

Human Security in the Post-Post-Cold War Era

Hiroaki Shiga

Professor, Graduate School of International Social Sciences, Yokohama National University

Abstract

The end of the Cold War and the reduced risk of inter-state warfare led to the emergence of a new concept of “human security.” It is a normative ideal in which every human being is treated as the ultimate beneficiary of security. However, the recent escalation of major-power confrontation has led to a renewed focus on the traditional military power-centered view of security that regards the state as the primary object of safeguarding. National security and human security are not necessarily contradictory and can complement each other. Nevertheless, history has shown that national security does not guarantee the realization of human security and that there is a danger that human security will be sacrificed in the name of national security. To ensure that human security is firmly realized, even as national security takes precedence again, it is essential to restore and strengthen the state’s functions of providing public goods to satisfy human needs and dignity. This involves addressing the shrinkage of these functions due to economic globalization informed by neoliberalism and re-establishing “politics” as an activity of building consensus through negotiation and compromise while reconciling diverse interests and values. Only by doing so can the dignity of people—eroded by widening economic inequalities—be restored. Moreover, social cohesion can be achieved by overcoming widening political divisions. Such a state, where human security is firmly secured, will be able to better manage national security as well.

Introduction: Return of National Security?

The post-Cold War era following the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 introduced a plethora of “new” issues. As the risk of interstate wars, which could lead to nuclear exchanges, decreased, the problems of poverty and inequality, ethnic and religious conflict, and global environmental degradation—previously regarded as secondary issues—came to be seen as important challenges for humankind. Human security was proposed as a concept suitable for addressing these “new” challenges. Unlike traditional security

centered around military powers to defend the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a state from foreign invasion, human security was “intended to shift the security concept to a more people-centered one” (Kurusu 2002, 7). Put differently, human security was a normative idea that the referent and primary beneficiary of security policy must be each and every individual (Newman 2016, 1167).

However, since the late 2010s, traditional state-centered security has re-emerged into the spotlight due to the rapid economic and military rise of China and the escalation of the Sino-American conflict following a shift in US strategy from engagement to containment. The Russian invasion of Ukraine in February 2022 prompted an increased focus on traditional security. The fact that Russia, a permanent member of the UN Security Council—which bears primary responsibility for

The views expressed in this report are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the official positions of either JICA or the JICA Ogata Research Institute.

the maintenance of international peace and security—has mobilized a large military force and is overrunning a neighboring country, while threatening the use of nuclear weapons, has shocked the international community. In his assessment of the war, Olaf Scholz, the Chancellor of Germany, argued that it comprises a “historic turning point (*Zeitenwende*)” (Scholz 2022), and it came to be shared among developed countries.¹ The national security strategies of the US and European countries identified Russia and China as the biggest post-war security threats and began to pursue national security policies to contain them. In Japan, too, views emphasizing the importance of national security through military build-up appear to be gaining strength, stimulated by the expansion of North Korea’s nuclear arsenal and China’s perceived attempts to change the status quo by force in the South China Sea.

Against this backdrop, the claims of realist international politics scholars² have been gaining attention. John Mearsheimer, who refers to himself as an “offensive realist,” argues that the future world will be dominated by nationalism and realism necessary to survive in an anarchic international society (Mearsheimer 2018).³ Richard Haass and Charles Kupchan argue that in order to maintain world stability by avoiding wars among the major countries, a realistic option is a “New Concert of Powers” in which European countries, the US, India, and Japan compromise with non-democratic powers like Russia and China based on the principle of balance of power—the principle adopted by the European major powers in the 19th century (Haass and Kupchan 2021). What we commonly see among these claims is the emphasis on hard power, especially on the military forces of sovereign states

(and the economic strength to back them up), the focus on politics among large states, and the insistence that interstate cooperation has the inherent limitations in realizing public interests in international society.

Worse still, the escalation of military competition between states has become a phenomenon not confined to large countries. Emerging and developing countries that have achieved robust economic growth, such as India, Turkey, and Southeast Asian countries, are strengthening their military forces.⁴ Attempts to change the international status quo by military strength have also been observed.⁵ The risk of a security dilemma—whereby strengthening military forces creates anxiety in neighboring countries leading to a spiraling arms race (Herz 1950)—is increasing in various parts of the world, including the former Soviet Union, Southeast Asia, South Asia, and the Middle East.

As mentioned above, the post-Cold War era began with a new idea that people-centered security must be realized for every person in the world, an idea that had long been neglected during the Cold War era when national security was perceived as the top priority. Yet, more than 30 years later, it appears that we are entering a new era in which the warning in 1991 by Stephen Walt—a realist international scholar—should be re-evaluated. He argued that the danger of war has not been eliminated and that “organized violence has been a central part of human existence for millennia and is likely to remain so for the foreseeable future” (Walt 1991, 213). If so, then will we once again enter an era in which security is discussed mainly in terms of the state, whether in developed, emerging or developing countries?

This paper consists of three sections: Section 1 retrospectively examines the achievements and limitations of the human security concept as an alternative to traditional security in the post-Cold War era. Section 2 discusses the

¹ Chancellor Scholz mentioned that “We live in a historic turning point. It means that the future world is no longer the same as the previous world” (Scholz 2022).

² Realism is a school of international politics claiming that it is natural and inevitable for each country to pursue national interests centered around the security of its own country and that conflicts and disputes among nations in relation to traditional security are also unavoidable based on the observation that the essence of international politics lies in competition for survival among sovereign states in an inherently anarchic international society.

³ Mearsheimer claimed that the US is responsible for Russia’s invasion of Ukraine by accepting the former Soviet Union and Eastern European countries to be NATO members and damaging the national security interests of Russia (Mearsheimer 2022).

⁴ India’s military expenditure increased by about 2.3 times between 2008 and 2022, similar to China’s, and the total military expenditure of nine ASEAN countries, excluding Laos, increased by about 1.6 times over the same period (IISS 2023, 8).

⁵ Azerbaijan regained control of the disputed Nagorno-Karabakh region with military forces in 2023 that had been occupied by Armenia since the beginning of 1990s, while Russia, the self-proclaimed leader of the former Soviet region, was busy fighting the war in Ukraine.

relationship between human security and national security in the context of the accelerated transformation of the nature and role of the state by globalization in the post-Cold War era. Section 3 discusses what will be required to continue to deliver human security in a future world with increasing interstate conflicts.

1. Achievement of the Human Security Concept in the Post-Cold War Era

1.1. What is human security?

Discussions of security ask the question, “Who protects whom (what) from what threat and how?” In the Cold War era, the concept of national security was taken for granted, which assumes that a state is the only actor to defend its sovereignty and territorial integrity with military forces against foreign military threats. The discussion on security generally focused on nuclear deterrence and alliance policies (Walt 1991).

After the end of the Cold War, the 1994 UNDP report first introduced the concept of human security with a message that human welfare must be the priority of security (UNDP 1994). In other words, the report shifted the beneficiary of security from the state to the people. For most people in the world, especially those in developing countries, poverty, infectious diseases, hunger, unemployment, crime and corruption, as well as suppression by their own governments and discrimination, were serious and daily threats to their security. Unlike developed countries, state-building was still incomplete in many developing countries, and states were unable to protect people’s welfare and dignity. As people became aware of these issues in the post-Cold War era, the human security concept—based on compassion and a sense of responsibility for the security of people beyond national borders—was introduced as an alternative to the national security concept, which generally pays no attention to the security of people outside of national borders (Oshimura 2004).

Inspired by the message of the 1994 UNDP report, which insisted on the need for a shift from “nuclear security” to “human security” (UNDP 1994, 22), discussions flourished on what

exactly the concept of “human security” meant. The 1994 UNDP report identified seven areas of human security: economic, food, health, environmental, personal, community, and political security. Human security requires addressing a wide range of issues, including satisfaction of basic human needs, management of environmental issues, protection from organized violence such as wars and ethnic conflicts, ensuring that people will not suffer from disadvantages due to racial or ethnic origin, protection from oppression by a government, and fulfilment of basic human rights. Based on these factors, the UNDP report introduced human security as a concept for realizing two types of freedom, namely “freedom from fear” and “freedom from want.” The concept of human security has been interpreted and implemented in various ways by organizations and countries that provide development assistance. One approach to human security is to focus on a wide range of development issues, including environmental sustainability, participation of marginalized people in decision-making, and equitable distribution—extending beyond the satisfaction of the minimal needs of the people. Behind such human security practices lies the idea that development is “a foundational value from which other public goods and freedoms can be built, central to the fulfillment of individual agency and security” (Newman 2001, 245).

There was another set of human security theory and practice that was different from the development-oriented approaches mentioned above. This theory, known as the “responsibility to protect (R2P),” emerged in response to the increase in fragile states in the post-Cold War era. Lloyd Axworthy, then-Minister of Foreign Affairs of Canada and one of the leading advocates of R2P, argued that human security established a new standard for assessing the success or failure of national and international security policies, namely whether or not citizens could be protected from invasion by a state. The concept of R2P was embodied in a report published in 2001 by the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS), which was established under the leadership of Canada and Australia. The ICISS report stated that “(w)here a population is suffering serious harm, as a result of internal war, insurgency, repression or state failure, and the state in question is unwilling or unable to halt or avert it, the principle of non-intervention yields to the international

responsibility to protect,” claiming that foreign countries should be allowed to go on to humanitarian intervention by military means as a last resort (ICISS 2001).

In this way, the conceptions of human security came to be evaluated as “different, and sometimes competing, conceptions” that reflect “different sociological/cultural and geostrategic orientations” (Newman 2001, 239).

1.2. Achievements and limitations of the human security concept

1.2.1. Achievements

One achievement of the human security concept is that it has opened up a public debate on various issues that were previously overlooked or intentionally ignored under the traditional security paradigm. Since its inception, human security has challenged existing norms and institutions across a wide range of issues, including developmental strategy, the relationship between human beings and the environment, governance, and the relationship between state and individuals.

The impact of the human security concept was evident in the field of development assistance, where an emphasis had been long placed on economic growth, with assistance provided mainly to realize that aim through activities such as infrastructure building. Economic inequality within a country had hitherto received little attention. This trend was further exacerbated by the structural adjustment programs of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, driven by neoliberal ideas of the 1980s that focused on macroeconomic stability. These policies resulted in a greater burden on the most vulnerable due to hasty liberalization, privatization, deregulation, and strict fiscal austerity. By focusing on each individual, the human security concept highlighted the shortcomings of the assistance strategy that prioritized the macro framework of national policies. It has also been instrumental in setting a new agenda for development assistance: the need to focus on the redistributive role of government to address market failures in achieving equitable growth for all.

The introduction of the people-centered perspective of human security also revealed a fact that has been overlooked in traditional national security studies: even in developed countries, the daily lives of some citizens are far from safe

and secure. This recognition led to a shift in focus from the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), which were designed to address the needs of developing countries, to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which address want and fear as universal issues and aim to ensure a life with dignity for all human beings. Human security studies also raised the question of whether the government is providing security to its citizens on an equal basis. The relevance of this question is demonstrated by the Black Lives Matter movement in the United States and the riots that occurred throughout France in response to the killing of a young boy of immigrant origin by a police officer. Furthermore, human security studies pointed out that the investigative method of profiling, introduced as part of counter-terrorism measures, has a persistent racial bias. Consequently, attempts to ensure security for the general public may have the unintended consequence of placing a considerable burden on specific minority groups, thereby reinforcing existing prejudices.

The concept of human security is frequently criticized for being broad and difficult to define. However, as explained above, this concept integrates various issues that were previously discussed separately, thereby providing a comprehensive understanding of them (Takahashi and Yamakage 2008, ii). A good example is the issue of small arms and light weapons. As the concept of security has expanded to include human aspects, this issue, which used to be considered solely as a matter of arms control, is now interlinked with a wide variety of issues, including the human rights of vulnerable groups such as women and children, development of disadvantaged countries, crime and violence, and public health (Krause 2002). The establishment of a new international norm—that the trade in small arms and light weapons should be regulated internationally—led to the passage of the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects in 2001 (United Nations 2001).

1.2.2. Challenges

On the other hand, the human security concept has faced various challenges. One such challenge relates to the problem created by the inclination of some states, such as Canada and Australia, towards the R2P approach in the

interpretation and practice of human security. The ideal of mandating assistance to those suffering from humanitarian crises under the rule of a government that lacks the capacity, or even the will, to protect its own citizens is certainly noble. Nevertheless, the prospect of armed interventions based on such ideals is, in fact, influenced by judgments of right and wrong, shaped and simplified by Western national interests and the media, and was not necessarily fair to the parties to the conflict.⁶ Although the 2012 United Nations General Assembly resolution differentiated human security from R2P by reaffirming that the idea of human security respects the principle of national sovereignty (United Nations General Assembly 2012), the impact of R2P, which was squarely recognized as an exception to the principle of non-interference in internal affairs, was significant and contributed to developing countries adopting a cautious stance towards the human security concept.

The dissemination of the human security concept was further hindered by the advent of a new security paradigm that emerged in the wake of the 9/11 terrorist attacks in the United States in 2001. This paradigm advocated the elimination of threats from “others” through the use of military or police force. The repeated occurrence of terrorist attacks fostered a climate of distrust and hostility in developed countries towards individuals and groups who are perceived to be religiously, ethnically, and culturally different. In addition, fragile states, such as Afghanistan, or developing countries that produce refugees and immigrants, have been identified as hotbeds of terrorism and viewed as sources of threats, reinforcing the belief that only the state can protect its people from such threats.

The concept of human security is universal, with the objective of protecting human dignity and security regardless of differences in nationality, religion, culture, and race. Nevertheless, as the conviction that a state is the sole guarantor of security becomes more entrenched, it has become increasingly difficult to guarantee human dignity and security beyond national borders. In addition, various non-military

issues, such as food and environmental problems, have emerged as “security issues,” and the sense of urgency and tension that the word “security” carries fostered an awareness that the essence of the problem was a zero-sum competition with others, giving rise to a “politics of fear of the other” (Tosa 2003).

2. Human Security in the Post-Post-Cold War Era

Thus, while the dividing line between “us” and “others”—between our own country and others—has become entrenched in people’s minds, backed by fear of the alien other, what does it mean for us if an era in which inter-state war is once again a reality is to arrive? As Sadako Ogata warned as early as 2003 (Commission on Human Security 2003, 5), there is the possibility that security concepts may again revert to traditional national security. Moreover, as has happened in the USA and elsewhere in the name of the “war on terror,” will states begin to violate human security at home and abroad? Since we can never say that there is no such a danger, we must now examine the relationship between state security and human security.

2.1. Relationship between national security and human security

The relationship between national security and human security is not a binary one in which we should choose between the two (Kurusu 2002, 7).

In the first place, national security is crucial to human security since the state remains primarily responsible for the security of its people. The state is responsible not only for protecting its people’s lives and properties from foreign enemies but also for ensuring their welfare and dignity through various policy measures. Precisely because the state is responsible for such a wide range of areas, human security relies on the premise that the state functions autonomously and appropriately without being threatened by foreign invasion or foreign control. The atrocities committed by the Russian forces in Ukraine, such as massacres and torture of civilians,

⁶ The intervention by NATO forces in the civil conflict in Libya in 2011 prompted concerns about the underlying objective of the intervention, which was to overturn the Qaddafi regime. This resulted in strong opposition from Russia, China, and many developing countries.

as well as abductions of children, are evidence of the importance of national security to human security.

On the other hand, human security is also essential for national security. Sadako Ogata, who contributed to the establishment of the human security concept, stated that “human security reinforces state security but does not replace it” (Commission on Human Security 2003, 5). In a country where some people are not able to benefit from development or are deprived of opportunities to participate in political decision-making, such exclusions will lead to domestic conflicts, aggravating divisions and escalating conflicts, and the integrity of a sovereign state will be threatened from within. Such fragile states may be at a higher risk of invasion by external enemies.

In this way, human security and national security are mutually reinforcing. However, it is crucial to recognize that achieving national security does not necessarily mean that human security has also been attained. In addition, it should be noted that prioritizing national security may threaten human security. History has demonstrated the tensions between the logic of national security, especially the logic of the military, and the logic of human security. In times of war or similar “emergencies,” the voices of minority or vulnerable groups are often suppressed in the name of strengthening national solidarity and the logic of “sacrificing the pawn to save the king.”⁷ The war in Ukraine not only highlighted the importance of national security but also revealed the inherent danger of the logic of national security. In Ukraine, men between the ages of 18 and 60 are prohibited from leaving the country due to the obligation for military service, and it is estimated that by December 2023, 30,000 people had already been killed in the war (Reuters 2023). This demonstrates that the state is compelling its people to die on the battlefield for the sake of national security, thereby sacrificing human security.

⁷ Military expenses in the 2024 Ukraine national budget amounted to 1.7 trillion UAH (approximately 42 billion USD, nearly 50% of annual spending (Stepanenko 2023), which means that the budget that should have been applied to human security areas like education, medical care and welfare when the country is at peace is instead diverted toward national security. This is another example of the tense relationship between national security and human security.

2.2. Transformation of the state in the post-Cold War era

In this way, human security and national security may complement or contradict with each other. Then, what will be the relationship between these two security concepts, if national security comes to the fore in the coming post-post-Cold War era? One thing we can safely say is that we are not going back to the time of Cold War, because states have experienced a substantial change in their nature and roles during the post-Cold War era.

2.2.1. The idea of the sovereign and nation-state as ideal types

To understand the changes that states have undergone, it is necessary to identify the specific features of the modern state as an ideal type. Today, a state is considered the main constituent of international society and is typically characterized as being a “sovereign state” and a “nation-state.” Sovereign states are defined by three factors: sovereignty, territory, and people. Sovereignty refers to the right of ultimate decision-making within the territorial boundary of the state, and internationally, the authority to determine its will without intervention by other countries.

The concept of a sovereign state can be traced back to the Peace Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, which marked the end of the Thirty Year’s War. The French Revolution of 1789 added a new quality to the sovereign state, known as the nation-state. A nation-state is a sovereign state formed on the basis of national identity, where people share a sense of unity based on cultural, historical, religious, or political values. During the French Revolution, the abolition of the monarchy and class system was proclaimed, and the principle of sovereignty of the people—the idea that national sovereignty is executed based on the people’s intentions and that the basis of its validity relies on the people—was established. This gave the people a shared sense of belongingness to the nation.⁸ Under this nation-state system, people’s right to participate in national politics is ensured, and their lives and

⁸ In reality, nation-building was achieved “from above” through the creation of symbols of national unity, such as the national flag and anthem, compulsory education, conscription, and the forced assimilation of racial and ethnic minorities.

properties are protected through the provision of public goods, including security. In return, people are requested to fulfill tax obligations and military service to support and defend the state. The military of a nation-state, supported by a sense of national unity, has demonstrated historically unprecedented strength. Likewise, people's sense of national unity also became the foundation for economic development during peacetime. For this reason, the nation-state model established in France was imitated by other European countries, Japan after the Meiji Restoration, and by newly independent states after World Wars I and II. The 19th and 20th Centuries became the times when states all over the world pursued the formation of sovereign nation-states.

2.2.2. Transformation of a sovereign and nation-state

The characteristics of a sovereign and nation-state, as previously outlined, represent an idealized form of statehood, while the actual nature of the state has been subject to constant transformations throughout history. This is particularly evident in the changes observed in the nature of the state during the post-Cold War era.

(1) Transformation of a sovereign state: Hollowing out of the state and politics

Firstly, the scope of political issues that a state can determine on its own as a sovereign state has narrowed significantly. States are implementing policies such as market opening, deregulation and corporate tax reductions to survive intensifying competition to attract foreign investment. This makes it difficult for them to adopt policies to protect their own industries, workers and natural environments, or to increase corporate taxes to maintain social security systems (Tokunaga 2015, 34).⁹

The nature of public goods provided by a state for the realization of human security has undergone a transformation. In the 1990s, numerous countries privatized their infrastructure,

including electricity, water and transport. However, the negative consequences of this became apparent in the 2000s. In contrast to the initial expectation that privatization would result in enhanced service quality and reduced fees through market efficiency, it frequently led to the monopoly of one or a few private companies, thereby creating situations where socially vulnerable groups bear the brunt of price increases and the cancellation of service provision.¹⁰ This is a matter of significant concern from the perspective of human security.

Privatization and the growing presence of business actors can also be observed in other key areas of the state, including national defense and policing. In other words, privatization and the commodification of security are progressing (Newman 2016, 1168). The substitution of military and police functions with private military companies emerged in the 1990s, while in recent years, information technology (IT) giants and advertising firms have assumed a major role in information and cyber warfare, which is now regarded as one of the most essential aspects of modern warfare. This means a significant transformation in one of the most important attributes of the state, which Max Weber described as “the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical violence within a given territory” (Weber 1919 [2022], 9). In order for a state to legitimately monopolize the use of physical violence, it must possess overwhelming advantages in physical power to effectively control arbitrary violence by actors other than the state; however, this attribute of the state is now being eroded. Corporations outside of accountability of democratic governance of the state are gaining the ability to influence national security and even international peace through their immense wealth¹¹ and advanced technology.¹²

¹⁰ For example, water charges in England increased by approximately 45% in the two decades following privatization.

¹¹ As of 2018, 69 of the top 100 economic entities in the world are not nations but corporations like Amazon and Microsoft (Global Justice Now 2018).

¹² A case in point is the Starlink satellite network, operated by SpaceX and owned by Elon Musk, which has been used as the sole infrastructure for command, control, and communication for the Ukrainian forces. It has been reported that Musk exercises control over the level of access granted by the Ukrainian forces to this network, thereby significantly influencing the course of the war. Both the Ukrainian and US governments are concerned about the potential influence of Musk's actions on the war that could escalate into nuclear warfare (New York Times 2023).

⁹ The political space narrowed down in this way is being institutionalized with the multilateral free trade agreement (FTA) that came to be actively executed in the post-Cold War era. For example, the Ratchet Clause prohibits any subsequent withdrawal or rollback of preferential policies extended to international investors by the host countries of investment.

The curtailment of matters previously decided through democratic domestic political processes, and the reduction and transformation of state-provided public goods, has led to a “hollowing out of the state and politics.” Politics is the process of forming a consensus and determining public policies through negotiation and compromise between groups of individuals with varying interests and values. Furthermore, politics can be regarded as a continuous process whereby the people and the state engage in renegotiation and adjustment of the content of the social contract with respect to the realization of human security. The nature of this process has undergone significant change, as the role of private actors in the provision of public goods increased, and as a result of globalization and the spread of the idea that having a good investment environment for international investors is essential for economic development. Consequently, the provision of public goods and the public policy processes essential for realizing human security have been placed outside of the realm of politics.

One of the most significant consequences of the “hollowing out of the state and politics” is the emergence of political apathy among the general public. English political scientist Colin Hay posited that as globalization eroded the capacity of the sovereign state to formulate policies autonomously, a pervasive distrust of politics emerged, leading to widespread political apathy (Hay 2012). He cautions that, as a consequence, the world is being constructed in a manner that is advantageous only for small groups of selected people who benefit from globalization. Similarly, American scholar of political economy Dani Rodrik has observed that it is not possible to pursue the three objectives of globalization, sovereignty, and democracy simultaneously. This is now referred to as the “globalization trilemma” or “globalization paradox” (Rodrik 2014).

One of the reasons for this transformation of the sovereign state is the emergence of a political and economic ideology called neoliberalism and the consequent progress of economic globalization it has spurred. Neoliberalism argues that the welfare of human beings is optimized when individual entrepreneurial freedoms are maximized under institutions like strong guarantees of private property rights, free markets, and free trade (Harvey 2007, 10). Neoliberalism favors policies that maximize market mechanisms, such as liberation, privatization, and deregulation while claiming that state

intervention in economic activities must be minimized.¹³

Previous assumptions that the state, as a public policy maker and provider of public goods, can positively influence the economy and society have been challenged, and in the 1990s, “governance without government” came to be praised (Peters and Pierre 1998, 223–24). Neoliberalism also claims that globalization is unavoidable where goods and capital freely move beyond national borders.

Such ideas, succinctly expressed in the famous phrase of Margaret Thatcher, the former British Prime Minister, who said “you can’t buck the market,” serve as an ideological background for the “hollowing out of politics” that preclude neoliberal policies from being the subject of political discussions. Moreover, neoliberalism, which emphasizes the freedom of individuals, has also led to the dissemination of the so-called “self-responsibility” theory, which posits that poverty is a consequence of the attitudes and behaviors of the poor themselves. As this idea gained traction, a number of issues, such as unemployment and nursery care, that had previously been the domain of welfare states came to be viewed as risks that individuals were expected to cope with on their own.¹⁴ The individualization of risks that used to be shared in society through the redistributive function of the state has jeopardized human security by increasing the vulnerability of individuals to a range of inevitable risks in social life, such as natural disasters, accidents, illness and unemployment. Economic policies of neoliberalism were applied to developing countries and former communist countries through structural adjustment policies by the IMF and the World Bank. In this way, the reduction in the functions of a sovereign state, commodification of public goods, and hollowing out of state and politics expanded to the world.

¹³ The notion that the optimal distribution of resources can be achieved through market forces rather than government intervention was succinctly alluded to in the address delivered by then US President Ronald Reagan: “Government is not the solution to our problem, government is the problem” (Reagan 1981).

¹⁴ The US political philosopher Iris Marion Young noted that poverty used to be seen as a “national shame” and poverty reduction was seen as an important national policy. However, under the theory of self-responsibility informed by neoliberalism, the causes of poverty came to be viewed as stemming from the attitudes and actions of the poor themselves. This has become a mainstream view, leading to a fundamental shift in the understanding of poverty (Young 2014).

(2) Transformation of a nation-state: Erosion of social cohesion

Today, it is increasingly questionable whether even European countries and the USA, the first countries in the world to establish nation-states, are still “nation-states.” As a result of escalating economic and political divisions, the sense of national unity and social cohesion that underpinned the nation-state is being eroded.

One of the factors that has contributed to social division within the country is the rapid expansion of economic inequality. According to Thomas Piketty, a French economist who attracted wide attention with his book *Capital in the Twenty-First Century* in 2013, income disparity in developed countries, including the US, has been rapidly expanding since the 1980s and this trend is continuing (Piketty 2014). As a result, the World Inequity Lab recorded in the *World Inequity Report 2022* that the proportion of the wealth owned by the wealthy population in the top 1% in the world was approximately 40% as of 2021, far beyond 22% in 2016 (World Inequality Lab 2022). Economic inequality is being passed on to the next generation and is becoming more entrenched, and the middle class, that had been at the core of a nation's political and economic stability, is now on the verge of collapse.

Furthermore, in the post-Cold War period, while many countries, including the emerging economies known as the BRICS and the countries of Southeast Asia, have been on a trajectory of robust economic growth, there are still many countries that have been stuck in low growth and many fragile states that have not succeeded in forming sovereign nation-states. The outflow of large numbers of migrants and refugees from poverty-stricken and war-ridden countries has created political divisions by triggering the rise of populism in the destination countries, which sees the risk of upsetting ethnically, culturally and historically defined national unity. In response to this situation, the World Economic Forum's Global Risks Report for 2022 identified the polarization of society due to widening inequalities and the resulting weakening of social cohesion as the most significant threat in the short term (World Economic Forum 2022, 8).

3. Realizing Human Security in the Post-Post-Cold War Era

3.1. The importance of dignity

As examined above, states—as essential institutions for people to live securely and safely—are experiencing a significant transformation today. This transformation urges us to consider what should be done to realize human security against the recent international trend of escalating competition among major powers, which could propel a narrower understanding of national security to the fore.

In addressing this challenge, the UNDP's Special Report on Human Security in 2022 provides important insights. The report pointed out that, prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, six out of seven people worldwide felt that the world was insecure (UNDP 2022, 3). Awareness about human insecurity was more prominent in advanced countries (ibid., 6). It means that “even though people are on average living longer, healthier and wealthier lives, these advances have not succeeded in increasing people's sense of security” (ibid., iii). The Secretary-General of the United Nations, António Guterres, called this the “development paradox” (ibid., iii). What is then necessary to cope with this paradox?

While dignity is contingent upon the satisfaction of objective needs, it also encompasses subjective dimensions (Muto et al. 2022, 37–39). In the past, development strategies have tended to prioritize the satisfaction of objective needs, such as physical security and material needs. As evidenced by the “development paradox,” strategies designed to promote economic growth and social advancement cannot necessarily ensure the dignity of individuals. In the absence of a sense of dignity, individuals will not perceive their security to be assured.

This would be clear from the etymology of the English word “security.” The word “security” is derived from the Latin word *securitas*, which means “without care (anxiety).” As such, security is inherently subjective. Therefore, in realizing human security, it is necessary to consider under what conditions people feel their dignity is violated, what issues they are anxious about, what they are dissatisfied with and

what makes them feel angry about their unjust treatment.

It is crucial to recognize that feelings of anxiety, discontent and anger can provide a fertile ground for the emergence of chauvinistic nationalism, which seeks to establish a purely ethnocultural nation-state. Some have posited that this resurgence of nationalism, which is now evident in numerous countries, is attributable to the societal fluidity brought about by modernization and further exacerbated by globalization, which renders individuals as insignificant “grains of sand.” In the process of modernization, traditional communities based on land and blood ties collapsed, resulting in the loss of their protective function. Furthermore, the loss of the protective function of functional communities, such as trade unions and companies, was also accelerated by the intensification of economic competition due to globalization. With the mainstreaming of neoliberal ideology, poverty and inequality are more often attributed to the ability and attitude of individuals and are no longer considered an issue to be solved by the overall society.

Under such circumstances, people are unable to satisfy their desire for belongingness to live in a stable human relationship by belonging to a community or organization. They may also have an unfulfilled desire to gain approval for their existential value from others, leading to increasing anxiety, dissatisfaction, and even anger. They recognize the lack of dignity, i.e., they are not treated with respect by society. Thus, they are inclined toward chauvinistic and ethnocentric nationalism that satisfies their desire for belongingness as well as their desire for approval through a discourse of the “greatness of our own nation,” to which they are supposed to belong by birth (Nakajima and Shimazono 2022, 18). Francis Fukuyama argued that populist politicians are promoting the “politics of resentment” against the backdrop of people’s discontents with the failure of their desire for recognition of dignity to be fulfilled, causing the rise of nationalism in recent years (Fukuyama 2018).

In parallel with this, patriotism is making a comeback as a word of politics worldwide. While it is well-known that Xi Jinping and Vladimir Putin are both eager to promote patriotism, the US has also been saturated by the word “patriotic” since the 9-11 terrorist attack in 2001, which resulted in the enactment of the “Patriot Act” in the same year. People who

felt their dignity had been undermined, particularly white men living in the so-called “Rust Belt,”¹⁵ were frustrated by anger and prejudice against “others” such as immigrants, something that is considered to have laid the groundwork for the Trump administration, which promoted an “America First” brand of patriotism. Similar patriotism can also be seen in Asia and Europe. What is common is that it defines a nation by ethnic, religious, and cultural terms, agitates hatred toward minorities, inflames nostalgia toward the “great past,” and insists on recovering it by strengthening national unity. These “patriotic” claims resonate with the need of isolated individuals to recover their dignity by merging themselves into a large “imagined community.”¹⁶ Needless to say, militant attitudes toward minorities or different “others” contradict the ideal of human security, which emphasizes diversity and inclusion. In addition, emphasis on “greatness in the past” will lead to aggressive foreign diplomacy, thus promoting the likelihood of conflicts with neighboring countries and increasing the risk of war—the greatest risk to human security.¹⁷

3.2. How to rebuild the sovereign nation-state

The state, no matter how its function is being eroded, remains the most basic political unit in international society. While excessively strong states pose the greatest risk to human security, weak and incompetent states can also endanger human security. Only states have the capability and intention to fully provide public goods such as education and medical care to their people while effectively confronting non-state actors like large corporations that are strengthening their political influences (Garrard 2022, 7–8). To realize human security, therefore, a state must be firmly built (in developing countries and fragile states) or rebuilt (in developed

¹⁵ The “Rust Belt” is the region from the Midwest to the East on the Atlantic coast in the US that was the center of the steel and automobile industry in the past; it now suffers from a long-term depressed economy due to hollowing out of the industry.

¹⁶ Benedict Anderson argued that a “nation” is an “imagined community” that came to exist with the support of modernity, such as with the appearance of print capitalism (Anderson 1991).

¹⁷ Francis Fukuyama pointed out that people exhibit two types of desire for approval: the desire to be approved as equivalent to others and the desire to be acknowledged as an existence superior to others (Fukuyama 2018, xiii). When the latter is connected with narrow ethnocentric nationalism, the risks of war will increase.

countries), in spite of the aforementioned transformation of the sovereign and nation-state, if human security is to be secured. The restoration of politics, or collective decision-making through negotiation and compromise among various interests and values, is another imperative. Its importance is obvious considering the fact that wealth is distributed and thus inequality is exacerbated not only by market mechanisms but also by political factors (Piketty 2014, 22–23). For example, the dissemination of knowledge and skills that had been historically contributing to the reduction of economic inequality were achieved by public goods supplied by a state, not goods automatically supplied by market mechanisms (*ibid.*, 23–24) and the collective decision to ensure the adequate supply of such public goods needs to be solidified through the restoration of politics.

3.2.1. Reconstructing the nation-state through healthy nationalism

Recovery of social cohesion and a sense of unity among the people is another imperative for the restoration of the sovereign nation-state—if human security is to be achieved. Needless to say, ethno-cultural and chauvinistic nationalism and patriotism are dangerous for both international and domestic peace and thus for human security. Nonetheless, nationalism as the basis of people's sense of unity and solidarity cannot be considered as wrong and is rather necessary as far as the sovereign nation-state is the basic political unit.

Then what is desirable nationalism? In this regard, the speech by Martin Kimani, Kenyan Ambassador to the United Nations, at the emergency meeting of the UN Security Council held just before the Russian invasion of Ukraine may be helpful. He pointed out that many African countries are not satisfied with the current borders that European colonial powers arbitrarily drew without considering ethnic distribution, but they are striving today to form a new overarching “nation” beyond ethnic boundaries (Kimani 2022). Bearing in mind that Russia is invading neighboring countries to restore a perceived “great past,” he exclaimed that “we wanted something greater,” rather than forming “nations that looked ever backwards into history with a dangerous nostalgia” (*ibid.*).

Ambassador Kimani did not explain what “something

greater” means. Considering that he was warning about the danger of brandishing the “great history” of a specific ethnic group, it should mean an endeavor to form a nation by inclusively accepting every attribute of each and every person who resides in the territory, rather than defining a nation based on a specific ethnicity, religion, language or culture. It may sound overly idealistic and unrealistic. However, there is a compelling reason for this notion of “nation” to be realized: a nation wherein only a specific group—ethnic, religious or cultural—can feel the sense of solidarity would inevitably alienate others. It is not permissible in light of the human security concept, which emphasizes that dignity is guaranteed only when conditions of diversity, inclusiveness, and equality are met. In this regard, the emergence of new concepts of inclusive and healthy nationalism is worth acknowledging here. For example, the Israeli political scientist Yael Tamir emphasizes the need for civil nationalism (Tamir 2019). She argues that nationalism that maintains people's sense of unity based on tolerance for different “others” or empathy toward fellow citizens in hardships is now required to avoid division of the nation, as far as an alternative political community that would replace a sovereign nation-state remains elusive (*ibid.*).

3.2.2. Importance of recovering the functions of a sovereign state

What should be done to nurture such inclusive and healthy nationalism, i.e., to restore people's sense of unity and solidarity beyond political, economic, and ethnocultural cleavages? It is certainly necessary to nurture the spirit of tolerance and empathy, as Tamir argued. However, this will prove difficult in situations where many people suffer from poverty and inequality, or experience indignity resulting from the lack of belongingness or approval by others. As Yasushi Watanabe (Watanabe 2020), a Japanese political scientist who analyzed the surge of white nationalism in the US, argues, such situations will only accelerate what he calls “political tribalism,” wherein people who are divided along the lines of race, ethnic group, religion, gender, view others with hostility, refuse dialogue to find the middle ground, and seek a “strong leadership” that can beat different “others” (*ibid.*, 188–92). Without doubt, there is little hope to foster a

sense of national solidarity if “tribes” are trying to wipe out each other within the same country.

What is necessary is to address the fundamental causes of deep and entrenched political division. It is necessary to restore the state’s ability to provide public goods for the amelioration of inequality, alienation, and deprivation, rebuild the political space to enable citizens to make autonomous and informed decisions on public affairs, and revive the politics of negotiation and compromise for all stakeholders, all of which have been significantly eroded under globalization.

For example, a British sociologist Graeme Garrard argues that a “public interest state” should be established by bringing back the balance between the state and the market in favor of the former, compared to the current situation, which leans toward the side of the market and large corporations. This could be done through strengthened management of and involvement in the market by the state (Garrard 2022, 14–15). Ben Phillips, who has long worked at International NGOs on poverty issues, also argues that an active and strong government is essential to fight inequity (Phillips 2023, 132). What should be noted here is that Phillips argues that efforts on the side of the people are essential to make the government function appropriately and that people should not maintain the illusion that a government will take action merely by being given policy recommendations backed up with clear evidence (ibid., 138).

His emphasis on the role of ordinary people in engaging with public issues and keeping pressure on the government resonates with ongoing discussions about the shape of the new democracy. It is an endeavor to explore new ways of political participation, founded upon the principles of voluntary self-organization and mutual support of the people, to satisfy their needs and dignity. It seeks to respond to the voice of the people that has been long neglected under the traditional format of representative democracy (Graeber 2020). It is an idea and a practice to ensure a safe place for everyone and to bring politics back into people’s lives by talking about everyday issues and reaching out to those in need (Matsumura 2021, 13). Japanese cultural anthropologist Keiichiro Matsumura emphasizes that the practice of procuring the consent of community members and maintaining community without coercion or majority rule is not utopianism but is found in all

countries and societies—and has been practiced in Japan in times of major disasters. To realize such politics, it is necessary not to dismiss those who have been marginalized and left behind in global economic competition as “self-responsible,” but to recognize that all members of the national community have a responsibility to change the structural causes of their suffering (Young 2014, 197–98).

A small boom of the previously unfamiliar term “empathy”¹⁸ in Japan in the 2020s gives us some hope. It is a manifestation of the fact that more and more people have started to realize the importance of expressing anger about the situation in which the number of working poor is increasing, including those who cannot even earn their daily meals.¹⁹ Empathy promotes the importance of “putting themselves in someone else’s shoes” and consequently rebuilding social solidarity in modern society (Brady 2021a).

In this era of interstate competition, there is a growing danger that the voices of diversity and dissent will be drowned out in the name of national unity. In this context, to realize human security, it will become increasingly necessary to strengthen the state’s function of providing public goods, to activate governance from below based on people’s solidarity, and to effectively put sovereignty back in the hands of the people.

Conclusion

British historian E.H. Carr said that “the war of 1914–18 made an end of the view that war is a matter which affects only professional soldiers and, in so doing, dissipated the corresponding impression that international politics could safely be left in the hands of professional diplomats” (Carr 1939 [2001], 2). Carr’s statement is even more significant today, when confrontations among large countries are intensifying and power elites are again discussing diplomacy

¹⁸ The word “empathy” has many meanings, and here we understand it as “To acknowledge the existence of something different from yourself, something of a nature that you cannot accept, as an other, and to try to imagine what it is like to be that person” (Brady 2021a, 31).

¹⁹ In the mid-2010s, 27% of households in England were comprised of poor families, with 66% of these belonging to working households (Brady 2021b, 4).

and security solely from the viewpoint of state. We should be aware that the ravages of war will be far more tragic and devastating in comparison with those of the First World War. As suggested by the war in Ukraine, we must recognize the fact that young people, conscripted for military service, become “cannon fodder” on the battlefield. We must also realize that death on the battlefield does not come to everyone equally, as ethnic minorities²⁰ and those considered economically vulnerable²¹ are more likely to be forced to join the military and die. That is why we must monitor and participate in the discussion on state decision-making regarding wars and security. Human security advocates the importance of each citizen thinking about how security should be in the future and the relationship between national security and people’s (individuals’ and community’s) own security should be assessed as a matter of personal concern.

While Carr is considered one of the founders of classical realism in international politics, he pointed out that “realism tends to emphasise the irresistible strength of existing forces and the inevitable character of existing tendencies,” resulting in “the sterilisation of thought and the negation of action.” Therefore, there is a stage where “utopianism must be invoked to counteract the barrenness of realism” (ibid., 10). Today, widely recognized as a historical turning point, realism as a thought of old age “which rejects purpose altogether” should be balanced with utopianism as an immature thought which is “predominantly purposive” (ibid., 10), from the viewpoint of human security. For this purpose, we should avoid falling into fatalism like “we cannot buck the market” of neoliberalism or the realist dogma that national security is inevitably returning to the foreground of international politics. One scholar argued that realism is a “school of no hope” or “the curmudgeon of international relations thought” that continually points to “the gravity that undercuts human attempts to fly” (Poast 2022); yet mankind has tried to fly in the sky with ideals and dreams

to see a better world. Even though we are in an era in which national security is in the foreground, it is not unnatural—but rather unnecessary—for a state to uphold human security as a principle in its attempt to rebuild a healthy sovereign state and nation-state. The concept of human security should not be rejected as utopianism but understood as our vision of the future to be realized.

References

- Anderson, Benedict. 1983 [1991]. *Imagined Communities*. Verso.
- BBC News. 2006. Army ‘targeting poorer schools’. Accessed on November 29, 2023. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/wales/6199274.stm
- Brady, Mikako. 2021a. *Tasha no kutsu o haku: Anakikku empashi no susume* [Anarchic empathy: put yourself in someone’s shoes]. Bungei Shunju.
- . 2021b. *Yoroppa • Koringu • Ritanzu: Shakai • Seiji Jihyo Kuronikuru 2014–2021* [Europe Calling Returns – Sociopolitical Current Chronicle 2014–2021]. Iwanami Shoten.
- Carr, E.H. 1939 [2001]. *The Twenty Years’ Crisis, 1919–1939*. Perennial.
- Commission on Human Security. 2003. *Human Security Now*.
- Fukuyama, Francis. 2018. *Identity: The Demand for Dignity and the Politics of Resentment*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Garrard, Graeme. 2022. *The Return of the State: And Why It Is Essential for Our Health, Wealth and Happiness*. Yale University Press.
- Global Justice Now. 2018. 69 of the richest 100 entities on the planet are corporations, not governments, figures show. Accessed on December 15, 2023. <https://www.globaljustice.org.uk/news/69-richest-100-entities-planet-are-corporations-not-governments-figures-show/>
- Graeber, David. 2020. *Minshu Shugi no Hi-Seiyo Kigen ni tsuite ‘Aida’ no Kukan no Minshu Shugi* [There Never Was a West: Or, Democracy Emerges from the Spaces in Between]. Translated by Daisuke Kataoka. Ibunsha.
- Haass, Richard and Charles A. Kupchan. 2021. “The new concert of powers: How to prevent catastrophe and promote stability in a multipolar world.” *Foreign Affairs*. March 23, 2021.
- Harvey, David. 2007. *Shin Jiyu Shugi: Sono rekishiteki tenkai to genzai* [A Brief History of Neoliberalism]. Compiled and translated by Osamu Watanabe. Sakuhinsha.
- Hay, Colin. 2012. *Seiji wa Naze Kirawarerunoka: Minshu Shugi no Torimodoshikata* [Why We Hate Politics]. Translated by Toru Yoshida. Iwanami Shoten.
- Herz, John H. 1950. “Idealist internationalism and the security dilemma.” *World Politics*. 2(2): 157–180.
- International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS). 2001. *The Responsibility to Protect: Report of the International*

²⁰ According to the report by a Russian independent media, the proportion of the war dead of the Russian military in the Ukrainian war from the republic of ethnic minorities, like Buryatia, Tuva and North Ossetia, is particularly high (Vazhnyye Istori 2022).

²¹ Encouraging youth in poverty to apply for armed services by providing economic incentives such as scholarships is called “economic conscription.” This is exercised in the US and the UK (BBC News 2006).

- Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty*.
International Institute for Security Studies (IISS). 2023. *Asia-Pacific Regional Security Assessment 2023*.
- Kimani, Martin. 2022. "Statement to an Emergency Session of the UN Security Council on the Situation in Ukraine delivered 22 February 2022." United Nations. Accessed on May 11, 2023. <https://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/martinkimaniunitednationsrussiaukraine.htm>
- Krause, Keith. 2002. "Multilateral diplomacy, norm building, and UN conferences: The case of small arms and light weapons." *Global Governance*. 8: 247–263.
- Kurusu, Kaoru. 2002. "Joron: Anzen Hosho Kenkyu to "Ningen no Anzen Hosho" [Introduction: Study on Security and 'Human Security']. " *Kokusai Anzenhosyo* [International Security]. 30(3): 1–8.
- . 2009. "Ningen no Anzen Hosho Kenkyu to Kokusai Kankei-ron: Atarashii Risachi no chihei? [Human Security Studies and IR: New Research Frontier?]" *Kokusai Kokyo Seisaku Kenkyu* [International Public Policy Studies]. 14(1): 15–30.
- Matsumura, Keiichiro. 2021. *Kurashi no Anakizumu* [Anarchism in Daily Life]. Mishimasha Publishing.
- Mearsheimer, John, J. 2018. *The Great Delusion: Liberal Dreams and International Realities*. Yale University Press.
- . 2022. "The causes and consequences of the Ukraine war." *Horizons: Journal of International Relations and Sustainable Development*. 21: 12–27.
- Muto, Ako, Kota Sugitani, Kaito Takeuchi, and Nobuaki Oyama. 2022. "Ningen no Anzen Hosho Kenkyu no Ayumi – JICA Ogata Sadako Heiwa Kaihatsu Kenkyujo no Torikumi o Chushin Ni [History of Human Security Research: Efforts of the JICA Ogata Sadako Research Institute for Peace and Development]." *Human Security Today*. Compiled by JICA Ogata Sadako Research Institute for Peace and Development. Accessed on July 23, 2023. https://www.jica.go.jp/jica_ri/publication/booksandreports/20220331_02.html
- Nakajima, Takeshi and Shimazono Susumu. 2016. *Aikoku to Shinko no Kozo: Zentai Shugi wa Yomigaeru noka* [Structure of Patriotism and Religious Belief– Will Totalitarianism Come Back?]. Shueisha.
- New York Times. 2023. Elon Musk's Unmatched Power in the Stars. Accessed on July 30, 2023. <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2023/07/28/business/starlink.html>
- Newman, Edward. 2001. "Human security and constructivism." *International Studies Perspectives*. 2(3): 239–251.
- . 2016. "Human security: Reconciling critical aspirations with political 'realities'." *British Journal of Criminology*. 56(6): 1165–1183.
- Oshimura, Takashi. 2004. "Kokka no Anzen Hosho to Ningen no Anzen Hosho [National Security and Human Security]." *Kokusai Mondai* [International Issues]. 530: 14–27.
- Peters, B. Guy and John Pierre. 1998. "Governance without government? Rethinking public administration." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 8(2): 223–243.
- Phillips, Ben. 2023. *Imasugu Kakusa o Zesei Seyo!* [How to Fight Inequality]. Translated by Tatsuya Yamanaka and Mitsuki Fukasawa. Chikuma Shobo.
- Piketty, Thomas. 2014. *Niju Isseiki no Sihon* [Capital in the Twenty-First Century]. Translated by Hiroo Yamagata, Sakura Morioka, and Masashi Morimoto. Misuzu Shobo.
- Poast, Paul. 2022. "A world of power and fear: What critics of realism get wrong." *Foreign Affairs*. June 15, 2022.
- Reagan, Ronald. 1981. "Inaugural Address 1981." Accessed on February 1, 2024. <https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/speech/inaugural-address-1981>
- Reuters. 2023. Ukrainian Group Says More Than 30,000 Troops Have Died in Russia's Invasion. November 15, 2023. Accessed on November 22, 2023. <https://www.reuters.com/world/europe/ukrainian-group-says-more-than-30000-troops-have-died-russias-invasion-2023-11-15/>
- Rodrik, Dani. 2014. *Gurōbarizeshon • Paradokusu: Sekai Keizai no Mirai o Kimeru Mittsu no Michi* [The Globalization Paradox – Democracy and the Future of the World Economy]. Translated by Keita Shibayama and Yoshifumi Okawa. Hakusuisha.
- Rosen, Michael. 2021. *Songen: Sono Rekishi to Imi* [Dignity – Its History and Meaning]. Translated by Taichi Uchio and Yoichi Mine. Iwanami Shoten.
- Scholz, Olaf. 2022. "Regierungserklärung von Bundeskanzler Olaf Scholz am 27. Februar 2022." Accessed on January 1, 2024. <https://www.bundesregierung.de/breg-de/suche/regierungserklaerung-von-bundeskanzler-olaf-scholz-am-27-februar-2022-2008356>
- Stepanenko, Viktoriia. 2023. In 2024, Kyiv to Spend Everything on Defense – Budget Committee Chair. Kyiv Post. October 30, 2023. <https://www.kyivpost.com/post/23441>
- Takahashi, Tetsuya, and Susumu Yamakage. 2008. *Ningen no Anzen Hosho* [Human Security]. The University of Tokyo Press.
- Tamir, Yael. 2019. *Why Nationalism*. Princeton University Press.
- Tokunaga, Shota. 2015. "Seijiteki na mono no gainen to Seiji no Yogo: Banado Kurikku o kiten to shita Igrisu Seiji Keizaigaku o tegakari ni [The Concept of the Political Imagination and the Defense of Politics: A Study into a Strand of English Political Economy Proposed by Bernard Crick]." *Integrated Sciences for Global Society Studies*. 3: 33–44.
- Tosa, Hiroyuki. 2003. *Anzen Hosho toiu Gyakusetsu* [The Paradox of Security]. Seidosha.
- United Nations Development Program (UNDP). 1994. *Human Development Report 1994*.
- . 2022. 2022 Special Report on Human Security: *New threats to human security in the Anthropocene: Demanding greater solidarity*. Accessed on May 30, 2023. <https://hdr.undp.org/content/2022-special-report-human-security>
- United Nations General Assembly. 2012. Resolution adopted by the

- General Assembly on 10 September 2012. Accessed on June 22, 2023. <https://www.un.org/humansecurity/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/N1147622.pdf>
- United Nations. 2001. Report of the United Nations Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects. A/CONF.192/15. Accessed on January 5, 2024. <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/447095?v=pdf>
- Важные истории. 2022. «Юные, бедные, мертвые» [Young, Poor, Dead]. 4 МАЯ 2022. Accessed on January 15, 2024. <https://istories.media/investigations/2022/05/04/yunie-bednie-mertvie/>
- Walt, Stephen M. 1991. "The renaissance of security studies." *International Studies Quarterly*. 35(2): 211–239.
- Watanabe, Yasushi. 2020. *Hakujin Nashonarizumu: Amerika o Yurugasu 'Bunkateki Hando'* [White Nationalism – "Cultural Repercussion" that Shakes America]. Chuokoronsha.
- Weber, Max. 1919 [2020]. *Shokugyo to shiten no Seiji* [Politics as a Vocation]. Translated by Keihei Waki. Iwanami Shoten.
- World Economic Forum (WEF). 2022. *Global Risks Report 2022*, 17th Edition.
- World Inequality Lab. 2022. The World Inequality Report 2022. Accessed on December 17, 2023. <https://wir2022.wid.world/>
- Young, Iris Marion. 2014. *Seigi heno Sekinin* [Responsibility for Justice]. Translated by Yayo Okano and Naoko Ikeda. Iwanami Shoten.