



JICA Research Institute

JICA-RI Working Paper

Toward a Theory of Human Security

Akihiko Tanaka

No. 91

March 2015

JICA Research Institute



JICA Research Institute

Use and dissemination of this working paper is encouraged; however, the JICA Research Institute requests due acknowledgement and a copy of any publication for which this working paper has provided input. The views expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the official positions of either the JICA Research Institute or JICA.

JICA Research Institute
10-5 Ichigaya Honmura-cho
Shinjuku-ku
Tokyo 162-8433 JAPAN
TEL: +81-3-3269-3374
FAX: +81-3-3269-2054

Copyright ©2015 Japan International Cooperation Agency Research Institute
All rights reserved.

Toward a Theory of Human Security

Akihiko Tanaka*

Abstract

“Human security” has occupied a significant place in the global discourses of peace, development, and diplomacy, despite often made criticisms of its conceptual ambiguity. Arguing for the merit of a broader definition of human security, i.e. “the right of people to live in freedom and dignity, free from poverty and despair” (UN Resolution A/RES/66/290), this paper offers an interdisciplinary theoretical framework in which key aspects of human security are systematically laid out: types of threats from physical, living, and social systems; causal structures that produce threats to human security; instruments to deal with these threats; and issues of agency to protect human security. The tripartite differentiation of the sources of threats -- physical, living, and social systems -- roughly corresponds with the objects of inquiry of three groups of academic disciplines: (1) sciences and engineering based on physics and chemistry, (2) biological and ecological sciences, and (3) social sciences and the humanities.

This paper argues that a desirable theory of human security should rely on these multiple disciplines for the causal mechanisms that produce human security threats. It also contends that the theory should explore the interaction among different systems because threats to human security impact the physical, biological, and social aspects of human beings. In analyzing human security threats within the social system, this paper stresses the importance of analyzing the "collective action" aspects of human security threats. It argues, for example, the theoretical relevance of the Hobbesian "state of nature" as a condition where human security is chronically threatened socially. As to the types of measures to protect human security, this paper differentiates the instruments to affect the causes of the threat and those affecting the consequences. This paper argues that desirable instruments should be selected based on the analysis of the nature of the threat and its underlying causal mechanism. Finally, this paper discusses the issues of agency to protect human security: who should protect whose human security? Stressing the importance of responsible sovereign states as crucial agents to protect human security, this paper also argues that, given the global and interconnected nature of human security threats, cooperation among various stakeholders -- states, international organizations, the business sector, civil society organizations, academic institutions, and so on -- is essential.

* Japan International Cooperation Agency (Tanaka.Akihiko@jica.go.jp)

1. Introduction

Since the concept was first introduced in the *Human Development Report 1994* (UNDP, 1994), "human security" has occupied a significant place in the global discourses of peace, development, and diplomacy, despite often made criticism of its conceptual ambiguity. The Commission on Human Security, co-chaired by Sadako Ogata and Amartya Sen, submitted its report, titled *Human Security Now*, to the UN Secretary General in 2003. The United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security (UNTFHS), established in 1999, has supported more than 200 projects throughout the world. The Human Security Unit was established within the UNOCHA in 2004 and has managed the UNTFHS since then. The UN General Assembly came to a common understanding on the notion of Human Security in September 2012 (A/RES/66/290). As a testament to the relevance of human security in today's world, governments are adopting human security as a concept guiding their foreign and international policy. Japan, for example, declares that, in its 2015 Development Cooperation Charter, human security "is the guiding principle that lies at the foundation of Japan's development cooperation." In its National Security Strategy of 2013, Japan addresses global issues "based on the principles of human security." The Government of Thailand founded the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security to deal with human security issues within the country. Regional forums, such as the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation forum (APEC) and the Organization of American States (OAS) have released statements referring to the human security agenda. Prominent universities and academic institutions have programs that feature the human security perspective. Harvard's Program on Humanitarian Policy and Conflict Research has conducted research programs focused on human security. The London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE) has established a research unit on civil society and human security, and students can take a graduate course on human security. In Japan, the University of Tokyo and Tohoku University have Master's and Ph.D. programs on human security.

Like many other important policy-related and analytic concepts, human security can mean many things. However, the core attribute of the concept is clear: the referent of security is the individual as opposed to the state. As inter-state wars have become less frequent since the end of the Cold War, more attention has been given to large-scale violence caused by civil wars, ethnic rivalries and domestic turmoil. Under these circumstances, it is appropriate for policymakers to pay more attention to insecure conditions of individual human beings. It is also pertinent for the academic community to pay more attention to research on human-centered security conditions.

As a concept that addresses the conditions of individual human beings, human security is closely related with other human-centered concepts. Most notable are the concept of human development and, more inherently, the concept of human rights. As both the concepts of human development and human rights are contentious, the relationship among the three aforementioned concepts can also be polemical. As a normative concept, that of human rights is the most fundamental. Human security can be regarded as a subset of human rights, just as human development can be as another. Human development and human security are more than just subsets of human rights, however. They are more empirical and analytic than the concept of human rights; they deal with conditions on which desirable rights are realized. Human rights provide a normative base for the empirical and analytic discussion of human security and human development, ultimately leading to policy discussion. The discourse of human rights provides which rights should be protected and promoted by policies crafted within the human security and human development frameworks.

As the Commission on Human Security (2003) emphasizes, it seems useful to differentiate human security from human development, with the former concept focusing on the “downside risks” of human life and the latter centering on more upward expansion of human capabilities. As many human rights are subject to risks and opportunities, both human security and human development can be either broadly or narrowly defined, depending on which basic rights are to be protected and promoted. UNDP (1994) suggests that the goals of human security are to assure the

two basic rights of freedom from fear and freedom from want. The Commission on Human Security's (2003) definition, "to protect the vital core of all human lives in ways that enhance human freedoms and human fulfillment," appears broader than UNDP's (1994) definition and includes "human dignity."¹ The UN Resolution A/RES/66/290, adopted unanimously on September 10, 2012, largely endorsed the line of conceptual development since UNDP (1994) and CHS (2003) by describing human security as "the right of people to live in freedom and dignity, free from poverty and despair."

Evidently, human security and human development are closely related. If human development essentially indicates the achievement of basic rights, including the right to education, the right to health, the right to adequate standard of living, and so on², securing freedom from fear and freedom from want is a requisite of human development. Human security is the basis on which human development builds. On the other hand, empowering individuals and expanding their capabilities increase human security. Human development strengthens human security. Therefore, when dealing with human security, we should not neglect factors affecting human development.

Human security is an empirical and analytic concept that relates to policy issues. As such, human security is concerned with the causal understanding of human conditions. In other words, it is looking at hypothetical relations between causes and effects, and eventually policy measures that should work in real life. The emergence of the concept of human security inevitably affects the traditional academic discipline of security and peace studies, just as the concept of human development affects development studies. But what are the causal theories of human security?

On the surface, threats to human security, if broadly defined, appear so numerous that a simple theory of deterrence and mutual deterrence, which dominated security studies during the Cold War, would not be sufficient. Not only are threats diverse and numerous; possible measures to cope with them seemingly encompass almost all social measures. If threats to human security

¹ For various definitions of Human Security, see Tadjbakhsh and Chenoy (2007).

² The Human Development Index, used by the UNDP, is a composite measure of education, life expectancy, and per capita income, roughly corresponding to the basic rights to education, health, and standard of living.

include sudden financial market fluctuations, earthquakes, epidemics, civil wars, and so on, measures of human security may include all of the policy tools that the entire government bureaucracy disposes of. To many security studies specialists, who study only the effectiveness of military responses (and deterrence) to military attacks by other sovereign states, this new concept appears too unwieldy.

There are, therefore, suggestions for a much narrower definition of human security, especially in the field of security studies. Mack (2002), Lodgaard (2004), and MacFarlane and Khong (2006) limit the threats to human security to only those that are physical and violence-based. MacFarlane and Khong further narrow down the threats to those perpetrated by organized entities, such as terrorist groups.

However, this paper argues that human security cannot be reduced to a subset of traditional security studies. If security studies are truly interested in incorporating the concept of human security, they need to expand their scope much more extensively and re-design their theoretical toolkits. We need to put the concept of human security in a truly inter-disciplinary perspective and strive to create a new theoretical framework.

2. The quest for a theory of Human Security

Human security has many threats. Almost all dangers to human existence may be categorized as human security threats. While the causes of these wide-ranging threats appear to be diverse and numerous, the possible instruments able to deal with direct threats and underlying causes also appear just as varied. But this appearance may in fact indicate our ignorance about issues surrounding human security rather than the true complexity of reality. Given our limited grasp of human security conditions, the causes, threats, and policies appropriate to deal with these appear incredibly numerous. However, the number of factors on the surface, and, for that matter, the true complexity of reality, should not affect our willingness to engage in meaningful inquiry. A

growing number of living creatures would not prevent biologists from pursuing their studies. What is needed is an appropriate set of categories and challenging hypotheses (i.e. a theory of human security), so that we can make theoretical arguments more systematically and empirically, rather than in an ad hoc manner with only episodic evidence³.

During the Cold War, the focus of security studies in the United States' may have been narrowed due to the fact that the confrontation with the USSR was such a pressing issue at the time, especially in the arena of nuclear weapons. However, security studies in general should not necessarily concentrate on a single military threat and military responses to it. The expert group organized by Japanese Prime Minister Masayoshi Ohira submitted a report on "comprehensive national security" in 1980. It recommended that the Japanese government prepare for wide-ranging threats to national security, including the disruption of food and natural resource imports, large scale disasters, and conventional military attacks. The report also recommended that Japan prepare both military and non-military means to secure its population's well-being comprehensively.⁴

Studies that have narrower definitions of human security are clearly welcome. They would contribute to the more rigorous understanding of the human security phenomena in a specified domain. However, given the current state of our understanding, there is a need for more studies and policy debates on wide-ranging issues surrounding human security. We must sort out, as systematically as possible, different types of threats, their possible underlining causes, and

³ There have been several attempts to categorize basic concepts of human security. However, there are often lists of topics, rather than categories, that are located in theoretical systems. The concepts of vulnerability and resilience are often used in discussions related to human security. Although I do not discuss them in this paper, I define vulnerability as the condition in which the actor (or society) in question is *not* able to restore a desirable state of affairs within a certain timeframe after an occurrence of a specific perturbation (or the emergence of a certain threat). Resilience is the capability of minimizing vulnerability, or the capability to restore a desirable state of affairs within a certain timeframe after the occurrence of a certain threat. Vulnerability is not the same as human security. Human security is a function of the probability of emergence of human security threats and vulnerability to these threats once they emerge. Many cities in areas that are not prone to earthquakes are still vulnerable, as most buildings are not built to be earthquake-resistant. However, their level of human security with respect to earthquakes is not necessarily low, because the probability of large-scale earthquakes is very low.

⁴ The Comprehensive National Security Study Group (1980). For discussion on the concept of human security in the security study, see, for example, Paris (2001).

potential measures and agents to affect the causes, to reduce the probability of the occurrence of threats, and to minimize the damages once they occur. For that purpose, we need to mobilize as much knowledge as possible from all relevant disciplines, including social sciences, natural sciences, engineering and the humanities.

3. Threats to Human Security

First, threats to human security may be categorized in a fairly straightforward manner based on the concept of human security as defined in CHS (2003): threats to survival, threats to well-being, and threats to dignity. These threats may be further subdivided by focusing on their sources: threats from physical system, threats from living system, and threats from social system. The tripartite differentiation of the sources of threats to human security roughly corresponds with the objects of inquiry of three different groups of academic disciplines: (1) sciences and engineering based on physics and chemistry; (2) biological and ecological sciences, and (3) social sciences and the humanities.

The first type of threats to survival originates in physical systems, most typically natural disasters such as earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, tsunamis, floods, typhoons, cyclones, hurricanes forest fires and droughts. The second type of threats to survival comes from living systems and includes pandemics, endemics, famines, malnutrition and ecological disasters. The third type of threats to survival arises from social systems, such as intended /unintended violence (domestic violence, murder, rape, genocide, terrorism, panic, anarchy, civil wars, accidents, etc.), displacement (refugees, Internally Displaced Persons), breakdown of social lifelines/institutions, and weak or insufficient health/medical institutions. Some human acts, intended and unintended, can cause harm to human being through the mechanisms of physical and living systems. The Minamata disease, which in effect is mercury poisoning, was caused by a big factory in the city of Minamata releasing effluents contaminated with mercury in the Bay of Minamata.

Threats to well-being can similarly be sub-divided into three types. The first type includes physical phenomena that affect survival, as well as other phenomena that may not directly threaten survival but have serious economic repercussions, such as mild but extensive flooding, lowering of underground water, and physical isolation caused by natural disasters. Similarly, the second type encompasses threats from living systems. Those threats that affect survival also pose dangers to well-being, but many phenomena, such as poor harvest, deforestation and insects, that do not directly threaten survival need to be included in this type. Threats to well-being from the social systems include not only threats to survival, but also such phenomena as government failures (i.e. misguided policies of various types and degrees), market failures (i.e. fluctuation of commodity prices, breakdown of financial systems, etc.), and structural poverty (i.e. weak institutions /infrastructure, discriminatory social structure, etc.).

The third category of human security threats is threats to dignity. Again, theoretically this can include three types: those from physical systems, those from living systems, and those from social systems. The threats from social systems are very important when discussing threats to dignity because dignity is essentially a social concept. They may include intended/explicit discrimination/harassment, unintended/implicit discrimination, and social deprivation of material and non-material resources. However, phenomena arising in physical systems and living systems could affect dignity especially as they interact with social systems. Victims of diseases, particularly those of unknown causes, have often been discriminated against. Survivors of natural disasters are often traumatized by the memories and the loss of their families and friends.

4. Causes of Human Insecurity

As the above discussion indicates, threats to human security emerge out of physical, living and social systems. The next task, therefore, is to examine the different basic settings out of which threats to human security emerge (i.e. causes or sources of human insecurity).

First is the physical systems, in which the fundamental causal chains are determined by laws of physics. There are areas prone to be affected by natural hazards because of geological, geographic, and climatic dynamics. It is, at least on the surface, straightforward to identify causes of threats to human security (mostly threats to survival and well-being), such as earthquakes, tsunamis, typhoons, floods, tornados, and volcanic eruptions. Given substantial progress in geological and climate sciences, we may be able to understand the mechanisms that cause these natural hazards more accurately. However, these physical settings alone do not automatically bring about threats to human security; interactions with living systems (that is, biological phenomena) and social systems (that is, intended and unintended human behavior) are important determinants. No natural phenomena are likely to cause damages to humans where there are no humans or where humans are able to manage damages so that they are minimal. On the other hand, if congested, unsanitary, and poor areas are hit by floods, the interaction with humans and the biological sphere may lead to the spread of diseases and multiply the damage caused by the original natural hazard.

Some aspects of physical systems do not directly cause threats, but they could also affect human interaction through which threats to human security emerge. For instance, countries endowed with valuable natural resources could use these riches for national development. Natural resources can also cause conflict, with different actors vying to control and benefit from these resources. Climate change is another example in that as the climate changes, the pattern of resource supply can be shifted, thereby potentially causing natural hazards, epidemics and human conflicts.

The second category is the living systems (i.e. biological/ecological sphere). Pandemics have posed threats to survival and well-being and have had huge human/social consequences over the course of humanity (McNeill 1976, Diamond 1997). It is well known that the influenza outbreak in the early 20th century caused more human losses than World War I. In areas in which they spread, epidemics and endemics are also important threats to survival and well-being.

Changes in ecosystems also threaten people's well-being and survival. Medical sciences, studies on ecosystems, and studies on agriculture and forestry are some of the disciplines we need to explore to better understand the relations between biological/ecological systems and human security.

With respect to threats from physical and living systems, as I mentioned above, there is a need to study their impact on human dignity much more intensively and thoroughly. Victims of Hansen's disease have been discriminated against for a long time. Discrimination against minorities sometimes intensifies in areas devastated by natural disasters. Sociologists who conducted research following the Hanshin Awaji Great Earthquake of 1995 strongly suggested that natural disasters had psychological repercussions on survivors. After the Sichuan Earthquake of 2008 and the Great East Japan Earthquake of 2011⁵, greater attention was given to providing psychological support to those affected by these disasters. Further studies are needed to clarify different impacts of various types of threats under varying circumstances.

The third category is the social systems. A social system may be subdivided into three sub-settings: social, political and economic settings. One notable aspect of a social setting is the nature of ethnic composition. Whether an area has an egalitarian society, the extent to which an area is ethnically heterogeneous, and the amount of available "social capital" may affect the probability of conflicts occurring, a society's ability to cope with conflicts, and its capacity to manage threats to human security caused by nature. One of the factors that enabled Northeast Japan to limit damages and recover quickly from the unprecedented earthquake and tsunami disaster that struck in 2011 may be that the society is egalitarian, homogeneous, and is endowed with much social capital (Shimada 2014; Aldrich and Sawada 2015). The series of studies by Frances Stewart (2008) point to the significance of "horizontal inequalities," inequalities between groups of people that share common identity. These societal conditions do not exist in isolation. The natural, political and economic environments affect the state of society.

⁵ JICA conducted a technical cooperation project on mental care after the Sichuan Earthquake.

The second setting of a social system is the political setting. Theoretically simpler to understand is the notion of human security being threatened by intended actions perpetrated by an individual or group of individuals. Human security is threatened by criminals, gangs, and terrorists who willfully harm others. The task in these instances is to create an effective system to deter such willful acts of violence and to protect innocent lives. Obviously, in reality, things are not so clear-cut, which is why criminology is such an important and much-needed discipline.

However, when the threats emanate from collective action of many people, we need to tackle theoretically more challenging issues. In fact, in many cases of violent situations, it becomes much more difficult to pinpoint who the ultimate perpetrators are. As the referent of security shifts from sovereign states to individual humans, and due to a declining number of inter-state wars and a relative increase of civil wars, terrorism, and other organized and un-organized forms violence, we may need to re-visit the extreme of extreme political conditions: anarchy. In this instance, the most pertinent starting point may be the Hobbesian state of nature. The empirical referent example Hobbes had in mind when he wrote *Leviathan* was the English Civil War. If an area becomes anarchic for whatever reasons, threats to human security could be as stark as Hobbes (1968: 186) described:

"Whatsoever therefore is consequent to a time of War, where every man is Enemy to every man; the same is consequent to the time, wherein men live without other security, than what their own strength, and their own invention shall furnish them withal. In such condition, there is no place for Industry; because the fruit thereof is uncertain; and consequently no Culture of the Earth; no Navigation, nor use of the commodities that may be imported by Sea; no commodious Building; no Instruments of moving, and removing such things as require much force; no Knowledge of the face of the Earth; no account of Time; no Arts; no Letters; no Society; and which is worst of all, continual fear, and

danger of violent death; And the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short."

Whether this Hobbesian view actually exists is an empirical matter to investigate. But the description aligns very well with the recent conflicts and disasters of the late 20th and early 21st centuries. When the dominant focus of security studies was on state-security, there were debates on how stark the Hobbesian state of nature was as applied to the inter-state system. Some argued that Hobbes regarded anarchy that emerged in the inter-state system as more tolerable than anarchy on the individual level. Whether or not that was the case, in the early 21st century, we may have to confront a situation of anarchy among individuals and groups of individuals similar to the one Hobbes analyzed in the 17th century.

What are theories of anarchy at the individual level? Hobbes's logic is quite similar to the theories surrounding the Prisoners Dilemma: players end up in a suboptimal (in the sense of Pareto) but stable (in the sense of Nash) equilibrium (Rawls, 2007:73-77). The same logic is also used to explain the emergence of the security dilemma. Hobbes's solution, of course, was the creation of the Leviathan (the sovereign state). This is the basis of the recent argument calling on state-building to reduce the danger of threats to human security. Obviously, the need for state-building does not suggest that any kind of state-building is sufficient. We need to explore what kind of state-building is desirable in order to cope with a situation in which Hobbesian anarchy is the underlining cause of insecurity.

In fact, virtually all territories of the world are now under the jurisdiction of sovereign states. The problem is that not all sovereign states are able (or willing) to perform their necessary responsibilities as sovereign states. To the extent that states are weak and fragile, anarchical or near-anarchical conditions emerge where the Hobbesian logic prevails. As Hobbes eloquently argued, not only are individuals' survival in danger, many other attributes of civilization cease to exist as well. That many fragile countries have difficulty in achieving the Millennium

Development Goals (MDGs) can be explained through the lens of *Leviathan*. If natural disasters hit such anarchical societies, the level of devastation could be much greater than in well-governed areas.

As state-building starts making progress, the situation may become less anarchic. However, state functions may remain limited. Infrastructure may have been mostly destroyed, and necessary social structures, such as legal systems, may have been either non-existent or poorly developed. If the Leviathan does not prove to be as competent as Hobbes had hoped, it would be possible for people to abrogate such a Leviathan and return to the original state of anarchy. As the World Bank (2011)'s finding demonstrates, in the 21st century, around 90 percent of all civil wars erupt in post-conflict settings. Additionally, as Collier et al. (2003, pp. 83-84)'s finding demonstrates, a country nearing the end of a civil war faces about a 44 percent risk of experiencing conflict again within five years.

The third setting of a social system is the economic setting. A theoretically simpler situation is one in which economic decision-makers take mistaken and misguided policies. Disastrous policy mistakes can cause large-scale famines and hunger, as was the consequence of Mao Zedong's Great Leap Forward in the late 1950s. Mistakes by totalitarian dictators are theoretically simpler, but preventing them is not actually easy given that this may require completely transforming the totalitarian system. It is not easy to attribute most economic and social problems to the misguided policy of certain individuals, however, since many of these issues are the result of the collective action of many people.

The level of economic development affects the probability of human security threats emerging. High-income countries are capable of using preventive or management mechanisms to mitigate the effects of natural disasters and diseases (except probably in cases of full-scale pandemics). High-income countries have largely been immune from civil wars and large-scale organized or unorganized violence (although some are affected by terrorism). On the other hand, low-income countries have difficulty in preventing or managing natural disasters and diseases;

children and their mothers are particularly vulnerable and face much higher risks of unnatural deaths. To the extent that absolute poverty in and of itself is a threat to human security, a low level of economic development is virtually synonymous with a low level of human security. Civil wars, large-scale violence and terrorism, however, may not be the result of a low level of economic development. Nonetheless, as discussed, the implications of the Hobbesian state of nature in which anarchy prevails is that economic development will at best be stagnant. In this sense, the level of economic development and the level of human security threats are related to each other. But the relations are not linear, and the direction of causality may not be very clear. As the recent episodes of the "Arab Spring" illustrate, middle-income countries can also face serious threats to human security in the form of violence induced by political upheavals, terrorism, and as in the case of Syria, civil wars. Additionally, in middle-income countries where there are insufficient social safety-nets, or, for example, there is no effective universal health coverage system, people may face serious "downside risks" if the family's breadwinner suffers from serious illness.

The condition of the world economy could also be a source of threat to human security. A population's living conditions can be severely affected by the price fluctuation of a country's important commodities. The sudden decline of coffee prices in the late 1980s is presented as one of the potential complicating factors that intensified the ethnic confrontation between the Tutsi and the Hutu leading up to the genocide in Rwanda. Large scale financial crises also affect the political, economic and social conditions of a given country, as was apparent in the Southeast Asian countries in the wake of the 1997 Asian Financial Crisis.

The dependency theory is one of the views that argues that there are structural relationships between the "core" of the world economy and its "peripheries," in which the development of the "core" inevitably causes the "underdevelopment" of the peripheries. If these views are correct, the low degree of human security in the peripheries may be explained by the structure of the world economy. Given the dramatic economic growth in China and other East

Asian countries, the simplistic and deterministic version of the dependency theory appears to have lost its persuasiveness, though more refined versions may be relevant.

5. Instruments and agency of Human Security

The above discussion on causes of human insecurity being inevitably sketchy, there is a need for these to be more refined and empirically validated. Causal understanding alone, however, does not provide effective instruments to increase human security; it is important to explore how best to combine various measures to cope with a human security threat based on the analysis of its nature and its underlying causal mechanism. Generally speaking, there are two types of possible instruments, notably one affecting the causes and the other affecting their consequences:

- (1) Instruments that address the underlining causes of human security threats so that their occurrences and existence can be prevented or reduced.
- (2) Instruments that reduce and minimize the damages caused by human security threats once they emerge.

Whereas the first type of policy measures includes those intended to affect the causes of human security threats, it is important to note that there are types of threats whose causes are impossible or undesirable to eliminate. Some threats from nature cannot be controlled. For example, humans cannot stop tectonic plates from shifting to eliminate the risks of earthquakes or volcanic eruptions. Even if we could stop the geological movement around the globe, we may not want to do that. It is also impossible or undesirable to radically change the climate system to eradicate tropical cyclones. In these circumstances, the second type of instrument, defensive measures, is required.

Of course, there may exist options to reduce the frequency or magnitude of disasters. An example of such measures includes "mitigation" efforts in climate change. Efforts to reduce

Green House Gas (GHG) emissions are expected to reduce damage caused by on-going climate change in the long-run. These efforts, however important, are long-term attempts. Even if we can stop the increase of GHG emissions now, we are not able to prevent the significant impacts that will be caused by climate change in the coming decades and centuries. Here again, defensive measures, often called measures of “adaptation” in the discourse of climate change, are required.

Threats from micro-organisms and communicable diseases can be reduced by directly attacking microbes. Polio strains were eradicated in many parts of the world, but the fight against polio continues to be waged in such countries as Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Nigeria. For many types of diseases, it is difficult to eliminate microbes completely; in these cases, the second type of instruments is called for. Finding effective antibiotics and other medicines, improving daily health conditions, strengthening hospitals, and building the capacity of health sector personnel are all needed instruments to defend humans against threats from microbes.

Threats of survival from other humans also pose similar difficulties. If one could isolate a specific source of threat, for example individuals or groups of individuals with the clear intentions of harming others, and could control them entirely, one could prevent the emergence of human security threats. Forceful intervention from outside may work under these circumstances. But forceful intervention has its own risks; it may cause more harm to civilians, who are the most vulnerable. If the situation is close to the true Hobbesian state of war, forceful action against one specific party may not be morally appropriate.

The true remedy to the Hobbesian state of war is to transform it into a less miserable condition. Using the same game theory metaphor, the true solution to a Prisoners Dilemma situation is to alter the payoff matrix so that it becomes a different game with stable and optimal equilibriums. One could transform the nature of the game by promising economic incentives to hostile parties in exchange for cooperative behavior⁶. However, basic political conditions cannot

⁶ If one makes side-payments to both parties in the Prisoners Dilemma for cooperative behavior regardless of the other player’s response, one could transform the PD game into one with a stable and optimum equilibrium. If the side-payments are conditional to cooperation by both parties, the game could become the “stag hunt,” which has both a stable and optimum equilibrium and a stable and suboptimum

easily be fundamentally transformed in the short-term. “Inclusive” political and economic institutions are often referred to as crucial inputs for desirable state-building (Acemoglu and Robinson, 2012, for example). Creating these institutions is not easy. In the short-term, therefore, instruments of the second type to reduce and minimize the damages are needed. Humanitarian assistance and peace-keeping activities are such instruments. Based on the experiences of humanitarian assistance and peace-keeping, especially since the end of the Cold War, practical lessons have to be distilled for more effective operations.

The fundamental measures necessary to reduce threats to well-being are not easy, either. There is growing consensus that inclusive development is the desirable approach to development. The real debate now is centered around what are the concrete measures that contribute to inclusive development. Some of the key components include infrastructure that benefits all parts of the country, universal basic education, agricultural policies that empower smallholder farmers, vocational training for both men and women, universal health coverage, and adequate nutrition for all. To the extent that conditions of the world economy create threats to human security, it is important to introduce measures that foster the stability of basic commodities and of the financial system. But these are all interventions that take effect in the long-term, and may not protect human security when threatened by short-term radical fluctuations and /or natural disasters, civil wars, and diseases. This is where defensive mechanisms, such as humanitarian assistance, quick impact infrastructure development, and short-term and flexible vocational training, become important.

Threats to dignity require fundamental measures to affect the underlining conditions threatening dignity of individuals, especially if their causes are deliberate. Though no easy task, the apartheid regime in South Africa had to be dismantled. Political, economic and social structures that harm human dignity should be eradicated. Education, in the broad sense of

equilibrium. The “stag-hunt” is often regarded as comparable to the state of nature as Locke described and somewhat less stark than the Hobbesian situation, as players do not have strong incentives to deviate from the Pareto optimum equilibrium once they reach it.

upgrading the people's consciousness of human rights, should be promoted. There are also unintended threats to dignity, however. To the extent that social structures reinforce discrimination without it necessarily being apparent to the general public, it can be delicate to implement measures to change them. They may think that these are attempts at imposing different cultural values. There is a need for candid, honest discussions, and respectful persuasion. Threats to dignity may emerge due to a combination of other threats such as natural disaster, diseases, economic downturns, civil wars, and violence. To effectively address the different types of threats, we must use a combination of both fundamental measures and defensive measures.

Finally, there is an issue of agency: who should secure whose human security? It seems apparent that the government that has jurisdiction over the areas affected by human insecurity must play an important role in ensuring the well-being of affected people. Sovereignty as responsibility entails the state has the responsibility to protect citizens from threats to human security. Traditionally, the state is supposed to provide public security, social security and national security to its citizens⁷. The first is to deal with internal violence, the second to provide a minimum level of well-being and human dignity, and the third to protect individuals from external violence. In this sense, human security actually corresponds to the three types of security the state is to provide. It is, therefore, quite natural that states be the major agents in providing human security (It bears reminding that the ultimate objective of national (or state) security, at least of responsible states, is to protect as large a percentage of its population as possible. To that extent, state security enhances the human security of the people within a certain state.) .

However, given the above discussion on the underlining causes of human insecurity and possible instruments to address these, states are not the only agents of human security provision.

⁷ Adam Smith famously pointed out the three duties of the sovereign: “first, the duty of protecting the society from the violence and invasion of other independent societies; secondly, the duty of protecting, as far as possible, every member of the society from the injustice or oppression of every other member of it, or the duty of establishing an exact administration of justice; and, thirdly, the duty of erecting and maintaining certain public works and certain public institutions ...”(Smith, 1979:651). The first corresponds with national security, the second, public security, and the third, though rather minimalist, social security. I owe recognition to Yamakage (2008) for identifying the relationship between human security and the three types of “security” that the state is supposed to provide to its citizens.

First, some of the fundamental causes of threats to human security are not subject to state boundaries. Many of effects of geological, geographic, climatic, biological, ecological, economic and social phenomena go beyond a single state's capacity. To the extent that the fundamental causes are related to the interconnected forces in the global physical, biological/ecological, and human/social spheres, there are limitations to what single states can do. High income and well-functioning states can deploy defensive mechanisms to a significant degree, though this depends on the scale of threats. In this sense, even high income countries may not be able to respond adequately to huge human security threats caused by natural systems or threats coming from beyond borders. A telling example is that of Japan, one of the world's highest-income countries. The country became one of the largest aid recipients after the Great Eastern Japan Earthquake in 2011. In addition, the government of Japan, international governmental organizations, governments of other countries, non-governmental organizations, municipalities, local civil society organizations, business firms and religious organizations all participated in the recovery and reconstruction efforts.

Second, sovereign states differ in terms of capacity and characteristics. High-income states generally have a higher degree of defense or adaptive capacity, while many developing countries lack the capabilities to defend themselves from human security threats, let alone prevent them by unilaterally addressing their fundamental causes. The concept of "fragile state" is now often used to refer to situations in which a state has difficulty in providing many elements of human security⁸. The most extreme case is that of anarchy or of extreme totalitarian regimes, which tend to violate a range of human rights. In those instances, the role of international organizations is important. Peace-keeping missions of the United Nations and other regional organizations, as well as active diplomatic efforts, are necessary to bring peace to chaotic situations or to persuade dictators to change their policies. The idea of responsibility to protect may become necessary in these kinds of extreme conditions. However, we still have a lot to learn

⁸ Tanaka (1996) included my first analysis of fragile states, which I then called the "sphere of chaos."

about effective measures to bring human security to such situations. The Iraq War demonstrated that dismantling a dictatorial regime does not automatically create a situation with higher human security.

Third, stakeholders other than states have distinct capacities to contribute to the enhancement of human security. The business sector and NGOs could react to human security crises more quickly and effectively in certain circumstances. The quality of civil society could influence the degree of damage caused by similar physical and biological threats; it could prevent the occurrence of threats from the social system.

6. Concluding Remarks

Human security is the right concept for the world system of the 21st century, where interactions occur along geological, geographic, climatic, biological, and social systems on the global level, and where unilateral actions by single states are inadequate to deal with threats emerging from such interaction. States are important, but there are limitations to states' capacities, with some being so fragile that they cannot secure many elements needed for human security. Some high income states may also struggle, albeit not to the same extent. International and global cooperation is needed, and all stakeholders should be mobilized to enhance human security.

However, the above discussion indicates how ignorant we still are about the underlining causes, their interaction with each other, and useful instruments to cope with these threats. Most of my observations presented above are preliminary, tentative and hypothetical. But to increase our knowledge on human security, we need theoretical clarity and must be ready to conduct more empirical studies. My above efforts are simply an attempt at providing theoretical clarity and presenting some propositions to be tested empirically. I hope that it will be the basis for an improved theoretical framework and will lead to more conclusive empirical statements about human security.

References

- Acemoglu, Daron, and James Robinson. 2012. *Why nations fail: The origins of power, prosperity, and poverty*. Random House Digital, Inc.
- Aldrich, Daniel P., and Yasuyuki Sawada. 2015. "The physical and social determinants of mortality in the 3.11 tsunami." *Social Science & Medicine* 124 (2015):66-75
- Collier, Paul, V. L. Elliot, Havard Hegre, Anke Hoeffler, Marta Reynal-Querol, and Nicholas Sambanis. 2003. *Breaking the Conflict Trap: Civil War and Development Policy*, World Bank Policy Research Report. World Bank/Oxford University Press.
- Collier, Paul, and Anke Hoeffler. 2002. "Greed and Grievance in Civil Wars." Working Paper Series 2002-01. Centre for the Study of African Economies, Oxford, U.K.
- Commission on Human Security (CHS). 2003. *Human Security Now*. New York: Commission on Human Security.
- Diamond, Jared. 1997. *Guns, Germs, and Steel: A Short History of Everybody for the Last 13,000 Years*. Chatto & Windus.
- Hobbes, Thomas (Edited by G.B. Maacpherson). 1968 (originally 1651). *Leviathan*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Lodgaard, Sverre, 2004. 'Human Security – concept and operationalization'. In Marie Muller and Bas de Gaay Fortman (eds.), *From Warfare to Welfare*. Assen: Royal van Gorcum, pp. 16-38.
- MacFarlane, S. Neil, and Yuen Foong Khong. 2006. *Human Security and the UN - A Critical History*. Indiana University Press.
- Mack, Andrew. 2002. 'Human Security in the new millennium.' *Work in Progress: A Review of Research of the United Nations University* 16 (3): 4-6.
- McNeill, William. 1976. *Plagues and Peoples*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.
- Paris, Roland. 2001. "Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air," *International Security* 26-2 : 87-102.
- Rawls, John (Edited by Samuel Freeman). 2007. *Lectures on the History of Political Philosophy*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Shimada, Go. Forthcoming. The Role of Social Capital after Disasters: An Empirical Study of Japan based on Time-Series-Cross-Section (TSCS) Data from 1970 to 2009. *JICA Research Institute Working Paper*.
- Shimada, Go. 2014. A Quantitative Study of Social Capital on the Tertiary Sector of Kobe - Have Social Capital Promoted Economic Reconstruction Since the Great Hanshin Awaji Earthquake? *JICA Research Institute Working Paper*
- Smith, Adam. 1979. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Company, 1979.
- Stewart, Frances. ed. 2008. *Horizontal Inequalities and Conflict: Understanding Group Violence in Multiethnic Societies*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan
- Tadjbakhsh, Shahrbanou and Anuradha Chenoy. *Human Security: Concepts and Implications*, New York: Routledge, 2007.
- Tanaka, Akihiko. 1996. *Atarashii chusei: 21seiki no sekai shisutemu*. Tokyo: Nihonkeizai shimbunsha. (Akihiko Tanaka (translated by Jean Connell Hoff). 2002. *The New Middle Ages: The World System in the 21st Century*. Tokyo: The International House of Japan.)
- The Comprehensive National Security Study Group. 1980. Report on Comprehensive National Security (<http://www.ioc.u-tokyo.ac.jp/~worldjpn/documents/texts/JPSC/19800702.O1E.html>).
- UNDP. 1994. *Human Development Report 1994: New Dimensions of Human Security*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Yamakage, Susumu. 2008. "Chikyu shakai no kadai to ningen no anzenhosho" (Challenges to the Global Community and Human Security) in Takahashi, Tetsuya and Yamakage, Susumu, eds. *Ningen no anzenhoso* (Human Security). Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 2008: 1-18.
- World Bank. 2011. *World Development Report 2011: Conflict, Security, and Development*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

Abstract (in Japanese)

要約

しばしば曖昧であるとの批判はなされるものの、「人間の安全保障」は、世界の平和、開発、外交をめぐる議論において重要な地位を占めてきた。「貧困と絶望から免れ、自由と尊厳のもとに生きる権利」(UN Resolution A/RES/66/290) というような広義の定義の有用性を指摘しつつ、本論文は、人間の安全保障のさまざまな側面を体系的に検討する学際的理論枠組み--人間の安全保障への脅威の発生システム(物理、生命、社会)に基づく分類、人間の安全保障への脅威発生の因果関係、脅威対応への手段、人間の安全保障確保のための主体の問題--を提示する。人間の安全保障に対する脅威の源泉としての三つのシステム分類(物理システム、生命システム、社会システム)は、(1)物理学・化学に基礎をおく諸科学や工学、(2)生物学・生態学に基礎をおく諸科学、(3)社会科学の学問分野の区別に対応している。人間の安全保障に関する望ましい理論は、脅威発生のメカニズムに関して、これらの多くの学問分野の知見に依存しなければならない。それに加え、人間が同時に物理的、生命的、そして社会的存在であることを念頭に、三つのシステム間の相互作用についての探究を進めなければならないと本論文は論じる。社会システム内での人間の安全保障を分析するにあたっては、本論文は、とりわけ人間の安全保障に影響をあたえる「集合行動」の側面の重要性に着目すべきであると論じる。その関連で、人間の安全保障が恒常的に脅かされる状態として、ホッブズのいう「自然状態」を再検討することの理論的有用性が言及される。人間の安全保障を確保する手段として、本論文は、脅威の原因に影響を与える手段と、脅威の結果に影響を与える手段の二つを区別している。どのような脅威にいかなる手段を組み合わせ対応するかは、脅威の性格や発生のメカニズムに即して適切に行われなければならない。最後に本論文は、誰が誰の人間の安全保障を確保するかに関する主体の問題を論ずる。基本的には責任ある主権国家が決定的な役割を果たすとの認識を示しつつも、本論文は、地球的規模でかつ相互関連性の高い人間の安全保障への脅威の性格からして、さまざまな関係主体--国家、国際組織、企業、市民社会組織、学術機関など--の協力が不可欠であることを主張する。