International Law, 1(1), 43-55.

Gasper D, Gómez OA. (2014). Evolution of Thinking and Research on Human and Personal Security 1994-2013. UNDP Human Development Report Office Occasional Paper. http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/gomez_hdr14.pdf

Gilder A. (2020a). Human Security and the Stabilization Mandate of MINUSCA. International Peacekeeping, 1-33. https://doi.org/10.1080/13533312.2020.1733423.

Gilder A. (2020b). International law and human security in a kaleidoscopic world. Indian Journal of International Law, 1-27. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40901-020-00109-w.

Gómez OA, Gasper D, Mine Y. (2013). Good practices in addressing human security through Human Development Reports. UNDP Human Development Report Office Occasional Paper. http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/good_practices.pdf

Hampson F. (2004). A Concept in Need of a Global Policy Response. Security Dialogue, 35(3), 349-50.

Hanlon R, Christie K. (2016). Freedom from Fear, Freedom from Want: An Introduction to Human Security. Toronto. University of Toronto Press.

Howard-Hassmann R. (2012). Human Security: Undermining Human Rights? Human Rights Quarterly, 34(1), 88-112.

Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues. (1982). Common Security:

A Programme for Disarmament – The Report of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues under the Chairmanship of Olof Palme. Clerkenwell. Pan. Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs. (1999). Diplomatic Bluebook 1999: Japan's Diplomacy with Leadership Toward the New Century. http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/other/bluebook/1999/index.html.

Kaldor M. (2011). Human Security. Society and Economy, 33(3), 441-448.

King G, Murray C. (2002). Rethinking Human Security. Political Science Quarterly, 116(4), 585-610.

Krause K. (2004). The Key to a Powerful Agenda, If Properly Delimited/ Security Dialogue, 35(3), 367-68.

Leaning J. (2004). Psychosocial Well-Being over Time. Security Dialogue, 35(3), 354-355.

Liotta PH, Owen T (2006). Why Human Security. Whitehead Journal of Diplomacy and International Relations, 7, 37-54.

MacFarlane N, Foong Khong Y. (2006). Human Security and the UN: a critical history. Indiana University Press.

Moher J. (2012) Canada's Human Security Agenda. Department of Foreign Affairs & International Trade, Canada.
http://odihpn.org/magazine/canada%C2%92s-human-security-agenda/

Murphy CN. (2006). The United Nations Development Programme A Better Way? Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Noortmann M, Ryngaert C. (2014). Towards a (New) Human Security-Based Agenda for International Law and Non-State Actors. In Ryngaert C, Noortmann M (Eds.) Human Security and International Law pp.195-203. Antwerp. Intersensia.

Oberleitner G. (2005b). Human Security: A Challenge to International Law? Global Governance, 11(2), 185.

Oberleitner G. (2005a). Porcupines in love: the intricate convergence of human rights and human security. European Human Rights Law Review, 6, 588.

Owen T. (2004). Human Security – Conflict, Critique and Consensus: Colloquium Remarks and a Proposal for a Threshold-Based Definition. Security Dialogue, 35(3), 373-387.

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

Roznai Y. (2014). The Insecurity of Human Security. Wisconsin International Law Journal, 32(1), 95-141.

Sen A. (1999). Development as Freedom. Oxford. Oxford University Press.

Tadjbakhsh S, Chenoy A. (2007). Human Security: concepts and implications. Abingdon. Routledge.

Tadjbakhsh S. (2005). Human Security: Concepts and Implications with an Application to Post-Intervention Challenges in Afghanistan. Les Études du CERI N° 117-118, Sciences Po.

Tadjbakhsh S. (2014). In Defense of the Broad View of Human Security. In Martin M, Owen T (Eds.) Routledge Handbook of Human Security. Abingdon: Routledge.

Thakur R (2004). A Political Worldview. Security Dialogue, 35(3), 347-8.

Thérien J. (2012). Human Security: The Making of a UN Ideology. Global Society, 25(2), 191-213.

UN General Assembly. (2005). 2005 World Summit Outcome. (24 October 2005) UN Doc A/RES/60/1.

UN General Assembly. (2012a). Follow-up to paragraph 143 on human security of the 2005 World Summit Outcome. (25 October 2012) UN Doc A/RES/66/290.

UN General Assembly. (2012b). Follow-up to the Millennium Summit (4 June 2012) A/66/PV.112.

UN Secretary General (1999). Report of the Secretary-General on the Work of the Organization. UN Doc A/54/1.

UN Secretary-General (1992). An Agenda for Peace (17 June 1992) A/47/277.

UN Security Council (2000). Resolution 1296 (19 April 2000) UN Doc S/RES/1296.

UN Security Council. (1999). Resolution 1265 (17 September 1999) UN Doc S/RES/1265.

UNDP. (1994). Human Development Report 1994: New Dimensions of Human Security. http://www.hdr.undp.org/en/content/human-development-report-1994

UNHCR (1997). The State of the World's Refugees 1997: A Humanitarian Agenda. http://www.unhcr.org/uk/publications/sowr/3eb789f42/state-worlds-refugees-1997-humanitarian-agenda-chapter-2-defending-refugee.html

United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). Our Common Future. Oxford. Oxford University Press.

von Tigerstrom B. (2007) Human Security and International Law. Oxford. Hart.

Winslow D, Eriksen TH (2004). A Broad Concept that Encourages Interdisciplinary Thinking. Security Dialogue, 35(3), 361-2

Zwierlein C and Graf R. (2010). The Production of Human Security in Premodern and Contemporary History. Historical Social Research, 34(4), 7-21.