JICA Research Institute

JICA-RI Working Paper

Human Security in Practice: East Asian Experiences

Does the Concept of Human Security Generate Additional Value? An Analysis of Japanese Stakeholder Perceptions

Kaoru Kurusu

No. 122

March 2016

JICA Research Institute

This paper was prepared as part of a research project on “Human Security in Practice: East Asian Experiences,” organized by the Japan International Cooperation Agency Research Institute (JICA-RI).

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

Does the Concept of Human Security Generate Additional Value? An Analysis of Japanese Stakeholder Perceptions

Kaoru Kurusu*

Abstract

Conceptual debates on what constitutes human security have continued for two decades. However, the question remains as to whether the introduction of 'human security' offers any added value to the thinking and ways of achieving wellbeing and security. To provide a preliminary answer to this question, this paper focuses on the case of Japan, a country acknowledged as being one of the most committed advocates of human security in its foreign policy.

This paper aims at collecting data on Japanese key stakeholder perceptions on the utility of the human security concept by conducting interviews with those who are active in the field of human security in government, academia, civil society and the private sector. Based on these interviews, this paper presents 'issues for further research' on the question of the added value of human security by observing how the human security concept has been understood and evaluated as well as actually applied in practice by Japanese stakeholders.

The Japanese interviewees working in various sectors not only found at least some utility in the human security concept but also our interviews revealed some essential possibilities that the human security notion might bring: greater emphasis could be placed on 'onsite needs and people-related needs'; the 'comprehensiveness' of the notion can provide a totally different approach to complex situations of human insecurities; and the 'freedom to live in dignity' might add a stronger human face to development and security-related projects. Many of the interviewees pointed out the utility of human security in addressing human insecurities in Japan as well.

The paper suggests areas for future human security research. Such will include whether a stronger cross-sectoral/inter-departmental approach could increase the effectiveness of human security approach; how reluctant authorities can be persuaded to accept international assistance; how transnational actors can improve human security when state sovereignty is at issue; how human dignity aspect can be developed in human security policy and research.

Keywords: human security, Japan, perception, stakeholder, interview

* Professor, Graduate School of Law, Kobe University (kurusu@dragon.kobe-u.ac.jp).

1. Introduction

1.1 Objectives of the Paper

In the field of international public policy, a variety of human security issues have emerged over the past two decades. The security of states is not necessarily the same as individual's and community's security. Policies for national security and domestic stability sometimes infringe on the security of people. In a rapidly globalizing world, threats to people can easily spread beyond territorial borders, as illustrated by such phenomena as economic crises, pandemics, human trafficking, and terrorism. In the international arena, the notion of human security was first highlighted in the UNDP report of 1994[1] and since then has been mentioned and developed in a series of reports, declarations and resolutions of regional organizations along with the United Nations.[2]

Among these documents, the report of the Commission on Human Security (CHS), *Human Security Now*, published in 2003, known as the Ogata-Sen report after its main authors, specifically elaborated the concept in a way that the human-centered approach could be put into practice.[3] The report aimed at adding new value to existing policies and activities. It also accentuates the fact that human security can provide new insights into humanitarian and development policies and projects. The commission's report focuses on these key elements:

(i) It establishes that the goal of human security is to assure three freedoms (freedom from want, freedom from fear and freedom to live in dignity) for people and community.

(ii) Human security pays attention to the aspect of downside risks.

---

[1] UNDP, *Human Development Report*, 1994.

[2] See Conclusion of the G8 Foreign Ministers' Meeting, Köln, June 9-10, 1999; 2004 APEC Ministerial Meeting, Joint Statement: One Community, Our Future, Santiago, Chile, 17 - 18 Nov 2004. The following resolutions have been adopted in the UN General Assembly: 2005 World Summit Outcome, 15 September 2005, A/RES/60/1; "Follow-up to Paragraph 143 on Human Security of the 2005 World Summit Outcome," 16 July 2010, A/RES/64/291; Follow-up to Paragraph 143 on Human Security of the 2005 World Summit Outcome, 10 September 2012, A/RES/66/290.

[3] Commission on Human Security, *Human Security Now*.

(iii) Human security helps individuals and communities not only *cope with* actual threats but also works to *prevent* them. To put it in more conventional terms, to prevent risks for human survival, strengthening the 'resilience' of people and society is the key.

(iv) The goals of human security would be better achieved by combining protection and empowerment

(v) The human security approach stresses the significance of going beyond sectors (a multi-sectoral approach) since most human security issues are crosscutting in nature

(vi) The goals of human security would be better achieved by approaching not only individuals but also communities.

There have been various human security definitions advocated by different actors: such as the Canadian version of human security, especially around the turn of the century, and the EU version (more precisely, proposed by a study group on EU's security capabilities.[4] However, the concept elaborated by the CHS went through further elaboration and review processes from 2005 through 2012 so that it developed into the most comprehensive multilateral framework, that is, the one adopted by United Nations.

Considering that conceptual debates over what constitutes human security have taken place for two decades,[5] to what extent has it had an impact on the real world? Has the introduction of 'human security' brought about any added value to our wellbeing and security, especially to the most vulnerable people in the region of East Asia?[6] To give a preliminary answer to this question, this paper focuses on the case of Japan, the country acknowledged as being one of the most committed advocates of human security in its foreign policy. Several

[4] Study Group on Europe's Security Capabilities, A Human Security Doctrine for Europe (2004), http://www.lse.ac.uk/depts/global/studygroup/studygroup.htm.

[5] For example, see Roland Paris, "Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?" *International Security* 26, no. 2 (2001): 87-102; Edward Newman and Oliver Richmond, eds., *The United Nations and Human Security* (New York: Palgrave, 2001); Gary King and Christopher Murray, "Rethinking Human Security," *Political Science Quarterly* 226-4 (2001-2002): 585-610; Shahrbanou Tadjbakhsh and Anuradha Chenoy, *Human Security: Concepts and Implications* (London: Routledge, 2007).

[6] East Asia in this research means the ASEAN member states plus China, South Korea and Japan, according to the project scheme prepared by the JICA-RI.

East Asian countries use equivalent concepts to human security, while other countries in the region at least recognize in principle the importance of securing people's lives. However, Japan is a special case due to its explicit stance of having accepted and promoted the concept of human security from the very outset.

Despite Japan's status as one of the main advocates of human security, empirical analyses on its commitment to human security have been relatively few. Studies of the Japanese government's human security policy in general have been undertaken by scholars such as Tan and Edstrom.[7] Their studies present interesting summaries of policy processes, but they are not based on systematically collected empirical data. Meanwhile, Kojima and Yamakage[8] provide an interesting analysis of deliberations in the parliament using Diet Records as data, but this only focuses on perceptions of parliamentary members. Kurusu analyzes the historical process of policy formulation by the Japanese government and policy elites by using the information based on interviews, but this study does not include civil society and corporate actors.[9] To sum up, previous research falls short in two ways: Primary data on Japanese stakeholders' perceptions of human security has not as yet been systematically collected and analysis of such perceptions is very scarce.

Therefore, in order to address the gap in the empirical data on Japanese stakeholders and related analysis, this paper first aims at collecting data on Japanese key stakeholder perceptions on the utility of the human security concept by conducting interviews with them.

---

[7] Also see Julie Gilson and Phillida Purvis,"Japan's Pursuit of Human Security: Humanitarian Agenda or Political Pragmatism?" *Japan Forum* 15, no. 2 (2003): 193-207; Yoshihide Soeya, "Japanese Security Policy in Transition: The Rise of International and Human Security," *Asia-Pacific Review* 12, no. 1 (2005): 103-116; Akiko Fukushima, Ningen no Anzenhosho [Human Security], Tokyo: Chikura Shobo, 2010; David Bosold and Sascha Werthes, "Human Security in Practice: Canadian and Japanese Experiences," *Internationale Politik und Gesellschaft* I (2005): 84-101.

[8] Subaru Yamakage and Kojima Tomoyuki, *"Nihon Seifu to Kokunai no 'Ningen no Anzen Hosho' Nninshiki no Kairi – Kokkai no Giron o Chushin ni"* [Discrepancies in Recognition on 'Human Security' in Japan: Focusing on Arguments within both Houses of the Diet] Policy and Governance Working Paper Series, no. 98 (March 2006): 1-24.

[9] Kaoru Kurusu, "Japan as an Active Agent for Global Norms: The Political Dynamism Behind the Acceptance and Promotion of 'Human Security'," trans. Rikki Kersten. *Asia Pacific Review* 18, no. 2 (2011): 115-37.

'Stakeholders' here means those who are active individuals in the field of human security in government, academia, civil society and private sectors. Second, this paper tries to establish hypotheses or 'issues for further research' on the question of the additional value of human security by looking at how the concept of human security has been understood and evaluated, as well as actually applied in practice by Japanese stakeholders. To these ends, this research is based on data drawn mainly from in-depth interviews. A small team of interviewers[10] conducted interviews with ten major individuals who are well known in the field of human security. Besides the interviews, this study has been supplemented by other primary sources such as the Diet Record[11], white papers from the public sector, and corporate reports and additional secondary source publications.

In the next section this paper will present a brief overview of how Japan's human security policy has evolved. The second section will present the methods used in this research, explain the selection criteria of interviewees and present the six interview questions. After this, the subsequent sections will analyze perceptions of key stakeholders along the line of these six elements. I will then conclude by providing implications for further research based on this preliminary study.

1.2 Human Security in Japan's Foreign Policy[12]

This section highlights the characteristics of historical views on human security in Japan and analyzes their evolution, in ideas and approaches, based on our interviews.

When the *Human Development Report* was published in 1994, only a small number of Japanese policymakers were interested in the notion of human security. However, the

[10] The team consisted of Kaoru Kurusu, Yoichi Mine, Ryutato Murotani and Sachiko Goto. See Table 1.
[11] Available from the following data search system: http://kokkai.ndl.go.jp/.
[12] For a detailed analysis of Japan's foreign policy making regarding human security, see Kurusu, "Japan as an Active Agent for Global Norms," trans. Rikki Kersten. (2011): 115-37.

definition and usage of the term human security [*ningen no anzenhosho*] by policymakers was far from settled. For instance, during this period, according to the Diet Record, some parliamentarians used the notion in the context of domestic issues such as the government's response to the Great Hanshin Awaji Earthquake, social welfare policy and the issue of US bases in Okinawa, whereas others referred to human security in debating foreign policies. Notably Prime Minister MURAYAMA Tomiichi, advocated in 1995 that Japan, with its pacifist constitution, should pursue human security as one of its primary international policy approaches.[13]

However, Murayama failed to take any clear initiative toward realizing this goal before he left office, partly due to his short tenure as prime minister. Only after Prime Minister Keizo OBUCHI came to power did the Japanese government start to regard human security as its main foreign policy tool. From 1997 through 1998, Japan sought an appropriate policy concept that succinctly expressed the philosophy behind Japan's assistance to people suffering from the Asian economic crisis. Since then, the Japanese government has engaged itself in promoting and implementing the concept – one step toward this was the establishment of the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security in 1999. Gradually from this period onward, human security has become a term that the government has used primarily for promoting its foreign policy in multilateral organizations and development policy (i.e., the freedom from want aspect has been emphasized more).

While the Japanese government pursued human security in issues related to official development assistance (ODA) and global issues, the Canadian government also used human security to denote its policies when campaigning for the treaty banning anti-personnel landmines and later in establishing the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS). This was done in order to discuss the crucial issue of transcending

[13] The Upper House Budget Committee in the 132nd Parliament, February 24, 1995.

sovereignty in cases of large-scale loss of life with genocidal intentions or due to state neglect, or in situations of failed states experiencing large-scale ethnic cleansing.[14] In short, it explicitly articulated 'freedom from fear' as a policy priority. As a result of the differing stances of Japan and Canada, human security in a sense became a 'politicized' concept. Japan therefore took the initiative of establishing the CHS partially due to the need to address the gap between the two governments' stances toward human security. The commission was assigned the task of reconsidering the concept of human security holistically and submitting a report to the UN Secretary General. In a word, it was to 'edit' the concept so that it could be utilized for actual policies and projects on the ground. In 2003, the commission issued the *Human Security Now* report mentioned at the beginning of this paper.

After the report was published, the Japanese government introduced its main ideas into the revised ODA Charter of 2003 and since then human security has become one of the fundamental principles of Japan's ODA. The Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), under the new leadership of OGATA Sadako, a former UNHCR, also began to incorporate its ideas into the organization's principles. In 2004 JICA presented its revised policy pillars: "on the ground," "efficacy, benefit, speed" and "human security." In order to realize the policy pillars in actual projects, JICA introduced the "Seven Aspects of Human Security."[15] The CHS report of 2003 was so influential that it encouraged Japanese stakeholders, though mainly governmental actors, to rethink or confirm their views on human security. The Japanese

[14] Regarding Canadian policy on human security, see for example Rob McRae and Don Hubert, eds., *Human Security and the New Diplomacy: Protecting People, Promoting Peace* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001); Heather Smith, "Diminishing Human Security: The Canadian Case," ed. Sandra Maclean, David R. Black and Timothy M. Shaw, *A Decade of Human Security* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 73-84.

[15] The seven aspects are: (1) reaching those in need through a human-centered approach; (2) empowering people as well as protecting them; (3) focusing on the most vulnerable people, whose survival, livelihood and dignity are at risk; (4) comprehensively addressing both "freedom from want" and "freedom from fear;" (5) responding to people's needs by assessing and addressing threats through flexible and inter-sectoral approaches; (6) working with both governments and local communities to realize sustainable development; and (7) strengthening partnerships with various actors to achieve higher impact from assistance.

stakeholders' understanding of human security more or less converged around the ideas that the commission's report presented.

Though progressing more slowly, human security started to be incorporated into other foreign policy fields than development assistance. First, human security came to be implemented in a manner closely related to the peacebuilding activities that the Japanese government launched at the beginning of the 2000s. In 2002 the final report of the Advisory Group on International Cooperation for Peace chaired by AKASHI Yasushi underlined the point that Japan should go beyond traditional ways of ODA and make greater contributions to the areas of conflict prevention, peace consolidation and state-building.[16] In the 2003 ODA Charter introduced above, the Japanese government made clear that its overseas assistance would be used for peacebuilding activities; that is, consolidation of peace and state-building in Japan's terminology:

> In order to address direct threats to individuals such as conflicts, disasters, and infectious diseases, it is important not only to consider the global, regional and national perspectives but also the perspective of human security, which focuses on individuals. Accordingly Japan will implement ODA to strengthen the capacity of local communities through human resource development. To ensure that human dignity is maintained at all stages, from conflict through to the reconstruction and development stages, Japan will extend assistance for the protection and empowerment of individuals. [17]

In this way human security has become closely related to the concept of peacebuilding. Human security and peacebuilding were expected to add new official flavors to Japan's foreign policy posture by expanding areas of activities for 'international contribution.'

---

[16] Report of the Advisory Group on International Cooperation for Peace (2002).
[17] Government of Japan and Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA), *Japan's Official Development Assistance Charter* (Tokyo: Government of Japan and MOFA, 2003).

Second, as human security has become part of the formal external policy vocabulary for the Japanese government in the context that the government started expanding its scope of international cooperation to peacebuilding overseas, the Ministry of Defense and SDF have also slowly started to mention, though not often, the term 'human security.' The National Defense Program Guideline of 2010 referred to human security as one of fundamental principles of Japan's national security. The National Security Strategy of December 2013 adopted by the Cabinet also refers to human security as one of the national security principles that Japan upholds when tackling with global issues.[18] However, despite the fact that human security is mainly used as a guiding principle in dealing with global issues, its direct connection to the SDF missions has not yet clearly been defined in the wordings of such policy papers.

From the interviews I conducted with government officials in my previous research[19] I developed the perception that, although human security has been introduced as an important foreign policy principle, it has not been necessarily been accepted in every department of their organizations. The level of recognition of human security is relatively higher within JICA due to its role as the implementation agency for development assistance, as opposed to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA), which deals with a variety of diplomatic issues other than human security. Within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, human security has tended to be regarded as a matter to be dealt with mainly by bodies such as the International Cooperation Bureau. How seriously the Ministry of Defense has incorporated the notion of human security will require strict scrutiny at the time when inter-state tensions have rapidly gained more attention in the national security sector.

---

[18] National Security Strategy, December 2013, http://japan.kantei.go.jp/96_abe/documents/2013/__icsFiles/afieldfile/2013/12/17/NSS.pdf. Also see Chiyuki Aoi, "Japanese Participation in Peace Operations," *Asia-Pacific Nations in International Peace Support and Stability Operations*, ed. Chiyuki Aoi and Yee-Kuang Heng (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2014), 64.

[19] Kurusu, "Japan as an Active Agent for Global Norms," trans. Rikki Kersten (2011).

In the national Diet, we notice that the term has been used more freely by MPs with various nuances. Human security was mentioned by those who support Japan's humanitarian missions and peace support activities in Iraq. Other MPs used the term, on the other hand, to criticize Japan's decision to send the SDF within the framework of a peace support mission under the Coalition of Willing.[20]

Meanwhile from the mid-2000s onwards, MOFA, as the main advocate of human security in the Japanese context, has been actively disseminating the human security notion in the UN General Assembly. Such initiatives led to the inclusion of a paragraph on human security in the final document of the UN General Assembly World Summit in 2005 and adoption of two resolutions on human security in 2010 and 2012.[21] It was a highpoint in Japan's understanding of human security as its foreign and international policy tool.

After 2012, there were two developments that drove a number of Japanese stakeholders to reconsider the meaning and utility of human security, be it as a policy concept or an approach. First, since the government has achieved its tentative goal of acquiring the GA resolution, it is now faced with a situation in which it might lose further impetus in the field of human security. The government especially has tried to explore ideas on how to utilize human security as a tool for increasing its successful impact in foreign policy arenas. Second, the Japanese stakeholders were moved by the experience of the Great East Japan Earthquake in March 2011 and the radioactive contamination subsequently caused by Fukushima nuclear power plants. Even as a relatively new development, it has become more common to hear the

[20] For example, the statement by Tomoko Abe (Social Democratic Party) at the Lower House Plenary Session in the 168nd Parliament, October 23, 2007.

[21] See 2005 World Summit Outcome, September 15, 2005, A/RES/60/1; "Follow-up to Paragraph 143 on Human Security of the 2005 World Summit Outcome," July 16, 2010, A/RES/64/291; Follow-up to Paragraph 143 on Human Security of the 2005 World Summit Outcome, September 10, 2012, A/RES/66/290.

argument that human security should be applied to domestic issues as well in the same way as Japan has applied it overseas – a point that emerged in our interviews as well.[22]

At the time of writing, Japanese domestic politics is faced with a national debate on whether to enact laws relating to collective self-defense and enhancing SDF's overseas capabilities – in other words, implementing a more traditional/military/state security agenda. Although opinion polls showed the majority of the Japanese population was against or cautious about the new laws, the laws finally passed in the Diet on September 19, 2015. This process provoked debates on the long-standing state identity of pacifism within Japanese society. Though it is not within a scope of this paper, we should continue to observe how understandings and definitions of human security are being dealt with in the future through this debate.

2. Methodology

2.1 Method

This research explicitly employed descriptive analysis mainly based on data collected from interviews, not quantitative, large-N type analysis. I generally acknowledge the utility of such quantitative 'empirical' studies, but I must choose a qualitative method in view of the fact that the research level of this field has to start from a scratch, i.e., data generation and exploratory analysis. Here, the intention is not to test existing hypotheses on causal relations for scientific generalization with an abundance of data; in fact, there is little reliable and first-hand data before this research. Most specifically, there has been little adequate data on Japanese stakeholders' in-depth perceptions in the field of human security as yet, so that collected interview narratives are valuable for further analysis of Japan's policy-making process and its

[22] Makoto Katsumata, "Gaiko Seisaku Toshiteno Ningennoanzenhosho: Jinkentaikoku heno Rodomappu" [Human Security as Foreign Policy: A Roadmap to a Human Rights Great Power], *Kokusaimondai* [International Affairs] 603 (July-August 2011): 33.

involvement in human security issues. The scope of this research is limited to the collection of qualitative knowledge and extracting descriptive inference from it. That is, to depict characteristics and patterns of the Japanese key stakeholder perceptions of human security, while leaving adequate room for incorporating specificity and details of their discourse by utilizing their narratives.[23]

Thus I employed the following methods. First, 'semi-structured' interviews were conducted. This involves exploring a socially significant issue to generate detailed and specific data of the Japanese stakeholders' experiences and perceptions from within concrete contexts. The research process also aims to collect qualitative knowledge expressed in ordinary language. The selection of interviewees was not based on representativeness among a population, but on their significance for the research theme itself (i.e., key informant interviews).[24] The interviewees have either been involved in policy making and implementation, written about human security, or advocated its use by governments. Second, such qualitative data has been used for a categorization of characteristics and patterns and for suggesting preliminary hypotheses rooted in the case being studied.[25] Such results could serve partly as a basis for structured-focused comparison of the East Asian countries in the future.[26]

---

[23] Regarding qualitative case study methods, see Alexander George and Andrew Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2005); John Creswell, *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Approaches* (Los Angeles: Sage Publications, 2013).

[24] It could be said that especially in the cases of the civil society sector, private sector and academia, the level of representation by the interviewees is even lower.

[25] This is close to what has been referred to as a 'grounded theory' approach or a theory rooted in the original data themselves. It is based on 'abductive' ways of knowing in which researchers collect data in the field, then build preliminary theoretical hypotheses, return to the field again for additional data collection and then modify the theory. Such a method is utilized when the issue is quite new or unexplored and when in spite of the significance of the theme in the society data set for analysis has not been created. For more on the abduction method, see Peregrine Schwartz–Shea and Dvora Yanow, *Interpretive Research Design: Concepts and Processes* (London: Routledge, 2012: 23-43); Jörg Friedrichs and Friedrich Kratochwil, "On Acting and Knowing: How Pragmatism Can Advance International Relations Research and Methodology," *International Organization* 63, no. 3 (2009): 701-31.

[26] The current research is an issue-centered case study; it focuses on the case of Japan and is planned to be a part of a larger project by JICA-RI encompassing the East Asian region. As for structured-focused comparison, see George and Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences* (2005).

When semi-structured interviews are conducted,[27] in principle, interviews proceed with a prepared common 'interview guide' or list of questions. Interviewers, however, can modify such questions, flexibly responding to interactions between the interviewee and interviewer. In this way, we can let interviewees construct their 'narrative' freely, at the same time pursuing a common research objective. During communications and interactions between interviewers and interviewees, new insights can be found that might not have come up had a more structured process been followed.

2.2 Interviewees

The following criteria were employed for selection of interviewees. First, those who have been engaged in human security-related projects, policy or research and are known as being active in the field of human security. For the purpose of this paper, ordinary people or beneficiaries of human security projects were not included.[28] Second, interviewees were selected not only from the government sector but also from various sectors including academia, civil society and business in order to draw out a wide range of perceptions on human security and its (non) significance. Detailed interviews were conducted with ten key individuals, with at least one person from one sector. The list of our interviewees is shown in Table 1.

---

[27] For interview methods, see Steiner Qvale and Svend Brinkmann, *InterViews: Learning Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing* (Los Angeles: Sage Publications, 2009). And For interviewing policy elites, see Lewis Anthony Dexter, *Elite and Specialized Interviewing* (Colchester: ECPR Press, 2012).

[28] As discussed earlier, Japan's human security policy has been seen as nearly the equivalent of overseas development assistance and its expanded version including peacebuilding. Thus 'recipients of human security-oriented policy' refers to recipient countries and their people. It is beyond the scope of this research to investigate overseas recipients' perceptions. The author thanks the reviewer for raising this question. Although it is not a recipient perception survey, for case studies on projects on the ground done by the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security, see Japan Center for International Exchange, *Human Security in the United Nations* (Tokyo: JCIE, 2004); Susan Hubbard and Tomoko Suzuki, *Building Resilience: Human Security Approaches to AIDS in Africa and Asia* (Tokyo: Japan Center for International Exchange, 2008).

[Table 1] List of Interviewees

#	Interviewee	Sector	Position	Date of Interview	Duration
1	OKADA Miku*	Aid Agency	JICA (Global Issues and Development Partnership)	9/26/2013	60 min.
2	OHISHI Kensuke*	Aid Agency	JICA (then staff of Peacebuilding and Regional Development)	9/26/2013	60 min.
3	SHIMADA Tomoko*	Aid Agency	JICA (then staff of Peacebuilding and Regional Development)	9/26/2013	60 min.
4	HOSHINO Toshiya	University	Professor of Osaka University (International Relations)	11/12/2013	60 min.
5	KAJI Misako**	University	Professor of the University of Tokyo seconded from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs	11/11/2013	74 min
6	TANIAI Masaaki	Parliament (the Upper House)	New Komeito	2/26/2014	50 min.
7	INOGUCHI Kuniko	Parliament (the Upper House)	Liberal Democratic Party (LDP)	2/26/2014	75 min.
8	KANEDA Koichi	Company	Takeda Pharmaceutical Company (Senior Director, CSR, Corporate Communications Department)	3/10/2014	70 min.
9	KAGAWA Takehiro	Government	Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Ambassador, Director-General for Global Issues)	3/10/2014	60 min.
10	OSA Yukie***	NGO	Association for Aid and Relief Japan (President)	4/17/2014	65 min.
	Interviews were conducted by the author September 2013 through April 2014. When specified in the list, interviews were done in collaboration with Yoichi Mine (Doshisha University), Ryutaro Murotani and Sachiko Goto (JICA-RI). In this paper citations of comments by the interviewees are specified by the number listed in this table such as 'Interviewee 1.' * Interview was conducted by Kurusu, Mine, Murotani and Goto. ** Interview was conducted by Mine, Murotani and Goto. *** Interview was conducted by Goto.				

Interviews and analysis were conducted in the following way: the author started interviews soon after the research was commissioned by JICA-RI, during the period from September 2013 through April 2014. The duration of the interviews was approximately 60 minutes. Each interview was audio recorded and transcribed word-for-word in Japanese and then translated into English.

2.3 Questionnaire

In each interview, we raised six clusters of questions: (i) understandings of human security; (ii) human security in the region; (iii) cross-border responses to human security; (iv) human security in practice; (v) the conceptual basis of human security; and (vi) the added value of human security. Each cluster was broken into a couple of concrete questions as shown in Table 2.[29] Interviewees could express their views based on either personal opinions or positions representing their organizations; so we asked them to make it clear when their statements were based on their personal viewpoints. The description in the following sections flows along the line of these six elements.

[Table 2] Interview Questions

(i) Understandings of human security	How do you understand human security as a concept?
(ii) Human security in the region	What do you think are the major issues of human security in East Asia? Please indicate both urgent threats and long-term risks faced by the region. - What do you think are the major issues of human security in Japan? Please indicate both urgent threats and long-term risks faced by your country. - How should such situations be tackled?
(iii) Cross-border responses to human security	(iii-i) Accepting assistance Suppose that Japan was affected by a massive natural disaster (earthquake, tsunami, etc.) and its magnitude was considered to be far beyond the control of the government. - Do you think that the country should accept overseas assistance? - How about in cases where there is an escalation of violence? (iii-ii) Providing assistance In case of a massive natural disaster in East Asia that was beyond the control of the government, if the government of the affected country were reluctant to accept assistance from overseas, how would you deal with the situation? - How about in a cases where there is an escalation of violence?
(iv) Human security in practice	Do you (or your organization) think both protection and empowerment are equally important? Or do you (or your organization) prioritize one over the other? Why?

[29] These six clusters and specific questions are the result of several rounds of discussion and experimental interviews within JICA-RI.

(v) Conceptual basis of human security	The concept of human security consists of 'freedom from fear', 'freedom from want', and 'freedom to live in dignity'. - What do you think is the relationship between these three elements, if any? Do you (or your organization) attach weight to a particular element? If so, why? Do you think these three elements are interrelated? - 'Freedom to live in dignity' has been gradually recognized, although rather later than the other two freedoms. What do you think is meant by the addition of 'dignity' to the debates around human security?
(vi) Added value of human security	Do you think the concept of human security has induced any change in the ways of thinking, policy-making and/or practices? Would there be any difference now if the concept had not been introduced?

3. Conceptual Interpretation of Human Security:

3.1 More as a Practical Approach to Understand and Tackle Reality than an Abstract Concept

With regard to the characteristics of the usage of the human security concept in Japan, previous literature[30] and other data sources in general point to the following: human security has been regarded as a governmental policy slogan; a broad and comprehensive conception that is used for development assistance and for UN contexts; state security and human security are complementary.

In addition, Kurusu elucidated that in more concrete settings, such as within the UN context, the Japanese government has been cautious about ensuring that state sovereignty be respected and that non-military approaches to human security are prioritized. The cautious posture adopted by Japan has been due to consideration over uneasiness among developing countries about the potential for unwanted interventions.[31] In the formal debate of the UN General Assembly in 2010, for instance, the representative of Japan emphasized the following points: human security does not the entail use of force; it strengthens state sovereignty and does not contradict the UN Charter; and it is a different concept from 'the responsibility to protect'. Japan's interpretation can be understood more clearly when compared with statements

[30] For instance, Fukushima, *Ningen no Anzenhosho*; Kurusu, "Japan as an Active Agent for Global Norms"; Tan, "Not Just Global Rhetoric."
[31] Kaoru Kurusu, "Gendankai no Ningen no Anzenhosho" [Human Security at this Stage], *Kokusai Mondai* [International Affairs] no. 603 (July/August 2011): 5-14.

by other governments. In the same meeting, the EU member states stressed that the priority should be issues relating to freedom from fear: peacebuilding, anti-personnel landmines, protection of civilians in military conflicts and protection of children. For them, the responsibility to protect is also a component of human security.[32] On other occasions, European delegations have stressed that the UN should focus on human rights aspects when dealing with human security.

In the following paragraphs, I will evaluate the specific features drawn from our interviews in addition to the general characteristics mentioned above.

3.2 Human Security as Government Policy So Far; However There will be More Possibilities for Non-governmental Actors

As discussed above, in Japan, human security has been regarded as part of the Japanese *government*'s foreign/international policy agenda. Our interviewees likewise mentioned this point, saying that for MOFA, it is regarded as one of its foreign policy pillars and a guiding principle for international cooperation. For the current ruling parties (Liberal Democratic Party [LDP] and New Komeito, as of December 2014), human security is likewise one of the policy pillars, and overall interest in human security issues within the parties is high.[33] In a sense, the concept of human security has gained nearly non-partisan support to date in Japan. However, at the same time, there has been strong criticism against the above idea of 'human security as government policy'; that is, the government has been criticized for using the notion of human

[32] The Spanish representative, with presidency of the Council of the EU, at the UN formal debate on Human Security, 20-21th May 2010.

[33] Opposition parties, such as Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ), also regard human security as one of their foreign policy pillars. See DPJ's Policy Document, *Index 2009*; Fujiwara Kiichi, "Keizai-Kyoryoku: On the Life and Times of Japanese Economic Diplomacy," ed. William Tow, David Walton and Rikki Kersten, *New Approaches to Human Security in the Asia-Pacific: China, Japan and Australia* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2012), 93-106. The Social Democratic Party of Japan has been also an advocate of human security.

security just as a 'slogan' to advertise and sell its foreign policy.[34] Advocating human security and implementing it are not the same.

Besides the government sector, in academic circles for instance – at least in international relations studies – human security has attracted attention over the last decade: a large number of books and articles on the topic have been published. In annual meetings of the Japan Association of International Relations, panels on human security-related issues have been hosted almost every year. In addition, almost all the 'civics' or 'politics and economics' textbooks used in secondary education now refer to human security,[35] and we can assume that some portion of the younger generation has at least heard of human security. However, the concept is far from accepted among the population, at least for the time being. Moreover, Japanese civil society organizations seldom use the term 'human security'. Though their tasks and approaches could quite often be suitably expressed by the notion of human security, they have found limited utility in using the concept thus far.[36]

With the above tendency in mind, 'human security as the government's agenda', our interviewees emphasized other possibilities as well. One interviewee acknowledged that many NGO activities fall within the scope of human security, but more importantly, human security, by putting the human being at the center, can become a novel concept that encourages consideration of problems in a comprehensive way. Thereby it necessitates the collective contributions from various actors' based on a multi-sectoral approach [Interviewee 10]. Another interviewee suggested that private corporations could be involved in human security issues either on their own or in partnership with actors in other sectors [Interviewee 8]. These comments suggest that whether or not the notion of 'human security' is used by various actors

[34] Hsien-Li Tan, "Not Just Global Rhetoric: Japan's Substantive Actualization of its Human Security Foreign Policy," *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific* 10, no. 1 (2010): 159-87.
[35] Textbooks are available at Japan Textbook Research Center in Tokyo.
[36] Many of the civil society organizations had already implemented human security-related projects without using the term.

such as NGOs and corporations, such organizations have been active in human security issues. And *there is the possibility that such a notion could serve as the glue to bring various actors together to cope with such issues by using a comprehensive approach.* In this way, human security will not remain simply a governmental foreign policy slogan.

3.3 Human Security as a Broad and Comprehensive Concept

The second generally known characteristic is that Japanese actors have understood human security as a broad and comprehensive concept. In reality the government used it as both a principle for implementing bilateral official development assistance projects and a term to signify Japan's financial and technical contributions to the global and development agenda within the UN framework. That is, human security is not limited to activities related to 'freedom from fear,' such as protection of civilians in armed conflicts. Issues related to 'freedom from want,' such as poverty alleviation and coping with global issues (infectious disease and natural disasters), have been the main targets of Japan's human security policies. More issues have gradually started to be counted as relating to 'freedom from fear.' These include the removal of anti-personnel landmines, 'consolidation of peace' and 'state building' in Japan's policy terms. At the same time there has also been a growing recognition that both 'freedoms' are interrelatedly involved.

According to the interviews conducted for this research, human security is indeed mostly perceived as a broad and comprehensive concept. The most quintessential examples came from comments by the JICA staff members, who explained that human security is a broad concept and a variety of JICA projects fall generally under the concept. It encompasses issues from health to food and peacekeeping. Concerning this point, an interviewee (an MP/scholar) presented a slightly different but significant observation. That is, 'deep-rooted conflicts' that have emerged since the end of the Cold War have been the reason for increased

attention to human security. And human security must be a concept that can be applied to cases where there has been a 'systematic and mass loss of lives.' These cases cannot be solved only through economic and social measures such as poverty alleviation [Interviewee 7].

3.4 Human Security and State Security are Complementary

The third typical characteristic of the Japanese actors' understanding of human security concerns the relationship between human security and state security. Human security and state security are often seen being at opposite ends of a continuum in their approach to security considerations. However, this does not necessarily mean that state security and human security are contradictory; rather on many occasions, when the state functions well, both can complement each other. Of course, if a government is not functioning and thereby unable to provide security for people, or the government itself undermines people's security by causing or ignoring serious suppression of human rights, genocide and so on, then enhancing state security contradicts or is unrelated to people's security. Among our respondents, there was a common recognition of these points as well.

3.5 Other Points Found from the Interviews

A number of other points that seem worthy of attention are examined in the following paragraphs.

Downside Risks: The CHS report portrayed human security as a way of tackling 'downside risks,' in order to differentiate it from 'human development'. Human development focuses instead on the upward processes of human capability and wellbeing. However awareness of the distinction between the two terms has not been widely acknowledged among the Japanese key stakeholders.

While only few of our interviewees referred to such a conceptual distinction, the interviewee from the private sector found clear meaning in distinguishing between the terms. Private companies have their own comparative advantages in contributing to either human development or human security, saying that the human security concept is better understood when contrasted with the human development concept. The pharmaceutical company he works for, as part of its corporate social responsibility activities, has carried out a number of projects on human security-related issues. He contrasted human security (for downward aspect of lives) with human development (for upward promotion of wellbeing), saying that human security is the more appropriate field for a pharmaceutical company that has been working for patients and their lives [Interviewee 8]. It can be said that *a definition of human security that visibly focuses on downside risks is useful for certain actors*, while a more vague conceptualization is favored in other instances.

Human Security Perceived as a Practical Notion: Though our interviewees grasped human security in both abstract and practical senses, many of the interviewees more often attached practical meaning to human security. Indeed, a university professor seconded from MOFA stated that human security as a way of thinking is not itself novel, but that human security can be meaningful when it becomes an approach to realize such ways of thinking [Interviewee 5]. One interviewee, a scholar, repeatedly stressed that the actual humanitarian result is more important than term usage of human security [Interviewee 4].

Then what are (or can be) the characteristics of the human security concept when considered in a more practical sense? Indeed, for one JICA staff member, the introduction of human security has actually induced them to implement projects directly accessible to people; and that they should not only build the capacity of governments (top-down) but also empower people and communities through grassroots level (bottom-up) approaches [Interviewee 3]. On the other hand, an interviewee from an NGO mentioned that, for NGOs, human security is not

new at all, since the human-centered approach is *raison d'etre* for NGOs. However, it can become innovative and has strength when it encourages a multi-sector/agency approach based on a more comprehensive examination of a problem that cannot be realized by a single NGO [Interviewee 10].

Lastly, an interviewee pointed out that human security as a notion 'securitizes' serious threats to human beings. Securitization brings attention to specific issues, which might in itself be a merit. However, usage of the term 'security' might invoke politicization, and those who would be assisted might as a result become too cautious to accept even a potentially beneficial project for them. Thus the important point is not usage of the term 'human security' but that it is results-oriented [Interviewee 4]. Related issues will be discussed in Section 9 of this paper, on the added value of the human security concept.

4. Risks in East Asia and Japan

4.1 A Variety of Human Security Risks in East Asia: Natural Disasters, Social Risks, and Military Conflicts as Major Threats

According to our interviews, human security risks in East Asia can be categorized into several groups of issues: (i) natural disasters and environmental risks, (ii) inter-state relations, (iii) intra-state or regional conflicts, and (iv) social issues.

First, almost all the interviewees responded that natural disasters, such as earthquakes, tsunamis, and floods, would continue to be short-term as well as long-term risks in the region. This suggests that natural disasters, a distinguishing characteristic of this region, are widely perceived as risks.[37] Natural disasters affect people's lives in various ways. Disaster

[37] United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) and United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) assessed increasing disaster risks in Asia-Pacific are driven by the twin challenges of increasing exposure of its people and economic assets, and the inability of the most vulnerable groups to cope with disasters (UNISDR, October 23, 2012, http://www.unisdr.org/archive/29286). Cross regional comparison of the number of natural disasters for the last two decades shows that the risk in the Asia-Pacific region is the highest (UNESCAP, *Statistical Yearbook for Asia and the Pacific*, 2014).

prevention/reduction has become and will continue to be a crucial agenda item, and it is in most cases a crosscutting issue. One interviewee mentioned that the causes and outcomes of natural disasters in this region demonstrate their complex nature. East Asian countries now face a growing level of urbanization. As urbanization accelerates, ways of controlling and mitigating the risks emanating from natural disasters in densely populated urban areas will become a serious issue [Interviewee 1]. Another interviewee pointed out that natural disasters are likely to cause social instability in some cases as well as degradation in the quality of lives [Interviewee 2].

Second, one of the distinctive characteristics in East Asia, for example, if compared with Africa, is how growing tensions in *inter*-state relations impinge on human security. Three interviewees out of ten referred to inter-state and international system-level relations as urgent sources of human insecurity that deserve attention [Interviewees 5, 7 and 10]. First, the fluctuating relations between Japan, China and South Korea are likely to intensify regional instability, which could lead to human insecurity. Second, one of the respondents focused on system- or structural-level risks. According to 'world-systems theory,' over the next few decades, the world system will be faced with an upward phase of the economic cycle. The theory suggests that the likelihood of major wars increases in such upward phases. The Asia-pacific has become and will continue to be a center of economic growth, and this is what we call 'pivot Asia'. Therefore ways of controlling the risks of major wars and inducing China to be a part of the existing international order will be the most pressing issue not only for state security but for human security. [Interviewee 7].

Third, about a half of the interviewees pointed out that military conflicts or deep-rooted conflicts, such as in Myanmar and Mindanao, are likely to continue to be a source of human insecurity. Military conflicts can affect human security in many ways. They are likely to lead to a degradation of the quality of lives; people may have to flee as refugees or

become internally displaced persons; landmines continue to affect people even after peace agreement is signed [Interviewees 2,3,4,6 and 7].

Fourth, several respondents mentioned that social risks stemming from economic financial crises and the growing wealth gap are likely to affect the most vulnerable groups in the society. Especially in China and the ASEAN countries with their rapid economic growth, a gap between the rich and poor would likely increase human security risks [such as interviewees 2, 3 and 6].

4.2. Human Security Risks in Japan

Human Security as a Domestic Issue for a Developed Society

When we look at the case of Japan, except for the very initial period when the notion had not as yet been established in Japanese foreign policy, the idea of human security has been exclusively applied to foreign policy and development assistance for a long time. Against such tendencies in the past, all of our interviewees stressed that human security should be used as a notion to consider and deal with domestic issues in Japan as well.

One respondent said that for a long time Japan has been regarded as a donor country, but "there is a problem with this understanding." "Haven't we ignored our own domestic issues?" [Interviewee 4]. Another respondent also said that he would feel uncomfortable if the notion was applied only to economic/technical assistance policies for developing countries, adding that human security should be applied to all the individuals regardless of levels of economic development [Interviewee 9]. The Japanese government has understood human security mainly as a foreign policy guideline, not as applicable to its own domestic issues. Thus the government regards human security as something to be dealt with only by MOFA. The concept has not been well recognized among other ministries dealing with related concerns, and therefore close coordination among related agencies, a distinctive characteristic

of human security, has not been activated [Interviewee 10]. Another interviewee pointed out that there are some human security issues that have been systematically left behind as policy priorities even in Japan; these are in areas especially related to women and children, which are also human security issues [Interviewee 7].[38] For some of the interviewees, Japan's experience of the Great East Japan Earthquake in 2011 and subsequent radioactive contamination in Fukushima served as a serious opportunity for reconsideration [Interviewees 4, 5, 6, 8 and 10]. They came to believe that there are downside risks of human security in Japan as well, and that human security as a notion that should be regarded as domestically applicable.

In terms of what human security issues are/will be for Japan, our respondents raised several types of risks: (i) social issues, (ii) natural disasters, and (iii) others including foreign military bases and 'risk society.'[39]

Social Issues: Most of the interviewees pointed out that certain social issues that are typical for developed countries are likely to continue to be human security risks – even in Japan. These issues raised in the interviews include the inadequacy of the social welfare system when Japanese society is faced with a growing aging population and decreasing birth rates. Social issues such as the wealth gap and the plight of homeless people are also regarded as human security issues. The interviewees highlighted recent social issues that are also downside risks, especially for the younger population. These include the so-called 'working poor', who earn low levels of income in spite of their long working hours, 'black companies' that exploit employees, higher levels of unemployment of and, consequently, the poverty of the younger generation, as well as poverty among children especially.

[38] Kuniko Inoguchi, "Ningen no Anzenhosho no Aratana hihei: Saigai to Jendaa" [the March 11th Disaster and Gender: New Horizons for Human Security], *Gakujutsu no doko* [Trends in the Sciences] (August 2011): 68-71.
[39] Ulrich Beck, *Risk Society: Toward a New Modernity* (London: Sage Publications, 1992).

Natural Disasters: Half of our interviewees mentioned that natural disasters are and will continue to be a major source of human insecurity in Japan. As a result of the Great East Japan Earthquake, 15,891 died and 2,584 are still missing (as of March 2015).[40] Linked with this, following the subsequent tsunami and nuclear power plant crisis in Fukushima, there are people who have been forced to live away from their homes. With the number of such people remaining at 200,000 (as of August 2015), we should consider calling those people who were forced to leave their homes 'internally displaced persons' (IDPs). Earthquakes not only cause loss of lives and damage infrastructure but also destroy the communities in which people live. Similar serious earthquakes or 'megaquakes' are predicted to hit Japan – including urban cities – in coming decades.

Others Downside Risks: Other risks raised include, for example, the US military bases that continue to be located in Okinawa. Hazards and insecurities emanating from modernization, such as nuclear power plants, are also especially a growing concern for advanced societies.

In order to tackle such situations in the East Asia region as well as in Japan, most of our respondents emphasized the importance of employing multi-sectoral/ cross-departmental approaches. Not only governments but also companies and NGOs can play a distinct role based on comparative advantage.

[40] "Higashinihon Daishinsai Kara Yonen: Hinan 23 Man Nin, Seikatsu No Fukko Michinakaba," [Four Years from the Great East Japan Earthquake: 230 thousand People are Still Displaced, Still in the Half Way of Recovering Their Daily Lives," *Asahi Shimbun Digital*, March 11, 2015, http://www.asahi.com/articles/ASH3B5HC2H3BUTIL02W.html.

5. Cross-border Responses to Human Security

5.1 Accepting Assistance

As was discussed in Section 5-2, natural disasters have been and continue to be one of the major sources of threats to human security for Japanese society. Methods for tackling human insecurities at every stage of natural disasters should be a policy priority for the Japanese government, and this naturally would include improving policies for the acceptance of international assistance from overseas actors. The following questions are timely in view of the Great East Japan Earthquake that occurred in 2011. Not a small amount of literature has focused on Japan's acceptance of foreign assistance in the case of natural disasters (earthquakes and tsunamis), and we have abundant information about such cases.[41]

We asked if Japan should accept overseas assistance in cases where Japan has been affected by a massive natural disaster such as an earthquake and tsunami, and faced with serious damage that is beyond the capacity of the government. After asking about the case of a natural disaster, we then asked for their views on a case that involved an escalation of violence, in line with the list of interview questions in Table 2. Though in contemporary Japan, military conflicts that are beyond the government's control are unimaginable, Japanese society did experience a serious terrorist attack carried out by the Japanese *Aum Shinrikyo* cult in 1995, so the question is not inappropriate even in the case of Japan.

All of the interviewees responded in the affirmative to both interview questions above, though to varying degrees and with different emphases. According to the interviews, from a humanitarian point of view, Japan should accept overseas assistance. One respondent described

[41] For instance, see Kae Yanagisawa, ed., *Daisaigai ni Tachimukau Sekai to Nihon* [Japan that Challenges Great Disasters] (Tokyo: Saiki, 2013); Yutaka Katayama, "Higashinihon Daishinsai ji no Kokusai Kinkyu Shien Ukeire to Gaimusho" [International Emergency Assistance during the Great East Japan Earthquake and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs] *Journal of International Cooperation Studies* 20 (2013): 60–62; Masaki Watabe and Takeo Murakami, "Kokusai Jindo Shistemu no Hatten to Higashinihon Daishinsai" [Development of International Humanitarian System and the Great East Japan Earthquake] *Sekaiho Nenpo* 32 (March 2013): 195-215.

it concisely: in view of the Great Hanshin Awaji Earthquake, regrettably, Japan's domestic system was unable to cope with overseas offers of assistance at the time; yet there was some improvement by the time of the Great East Japan Earthquake [Interviewee 4].

The first occasion in which Japan accepted foreign assistance in the case of a natural disaster was after the Great Kanto Earthquake of 1923. Even after Japan became one of the largest economies in the world, Japan was faced with the necessity of accepting foreign assistance at the time of the Great Hanshin Awaji Earthquake of January 17, 1995. At that time the Japanese government was not well prepared to accept such offers of assistance and it took a substantial time before the decision was made to accept it. The earthquake, which took place in a densely populated and advanced city area in Western Japan, caused the deaths of more than 6000 people and destroyed core urban infrastructure in Kobe city and neighboring municipalities. On the day the earthquake hit Japan, the Japanese government responded negatively to foreign governments' offers to send rescue teams, saying that foreign rescue teams were not necessary since Japan could afford enough of its own. The Governments of Switzerland, France and the UK finally succeeded in gaining Japan's consent after repeated attempts to persuade the government.[42]

In March 2011, following the earthquake and tsunami in the Eastern region of Japan, the government decided to accept foreign assistance quickly and consequently received rescue teams from seventeen countries while a number of overseas NGOs were also active in the region. The assistance provided by the US military in Operation *Tomodachi* (friend) amounted to about 24,000 personnel with accompanying vessels and aircraft.[43] According to our interviewees, the criterion on whether to accept assistance or not should be the effectiveness of actors that provide assistance [Interviewee 6].

---

[42] Yanagisawa, *Daisaigai ni Tachimukau Sekai to Nihon*: 57-58.
[43] Yanagisawa, 62.

However, if we reconsider Japan's response to foreign assistance, it has been often pointed that greater coordination is indispensable, including coordination between the tangible foreign assistance offered and real needs on the ground. In order to mitigate human insecurities quickly and effectively, such coordination is essential. One interviewee mentioned that taking any offers could easily lead to confusion, and some coordination is necessary [Interviewee 4]. The issue of coordination was mentioned by other interviewees as well in related contexts. Another interviewee mentioned that since the scale of the disaster was unexpectedly huge, even local governments could not function. So manuals and know-how on how to deal with such situations would be essential [Interviewee 9].

If we look at the interviewee responses to the question related to cases of terrorism or conflict, Japan also should accept foreign assistance. In preparing for terrorism and military conflicts, Japan should plan a scenario on how various actors would act. An interviewee mentioned that it should accept overseas assistance only when the purpose is humanitarian and it is a last resort.[44] Another interviewee said that if we are to accept foreign military personnel, it should be based on confidence in existing bilateral relations, such as bilateral alliances and other established institutional relations.

5.2 Providing Assistance

The next question concerned what would happen in the case of a massive natural disaster in East Asia that was beyond the control of the national government; if the government of the affected country was reluctant to accept assistance from overseas, how would you deal with the situation? We asked same question in the case of an escalation of violence as well.

These questions are linked to the issue of state sovereignty. According to previous research, Japan's government actors have been more or less skeptical about linking human

[44] The interviewee is kept anonymous upon his/her request.

security to interventions that extend beyond state sovereignty even in case of humanitarian emergencies.[45] Japan has its 'peace constitution' and has long-term experience of bilateral official economic assistance based on 'requests' by the recipients. In addition, the Japanese government was concerned about opposition from developing countries' to the transcendence of sovereignty – especially in regard to humanitarian intervention or the 'responsibility to protect' issue, formerly raised by the Canadian government. Japan has stressed the importance of the international community's efforts for preventive measures that do not require the use of force. In promoting resolutions in the UN General Assembly in 2005, 2009 and 2012, Japan's MOFA made every effort to differentiate between the two concepts so that human security did not include R2P.[46]

In the case of natural disasters, our respondents' main stance was that assisting human security in foreign countries should be based on the 'recipient country's request or consent'. However, if the government is reluctant or not functioning, we should first analyze the situation in order to understand the reasons for the sensitivity of the government and should 'persuade' it to accept foreign assistance. The reasons for this are as follows: if the government is not functioning properly, bilateral foreign aid is unlikely to be effective [Interviewee 3]. And if we intervene without the recipient country's consent, the negative impacts of doing so could be greater [Interviewee 1]. In some cases, we might be able to avoid directly bringing sovereignty to the center of the agenda by approaching the country through quiet diplomacy. An interviewee suggested:

[45] For instance, Kaoru Kurusu, 'Gendankai no Ningen no Anzenhosho' [Human Security at this Stage], *Kokusai Mondai* [International Affairs] 603 (July-August 2011): 5-14.
[46] Kaoru Kurusu, "Japan as an Active Agent for a Human Security Norm: From an Initial Recipient to a Norm Entrepreneur," Paper presented at 2011 ISA Annual Conference in Montreal, March 16, 2011.

> Before taking these measures, as a premise, how come they are so reluctant? We must thoroughly analyze the reasons for their sensitivity. Then, if we find some areas or fields able to cooperate, we could start with these. As a rule, I believe that we should not give up by saying to ourselves, "This is an issue of sovereignty, so that there is no hope of resolving it." But, I would rather think that more and more analysis is desirable. We should avoid any dogmatic arguments. We have to accept calm analysis for the purpose of avoiding politicizing human security or any humanitarian ideas related to the human lives at stake now. I know it is difficult in many cases, but it is not bad to try anyway [Interviewee 4].

Another interviewee concurred that Japan, at the time of Great Hanshin Awaji Earthquake, had also experienced a situation in which the government itself was thrown into a panic. It would hold true even for a country that suffers from internal political tensions. Japan can persuade other governments by citing Japan's own experience of failure. Japan should build reliable relations with those countries on a day-to-day basis so that Japan's offer might be accepted without skepticism [Interviewee 7].

Second, when a recipient government is reluctant, NGOs can be much better suited for the task of assisting people in such a country. Japan can assist people indirectly through NGOs or international humanitarian organizations by giving them financial support and so on [Interviewees 2, 3, 6]. Private companies can contribute by division of roles in which they build partnerships with NGOs and Japan Platform[47] in addition to giving financial and other resources to them [Interviewee 8]. Third, when the government is not functioning (but not unwilling) and cannot ask for assistance, there was also the view that we should provide

[47] Japan Platform is a framework in which NGOs, the business community and MOFA work together for prompt implementation of emergency aid. It also offers financial support to Japanese NGOs through ODA funds as well as inviting donations from the private sector. More information is available from its website: http://www.japanplatform.org/.

assistance upon a request from international organizations or if there is acceptance by recipient country [Interviewee 6].

In the second case, namely in cases where there has been an escalation of violence, the basic position of respondents was similar to the case of natural disasters. Assistance should be based on the 'recipient country's request or consent'. Some expressed their private views that in an extremely serious humanitarian crisis due to escalation of violence, the international society should intervene. One of the interviewees, however, noted that forceful intervention does not always guarantee a better humanitarian consequence [Interviewee 5].

In such cases, what the Japanese government has actually been able to do is to 'indirectly' assist the country by giving financial support through the United Nations. Alternatively, Japan (as of August 2015) is not able to send the Self Defense Forces to conflict areas and could instead contribute more in terms of conflict mediation as a third party [Interviewee 9]. Using international organizations could make recipient governments believe that the intervention has no political motivation. Japan can also approach such cases by setting up international conferences so that the recipient government is assured of continued commitment of international society's involvement [Interviewee 5].Another way to be involved in such a situation is to provide specialized knowledge and know-how in areas where Japan is considered better. For instance, in the Syrian case, Japan's has a specialized capability for disposing of chemical weapons and could play an important role in securing human lives in Syria and related countries [Interviewee 7].

In the interviews above our intention was to ask about cases of extreme humanitarian crises such as genocide and ethnic cleansing. It is clear that the measures the Japanese government can take are limited since it lacks capacity for military intervention. However, I would like to underline the point that some of our interviewees stressed the necessity of proactively finding other ways more suitable for the Japanese government to act and implied that there are likely to be cases in which such measures will prove to be more effective.

6. Human Security in Practice: On Protection and Empowerment

Interviewees were asked the questions: do you (or your organization) think both protection and empowerment are equally important? Or do you (or your organization) prioritize one over the other? Why?

There is a shared perception that both approaches (protection and empowerment) are important and closely connected each other. This view is in line with the approach to human security developed in the CHS (2003) report and can be compared with claims that the notion of human security has an impact when focusing on protection in humanitarian emergencies. In terms of which of the two approaches is more important, the answer depends on individual cases and contexts. One interviewee noted that,

> [...] protection is a necessary condition while empowerment is a sufficient condition. [...] In a life-threatening emergency, protection is more important. But after this, just like follow-though in playing tennis, we must take care of what is to come next. Otherwise, in a precise sense, it will not be regarded as a good policy in the framework of human security [Interviewee 4].

Other interviewees said that, to make human security "sustainable," empowerment is quite important [Interviewees 5 and 6]. Protecting people affected by tsunami is crucial, but what is more essential is to help people so that they can rebuild their own lives and thus to assure 'resilience'. For such a purpose, we also have to empower 'communities' [Interviewee 9]. An interviewee from the private sector also concurred that both approaches[48] were important and added that there are high expectations from society that his company will make a contribution in the field of so-called 'protection' approaches. The company seeks out

[48] The company's empowerment approaches include an initiative for a financial aid program designed to develop and strengthen the capacity of healthcare workers through the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (The Global Fund): http://www.takeda.com/access/activity/citizenship/.

potential areas of human security to which insufficient attention has been paid and protection has not been provided [Interviewee 8].

JICA, as an implementation agency for official development assistance, had mainly focused on the improvement of people's daily lives, based on 'empowerment' approaches. One staff member mentioned that approaches promoting 'empowerment' have become even stronger since the introduction of human security [Interviewee 3]. In a practical sense, "emphasis on [either aspect of] human security varies among JICA's internal departments" [Interviewee 3]. JICA had not previously dealt so much with issues in areas of 'protection' proper, namely protection of people in case of emergencies such as armed conflict. Nonetheless, it is still interesting to point out that JICA interpreted the meaning of 'protection,' in way that it was able to fit with JICA's previous principles and activities, after the introduction of the human security principle. A staff member of JICA mentioned that 'protection' means creating national "frameworks."

> JICA regards them [i.e., protection and empowerment] both as important. Providing assistance to national framework building is regarded as protection: great emphasis is placed on this point [Interviewee 3].

Another interviewee also gave a similar view:

> Historically, JICA has employed bottom-up approaches by sending specialists to long-term projects. However, such an approach is not sustainable without protection by the recipient government. Both approaches are necessary. Ability to give top-down protection leads to sustainability [Interviewee 1].

For JICA staff, projects for 'protection' have mainly targeted the building of recipient governments' administrative and legal frameworks to 'protect' their people. It is a distinctive

interpretation of 'protection' developed so that it fits customs or norms of implementation organization for development assistance.

7. Conceptual Basis of Human Security: The Three Freedoms

Human security highlights the "universality and interdependence of a set of freedoms that are fundamental to human lives: freedom from fear, freedom from want and freedom to live in dignity."[49] However, there has been some debate on which element should be prioritized. The disagreement between the governments of Canada and Japan in the beginning of the 2000s over whether a narrower approach with a focus on freedom from fear or a broader approach should be taken is still memorable. As we know, the CHS report was written so that Ogata and Sen could represent the efforts to realize freedom from fear and freedom from want, respectively. Apart from previous debates on freedoms from want and fear, 'freedom to live in dignity' has started to gain attention recently.

We firstly asked the following questions on the relationship of these elements: what do you think the relationship is between these three elements, if any? Do you (or your organization) attach weight to a particular element? If so, why? Our interviewees for the most part concurred that all the elements are co-related [for instance, interviewees 3, 4, 6, 8 and 9]. Some said that they are equally important, while another interviewee perceived the three elements as stages [Interviewee 3]. One interviewee said, "for convenience we separate these three components. But we could consider these three components as part of a comprehensive perspective." Encouraging people to think that the three elements are interrelated is the very innovative aspect of human security [Interviewee 4].

[49] Report of the Secretary General, Follow-up to General Assembly Resolution 64/291 on Human Security, 2012 (A/66/763).

Then we asked an additional question: what do you think is the meaning of adding "dignity" in the debates on human security? The dignity aspect appeared in the CHS report of 2003 and was also included in the UNSG Annan's report of 2005, *In Larger Freedom,* as one of three pillars of the UN activities.[50] In answer to this question, interestingly, most of our interviewees responded quite positively and gave their innovative views. An interviewee mentioned that even if the other two freedoms are met, it is insufficient for improving human security: the freedom to live in dignity also has to be fulfilled. According to his view, the final purpose of human security amounts to dignity. Even if our needs such as goods and education opportunities are met, if a person feels he/she is needed by none and left out, we do not think his/her human security has been achieved [Interviewee 6]. Another interviewee cited a phrase from the bible, "Man shall not live by bread alone," indicating that as a human being, the spiritual aspect is more important in the end [Interviewee 5]. A MOFA official said that human security's roots can be found in Amartya Sen's human development and Sadako Ogata's refugee protection and they brought these approaches with them when both subsequently became the chairpersons of the CHS. The newly emerging element of dignity reminds us that human society has to become more resilient and inclusive [Interviewee 9].

8. Has Human Security Generated Additional Value?

Lastly, this section of the paper examines the added value, if any, of human security. While human security as a notion has been criticized as something that merely gives old issues a new label,[51] there have been efforts to find its added value. For instance, at the UN General Assembly, a meeting on 'added value' to the work of the United Nations took place in May

[50] Report of the Secretary-General, *In Larger Freedom: Towards Development, Security and Human Rights for All*, 2005.
[51] Roland Paris, "Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?" *International Security* 26, no. 2 (2001): 87-102.

2008, and later the Secretary General's report in 2012 discussed the matter.[52] They discussed the added value of human security in a practical sense; what it would bring to the United Nations' tasks.[53]

Our interviewees gave us their views on what additional value has been generated by human security. The analysis provided in this paper mainly draws from the last interview question here, but related insights indicated in replies to other previous questions should be also pointed out. We asked the following questions: do you think the concept of human security has induced any change in the ways of thinking, policy-making and/or practices? ; Would there be any difference if the concept had not been introduced?

First, there was apparent interest in the instrumental utility of the human security concept. Some of our interviewees pointed out that the introduction of human security as a new concept has some appeal for both the international audience and domestic constituencies. An MP we interviewed mentioned that human security has become a catchword in explaining Japan's foreign policy, thereby building its brand and reputation internationally [Interviewee 6]. However, we should also critically evaluate how far the Japanese government has succeeded in launching the concept as a coherent and explicit policy idea.

For JICA similarly, the introduction of human security principles has brought some advantages. For instance, utility can be found in putting emphasis on the difference between JICA's approach and other donors' methods of assistance [Interviewee 2]. Additional utility was found by a staff member of JICA:

---

[52] A Panel Discussion on the Theme "People-Centred Responses: The Added Value of Human Security," 2010 (A/64/701); Report by the Secretary General, Follow-up to General Assembly Resolution 64/291 on Human Security, 2012 (A/66/763).

[53] The SG report raises three examples of climate change, post-conflict peacebuilding, and economic and financial crisis. In terms of climate change, "by focusing attention on the combined risks of climate-related threats, the human security approach highlights the interconnectedness and the cross-sectoral consequences of climate change and its impact on the different domains of human security." Such an analysis will "help to assess regularly the needs, vulnerabilities and capacities of people and communities at the national and sub-national levels" SG, 2012 (A/66/763).

> The concept is useful in explaining JICA's approach of giving assistance beyond sectors rather than merely assisting individual sectors [Interviewee 1].

Our interviewee from a private company said that his company has dealt with human lives since its establishment even though it had not referred to it as 'human security'. If there is additional value, human security as a concept, together with the concept of human development, can be used to place the company's CSR (corporate social responsibility) activities within a broader picture [Interviewee 8]. So here human security has a conceptual value in mapping various activities related to CSR and allocating appropriate meanings to its own CSR projects.

Second, the concept has brought the following changes to JICA. For some staff of JICA, human security was felt to have brought nothing new to an organization already engaged in implementing official development assistance. According to existing research, there was a relatively strong feeling that those seven aspects of human security discussed earlier in this paper had existed previously in more vague ways within JICA's practice.[54] But for others human security has brought new perspectives. For example, the practice of targeting its assistance not only at governments but also to people and communities was comparatively new.[55] In addition, as discussed already, the approach of empowering people has become stronger since the introduction of human security. Another point suggested in our interviewee comments and other literature is that previously there were many instances of established projects that did not reach the people in need.[56] However, this has changed since the introduction of human security as a principle. One interviewee said:[57]

---

[54] Kurusu, "Japan as an Active Agent for Global Norms," 130.
[55] For a similar view of a JICA staff member, see Kurusu, "Japan as an Active Agent for Global Norms," 130; JICA, *Monthly JICA*, February 2007.
[56] JICA, *Monthly JICA*, October 2006.
[57] The interviewee was kept anonymous upon his/her request.

> I also had the impression that the organization had begun to emphasize onsite needs and people-related needs more, or to focus on the bottom-up approach, although I believe this could be attributed to the influence of President Ogata as well as the idea of human security. […] A bottom-up approach had been advocated. However, instead of just being advocated, it was put into action, such as by allocating more people to field sites. This was a new movement. I have the impression that this was a result of President Ogata's initiative rather than the idea of human security. In a way, I associate human security with President Ogata.

Third, some pointed out that human security's comprehensive nature and its multi-sector approach are new on the ground. Protection and empowerment, as approaches to human security, are often named as new aspects that are brought by the concept. However, an interviewee from a NGO underlined that in reality they are not new. But rather it is its 'comprehensive' or crosscutting nature that is considered to be innovative especially in achieving human security on the ground [Interviewee 10]. NGOs usually engage in a single issue or a limited number of issues. However, for example, if they are to deal with the abolition of anti-personnel landmines, not only by advocating as such but also employing broader and crosscutting approaches, such as linking their approach to a development perspective may be more effective. Human security is such a comprehensive idea that brings together all the related issues that have been formerly dealt with in isolation [Interviewee 1]. JICA staff also touched upon this aspect, as mentioned earlier.

Fourth, the additional element of 'dignity' was mentioned as added value of human security. An Upper House MP indicated that although the freedoms from want and fear were the main challenges in the 20th century, we should seek 'dignity' in the 21st century [Interviewee 7]. Likewise, as a JICA staff member pointed out,

> I think people perceive the concept of human security differently. Probably, some of those who view it broadly will wonder what's new about it. I think that it is not a new idea for people who advocate empowerment or capacity development on a daily basis. […] The freedom to live in dignity, or the psychological aspect that I mentioned earlier, tends to be overlooked. So I feel that the concept of human security could lead you to become aware that this point shouldn't be overlooked. Or maybe I should say that it could somehow be a framework that leads you to stop and think about the aspect [Interviewee 3].

In all probability, dignity is an idea of waiting and caring. Putting aside exceptional humanitarian crises such as genocide and ethnic cleansing or serious violations of human rights, when cooperating through the provision of assistance, we should not violate feelings of people in recipient societies and should respect what they believe in the ways that they organize their cultural, religious, and social lives. With this dignity approach we may be able to integrate respect for cultural and religious differences into human security practice.

Fifth, human security can serve as a notion that directs our attention to individuals. An interviewee stressed this point:

> I personally believe that, whenever we use the concrete and articulate idea of focusing on people's security and welfare, eventually it makes a big difference. There is a possibility that the usage of human security as a guiding notion might encourage related organizations and officials to notice suffering people's faces and promote assistance with a more human touch. Different from the notion of assisting a country, the notion of human security directs those in charge of assistance to consider suffering in people's faces there, not their numbers [Interviewee 4].

9. Conclusions and Suggestions

Although the notion of human security has been adopted in the resolutions of the UN General Assembly, it has not yet become a mainstream concept accepted in all societies and countries in East Asia. Nor has Japanese society fully understood the concept yet. However, as discussed in the previous section, our interviewees from various sectors, who have been active in human security-related policies and projects, found at least some utility in the human security concept. For example, there is the instrumental utility of human security in informing state policies or an organization's activities. Furthermore, our interviewees in fact described essential meanings in the approach that the human security notion might bring: *more emphasis could be placed on 'onsite needs and people-related needs'*; *'comprehensiveness' of the notion would bring a quite different useful approach to a complex problem that has been previously dealt as an isolated issue*; *the third element of 'dignity' might add a more human face to development and security-related projects*.

The findings through this analysis may sound relatively unexciting, for instance, compared with the way the emerging norm of 'responsibility to protect' challenges state sovereignty and might have an impact on exceptional cases of humanitarian crisis if implemented. However, in many cases, human insecurities take place in day-to-day situations. In such cases, finding vulnerable groups and individuals, finding comprehensive solutions, by considering local political, social, and cultural contexts and coordinating appropriate approaches beyond various sectors, actors and donors is indispensable but requires a time-consuming effort. Though such approaches do not bring about instant and drastic impacts on humans in situations where they are at risk, a longer-term strategy based on human security principles is better at ameliorating them and building societies resilient to such risks.

Finally, this paper claimed that it would identify preliminary hypotheses or 'areas for further research'. These following points are drawn from areas on which at least some, if not all, of the interviewees concurred:

(a) Possible Areas of Human Security Risks in Japan and East Asia

- ✓ In East Asia, where natural disasters, 'deep-rooted conflicts' and social issues due to rapid economic growth will continue with larger populations at increased risk, human security will have utility in tackling such issues. More active collaboration by practitioners and scholars in the area of ASEAN plus three is required.
- ✓ Inter-state tensions, especially in Northeast Asia, are expected to continue or increase. Inter-state/regional/system level instabilities will impinge on human security. Greater attention should be paid to interstate tensions and human security in East Asia by scholars of security studies.
- ✓ Human security risks exist in every society, and 'advanced' societies are not exceptions in this regard. Human security can provide useful tools for addressing such risks and suggest better approaches for tackling them in Japan as well.

(b) Better Ways to Understand and Approach Human Security Issues

- ✓ Japan can contribute more in areas of human security, by developing and providing highly specialized knowledge and skills in specific human insecurity situations. That means Japan's contribution to human security does not have to be confined to the area of development assistance. A stronger cross-sectoral/inter-departmental approach is required for Japan in this regard.
- ✓ Interventions without the targeted country's consent, even if they do not entail the use of military force, are counter-productive in many cases. In spite of bringing state sovereignty to the center of the issue, in many cases, measures such as detailed context-specific analysis and persuasion will promote the realization of human security.

- ✓ Civil society organizations and humanitarian international organizations can contribute more toward promoting human security in situations where recipient state's sovereignty is at issue. Governments can do more by supporting such non-governmental organizations by giving financial and other resources.
- ✓ More attention should be paid to the 'freedom to live in dignity' aspect of human security. It will bring a new perspective to human security discourse and policies.

Lastly the paper would like to pay attention to a caveat by an interviewee again:

> Human security is a very sensitive term. I am concerned that this term might be easily politicized. In this sense, as a result, I cannot help wondering whether this term will itself become a hurdle in [our] attempts to protect people, rather than assuring people's security. In order to overcome this hurdle, I believe that we should make up our minds to promote people's interests and freedom by formulating concrete and practical plans, policies and budgets, rather than merely promoting the spread of this term [Interviewee 4].

The above statement indicates that spreading the term is not the final goal. What is more essential to the region are the new ways of thinking and analysis that the concept of human security makes possible, along with the approaches to tackle the insecurities in the region.

References

Annan, Kofi. *In Larger Freedom: Towards Development, Security and Human Rights for All: Report of the Secretary-General,* UN Document A/59/2005. New York: United Nations, March 21, 2005.

Aoi, Chiyuki, and Yee-Kuang Heng, eds. *Asia-Pacific Nations in International Peace Support and Stability Operations*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2014.

Beck, Urlihc. *Risk Society: Toward a New Modernity*. London: Sage Publications, 1992.

Bosold, David, and Sascha Werthes. "Human Security in Practice: Canadian and Japanese Experiences," *Internationale Politik und Gesellschaft* I (2005): 84-101.

Commission on Human Security. *Human Security Now.* New York: Commission on Human Security, 2003.

Creswell, John. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches.* Los Angeles: Sage Publications, 2013.

Dexter, Lewis Anthony. *Elite and Specialized Interviewing*, Colchester: ECPR Press, 2012.

Edstrom, Bert. *Japan and the Challenge of Human Security: The Founding of a New Policy 1995-2003.* Stockholm-Nacka: Institute for Security and Development Policy, 2008.

Friedrichs, Jörg, and Friedrich Kratochwil. "On Acting and Knowing: How Pragmatism Can Advance International Relations Research and Methodology." *International Organization* 63, no. 3 (2009): 701-31.

Fujiwara, Kiichi. "Keizai-Kyoryoku: On the Life and Times of Japanese Economic Diplomacy." In *New Approaches to Human Security in the Asia-Pacific: China, Japan and Australia,* edited by William Tow, David Walton, and Rikki Kersten, 93-106. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2012.

Fukushima, Akiko. *Ningen no Anzenhosho* [Human Security]. Tokyo: Chikura Shobo, 2010.

George, Alexander L., and Andrew Bennett. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2005.

Gilson, Julie, and Phillida Purvis. "Japan's Pursuit of Human Security: Humanitarian Agenda or Political Pragmatism?" *Japan Forum* 15, no. 2 (2003): 193−207.

Hubbard, Susan, and Tomoko Suzuki. *Building Resilience: Human Security Approaches to AIDS in Africa and Asia.* Tokyo: Japan Center for International Exchange, 2008.

Inoguchi, Kuniko. "Ningen no Anzenhosho no Aratana Chihei: Saigai to Jendaa" [The March 11th Disaster and Gender: New Horizons for Human Security]. *Gakujutsu no Doko* [Trends in the Sciences] (August 2011): 68-71.

Japan Center for International Exchange. *Human Security in the United Nations.* Tokyo: JCIE, 2004.

Katayama, Yutaka. "Higashinihon Daishinsai ji no Kokusai Kinkyu Shien Ukeire to Gaimusho." [International Emergency Assistance during the Great East Japan Earthquake and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs]. *Journal of International Cooperation Studies* 20 (2013): 60–62.

Katsumata, Makoto. "Gaiko Seisaku Toshiteno Ningennoanzenhosho: Jinkentaikoku Heno Rodomappu" [Human Security as Foreign Policy: A Roadmap to a Human Rights Great Power]. *Kokusaimondai* [International Affairs] 603 (July-August 2011): 25-35.

King, Gary, and Christopher Murray. "Rethinking Human Security." *Political Science Quarterly* 226, no. 4 (2001-2002): 585-610.

Kurusu, Kaoru. "Japan as an Active Agent for Global Norms: The Political Dynamism Behind the Acceptance and Promotion of 'Human Security'." Translated by Rikki Kersten. *Asia Pacific Review* 18, no. 2 (2011): 115-37.

———. "Japan as an Active Agent for a Human Security Norm: From an Initial Recipient to a Norm Entrepreneur." Paper presented at 2011 ISA Annual Conference in Montreal, March 16, 2011. http://citation.allacademic.com/meta/p501699_index.html.

———. 'Gendankai no Ningen no Anzenhosho,' [Human Security at this Stage]. *Kokusai Mondai* [International Affairs] 603 (July-August 2011): 5-14.

———. “In Search of a More Proactive International Role: The Political Dynamism Behind Human Security in Japan.” In *New Approaches to Human Security in the Asia-Pacific: China, Japan and Australia*, edited by William Tow, David Walton and Rikki Kersten and translated by Rikki Kersten, 121-38. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2012.
McRae, Rob, and Don Hubert, eds. *Human Security and the New Diplomacy: Protecting People, Promoting Peace*. Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2001.
Newman, Edward, and Oliver Richmond, eds. *The United Nations and Human Security.* New York: Palgrave, 2001.
Paris, Roland. “Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?” *International Security* 26, no. 2 (2001): 87-102.
Qvale, Steinar, and Svend Brinkmann. *InterViews: Learning Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications, 2009.
Saldaña, Jonny. *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications, 2013.
Schwartz–Shea, Peregrine, and Dvora Yanow. *Interpretive Research Design: Concepts and Processes*. London: Routledge, 2012.
Smith, Heather. “Diminishing Human Security: The Canadian Case.” In *A Decade of Human Security*, edited by Sandra Maclean, David R. Black and Timothy M. Shaw, 73-84. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.
Soeya, Yoshihide. “Japanese Security Policy in Transition: The Rise of International and Human Security.” *Asia-Pacific Review* 12, no. 1 (2005): 103−16.
Study Group on Europe’s Security Capabilities. “A Human Security Doctrine for Europe: The Barcelona Report of the Study Group on Europe’s Security Capabilities.” Barcelona, September 15, 2004. http://www.lse.ac.uk/internationalDevelopment/research/CSHS/humanSecurity/barcelonaReport.pdf.
Tadjbakhsh, Shahrbanou, and Anuradha Chenoy. *Human Security: Concepts and Implications*. London: Routledge, 2007.
Takeda Pharmaceutical Company. *Better Health, Brighter Future* (Annual Report 2013), 2013. http://www.takeda.com/investor-information/annual/files/ar2013_en.pdf.
Tan, Hsien-Li. “Not Just Global Rhetoric: Japan’s Substantive Actualization of its Human Security Foreign Policy.” *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific* 10, no. 1 (2010): 159 – 87.
Watabe, Masaki. “Kokusai Jindo Shistemu no Hatten to Higashinihon Daishinsai.” [Development of the International Humanitarian System and the Great East Japan Earthquake]. *Sekaiho Nenpo* 32 (March 2013): 195-215.
Yamakage, Subaru, and Kojima Tomoyuki. *Nihon Seifu to Kokunai no “Ningen no Anzen Hosho” Ninshiki no Kairi –Kokkai no Giron o Chushin ni* [Discrepancies in Recognition on ‘Human Security’ in Japan: Focusing on Arguments Within Both Houses of the Diet]. Policy and Governance Working Paper Series 98 (March 2006): 1-24.
Yanagisawa, Kae, ed. *Daisaigai ni Tachimukau Sekai to Nihon* [Japan that Challenges Great Disasters]. Tokyo: Saiki, 2013.

Abstract (in Japanese)

要約

人間の安全保障概念をめぐる議論がなされて 20 年以上たつ。しかし、人間の安全保障概念の導入によって、人間の厚生や安全をとらえる枠組み、あるいはそれらを向上させるための手法において、何らかの価値を生み出したのかについては必ずしも明らかではない。この問題を解明するうえでの初期的な試みとして、本研究は、対外政策として人間の安全保障の概念を唱道してきた日本を事例に、分析を行った。研究手法としては、日本の政府、学界、市民社会、民間において人間の安全保障に関連した分野で活動する中心的なステークホルダーを選定し聴き取り調査を行うことで、その人間の安全保障に関する認識を明らかにした。

インタビュイー（聴き取り対象者）は、少なくとも何らかの形で人間の安全保障概念の有用性を見出しただけでなく、主として、次の点において同概念がもたらしうる重要な可能性を指摘した。すなわち、①人間の安全保障は支援の現場と人々に直結したニーズに目を向けさせる概念として意味を持ちうる。②今日では、人々の安全が危機にさらされるが、そこには複合的で多様な要因が絡んでいる状況が生じている。そこで、人間の安全保障は、包括的なアプローチを動員することで、従来にはなかったような有効な対応をとることができる。③「尊厳をもって生きる自由」という側面を今後は視野に入れることにより、人々の安全にかかわる支援プロジェクトにおいて、より重要な影響をもたらすことができる。④そして、インタビュイーの多くが、人間の安全保障概念が、日本国内の問題を理解するうえでも、重要であると強調した。

最後に、本研究では日本のステークホルダー認識の分析をもとに、今後の人間の安全保障研究（うち政策志向の研究）に対する示唆を提示した。研究の問として、例えば次があげられるだろう。①部門横断的・省庁横断的なアプローチが、人間の安全保障支援プロジェクトにどのような効果をもたらすのか。②国際支援の受け入れに対して当該国政府が慎重である場合に、どのような説得が可能なのか。③関連して、国家主権が問題となり当該国政府が支援受け入れに慎重な時に、トランスナショナルな主体はどのように人間の安全保障の改善に関与できるのか。④そして、人間の安全保障の政策や研究において、「尊厳をもって生きる自由」をどのように展開していくのか。

Working Papers from the same research project

"Human Security in Practice: East Asian Experiences"

JICA-RI Working Paper No. 92
Human Security in Practice: The Chinese Experience
Ren Xiao

JICA-RI Working Paper No. 93
Human Security in Practice: The Case of South Korea
Eun Mee Kim, Seon Young Bae, and Ji Hyun Shin

JICA-RI Working Paper No. 95
Human Security in Cambodia: Far From Over
Pou Sovachana and Alice Beban

JICA-RI Working Paper No. 96
Human Security and Development in Myanmar: Issues and Implications
Moe Thuzar

JICA-RI Working Paper No. 98
Human Security in Practice: The Philippine Experience(s) from the Perspective of Different Stakeholders
Maria Ela L. Atienza

JICA-RI Working Paper No. 99
Perception on Human Security: Indonesian View
Lina A. Alexandra

JICA-RI Working Paper No. 100
The Concept of Human Security in Vietnam
Pham Lan Dung and Nguyen Ngoc Lan

JICA-RI Working Paper No. 101

Human Security in Singapore: Where Entitlement Feeds Insecurity

Belinda Chng and Sofiah Jamil

JICA-RI Working Paper No. 102

Human Security in Practice in Thailand

Surangrut Jumnianpol and Nithi Nuangjamnong