



Faculty
of Arts

Palacký University
Olomouc

DISSERTATION THESIS

2016

Lenka Dušková

Dissertation Thesis

Linking Development and Security – Critical Analysis of Human Security

Mgr. Lenka Dušková

Supervisor: Doc. Mgr. Oldřich Bureš, M.A., Ph.D.

Olomouc 2016

Declaration of authorship:

I hereby declare, that this dissertation thesis has been written by me in person. All information derived from other works has been acknowledged in the text and the list of references.

Mgr. Lenka Dušková

Olomouc, 2016

Acknowledgements:

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Oldřich Bureš for his guidance and valuable comments. Hereby I would like also to wholeheartedly acknowledge all the help and support from the faculty members of the Department of Political Science and European Studies, as well as my friends and colleges from the Department of Development Studies. Without their encouragement and precious support, it would not be possible for me to overcome the difficult personal and health conditions and find the courage and motivation to finish my thesis.

Abstract

The Human Security was conceptualised and presented in the United Nations Human Development Report in 1994. However, more than two decades later it keeps being a contested concept. The aim of the thesis is to map and critically reflect the evolution of security and development theories and discourses that have preceded and influenced the concept of Human Security and also to analyze how development and security have been influencing each other throughout of history and yet more intensively after the end of Cold War. It is argued that Human Security is a case example of convergence of the development and security. The thesis also focuses on the theoretical inquiry into the four central pillars (universality; interdependency; human focus; prevention) that constitute the base of Human Security using the perspective of Critical Theories with the aim to critically analyze the inherent contradictions. There are certain aspects, inbuilt within Human Security concept, which keep it close to the traditional security and development narratives. The interdisciplinary research combining the theoretical approaches from International Security and International Development Studies allowed for the broader insights into the Human Security concept, previously unexplored by the research community operating within the single disciplines.

Lidská bezpečnost byla konceptualizována a představena ve Zprávě OSN o lidském rozvoji v roce 1994, nicméně i po více než dvou dekádách zůstává tento koncept kontroverzním. Cílem dizertační práce je mapovat a kriticky zhodnotit vývoj bezpečnostních a rozvojových teorií a diskursů, které předcházely konceptu lidské bezpečnosti, a také analyzovat, jak se vzájemně, zejména v období po konci studené války, bezpečnost a rozvoj ovlivňovaly. Práce představuje koncept lidské bezpečnosti jako případ sblížení rozvoje a bezpečnosti. Důraz je kladen také na kritickou reflexi čtyř hlavních pilířů (univerzalita; vzájemná závislost; zaměření na člověka; prevence) za využití kritických teorií s cílem identifikovat a analyzovat zásadní rozpory. Práce argumentuje, že v rámci konceptu lidské bezpečnosti existují aspekty, které jej stále přibližují spíše k tradičnímu vnímání bezpečnosti a rozvoje, ačkoliv byl konstruován jako přístup, který se vůči tradičním přístupům vymezoval. Interdisciplinární výzkum propojil teoretické přístupy z mezinárodní bezpečnosti a rozvojových studií, čímž umožnil širší ohled do konceptu lidské bezpečnosti, konceptu dosud studovaného pouze v rámci (těchto) jednotlivých vědních oborů.

Content

Abstract	5
Content	6
List of Tables	7
1. Introduction	9
2. Aim, Research Questions & Methodology	16
2.1. <i>Key Concepts & Theoretical Framework</i>	24
2.1.1. Human Security: Definition	25
2.1.1.1. Broad Definition	29
2.1.1.2. Narrow Definition.....	30
2.1.1.3. Human Security: Japan’s or Canadian Way?	33
2.1.2. Developing World/Third World/Global South.....	37
2.1.3. Nature of Research Paradigms: Positivism vs. Non-positivism.....	39
2.1.4. Critical Theories Approach	43
3. Interpreting Security	49
3.1. <i>Traditional Understanding of Security</i>	57
3.2. <i>Intention to Re-conceptualise: Towards More Critical Approaches</i>	59
3.2.1. Copenhagen Security School.....	60
3.2.2. Aberstwyth School.....	64
3.2.3. Paris School.....	66
3.3. <i>Third World Security Studies</i>	68
3.4. <i>Human Security</i>	71
4. Interpreting Development	74
4.1. <i>Classical Approaches: Towards Modernisation</i>	88
4.2. <i>Structuralist Critique: Away From Dependency</i>	90
4.3. <i>Classical Economists & Neoliberal Approaches: Away from State</i>	92
4.4. <i>Critical Approaches: Reflected Dichotomy?</i>	93
4.4.1. The Most Radical Approach(es): Towards Plurality.....	96
4.4.2. Towards more Human-centred Development.....	98
4.4.2.1. Alternative Development(s)	99
4.4.2.2. Human Development Paradigm.....	101
4.4.2.3. Basic Needs Approach.....	105
5. Linking Security & Development: Times before Human Security	108
5.1. <i>Colonial Times</i>	108

5.2.	<i>Early Post-war, Cold War and beyond</i>	111
6.	Linking Security & Development: Nature of Human Security	117
6.1.	<i>Human Security: Origins & Context</i>	117
6.2.	<i>Human Security: Human Development & Human Security</i>	122
6.2.1.	<i>Human Security: Hybrid Concept</i>	123
6.2.2.	<i>Human Security: Development in Security or Security in Development?</i>	127
7.	Human Security: Critical Analysis of Key Pillars	133
7.1.	<i>Pillar of Universality or Civilising Mission Continued?</i>	136
7.2.	<i>Pillar of Interdependency or Hierarchy?</i>	139
7.3.	<i>Pillar of Prevention or Intervention?</i>	145
7.4.	<i>Pillar of Human-centred or State Centred Security?</i>	150
8.	Conclusion	154
	References	164
	Appendix	185

List of Tables

Table 1:	<i>Human Security Concepts</i>	32
Table 2:	<i>Classification of Security Approaches</i>	55
Table 3:	<i>Securitization model</i>	61
Table 4:	<i>State versus Human-cantered Security</i>	72
Table 5:	<i>Classification of Development Approaches</i>	83
Table 6:	<i>Human Development & Human Security</i>	126

“There are times in life when the question of knowing if one can think differently than one thinks, and perceive differently than one sees, is absolutely necessary if one is to go on looking and reflecting at all.”

Michel Foucault

1. Introduction

“The end of the Cold War brought a sigh of relief to people throughout the world, and with it the expectation that we at last had a safe and peaceful world and could turn to such pressing issues as poverty and environmental destruction without having to worry about ideological and/or armed conflict [...]. Unfortunately, those expectations proved overly optimistic. Rather than the peaceful world we all had dreamed of, the post-Cold War world has turned out fraught with strife. Ethnic conflict, religious turmoil, growing numbers of refugees, increased poverty, more disparity between the rich and poor, and no apparent end to environmental degradation.”

Prof. Takashi Inoguchi, vice-rector of United Nations University

Different people around the world including the “Global North” as well as the “Global South” are suffering from large scale insecurities. The challenges to human security present themselves in the different ways (i.e. mass migration, poverty, problematic livelihoods, effects of the climatic change, epidemics, changing character of conflicts, terrorism, bad governance, etc.). Moreover, today more than ever, we are confronted with the massive campaigns about these issues, mediated through the traditional as well as the new channels of information. Being more or less biased, more or less un-reflected these real time insecurities, strengthened by our perceived fears, produce the security dilemmas that further materialize in our actions and interventions.

The questions of human insecurities and thus the Human Security concept, which is central to this thesis, therefore seem to be even more relevant today, provoking the scholars and policymakers and practitioners to seek the innovative solutions for the current challenges within the newly converging security and development paradigms. These paradigms have been reflected in

the academic literature in several disciplines, including International Relations/International Security and International Development Studies, but this reflection has been complicated by the contested nature of the two core concepts inbuilt in Human Security and thus also this thesis – the development and the security. This contestation concerns the quest for finding working definitions and conceptualisations, as well as their critical reflection.

Within the time of existence of the above mentioned academic disciplines and even earlier in history, the disputed concepts (development and security) have undergone many radical changes, including those related to significant shifts in paradigms. There are different schools of thought within International Relations/International Security and International Development Studies that engage in establishing different concepts of development and security and analysing them as well as proposing strategies to achieve and sustain them. These schools of thought might not necessarily agree on the basic ontological and epistemological aspects of studying and understanding development and security. Moreover, the boundaries between the concepts are also not always clear and straight forward. There are traces of development discourses to be found within security theories as well as there are security aspects to development, penetrating development theories as well as policy and practice. These links and overlaps therefore deserve attention.

The divide between development and security, both as concepts of distinct fields of study and also as processes in society/international relations; and the respective policies to manage them (reflected into practical activities and interventions), have been changing over time. Despite the existence of many linkages to be experienced and/or studied at the different levels of analysis, even before the “*development and security nexus*” paradigm entered into the research fields of International Relations/International Security and International Development in the 1990s, security and development were

historically approached as different sectors with different ideas and aims belonging to distinct academic disciplines (Duffield, 2010). The author of the thesis aims to overcome this division and to bring in the insights that would combine both fields of study.

Even though certain researchers (e.g. Chandler, 2007) dismiss the existence of the *“development-security nexus”* and believe that the relationship between development and security stays more symbolic and on the rhetorical claims level, the author of this thesis takes as the point of departure the fact that in history we can observe certain manifestations of the linkages between development and security which started to become even more prominent after the end of the Cold War (*see below*). And among other, these linkages materialised in the form of Human Security concept, as also pointed out by an array of other authors (e.g. Duffield, 2001; CASE Collective, 2006; Buzan and Hansen, 2009 etc.). The author aims to identify and critically examine the linkages between development and security that have reflected in the Human Security Concept.

The end of the Cold War is considered to be the milestone in the intensification of the linking between development and security, since it led to important changes in international and security architecture. The loosening of political tensions and the growing range of new serious problems striking the *“Global South”* as well as on the global level, contributed to new security considerations for the public, practitioners, policy makers and also scholars. With the new context and circumstances, the link between development and security become part of the research.

From 1990's onwards several research fields have gradually developed to study the different aspects of merging of development and security (*“development-security nexus”*, in other words). One of them is (1) the study

of integration of development-security discourse into the basic national and international policy documents on security and development. Secondly (2) the conflict sensitive approach in development cooperation has been developed to sensitise the development actors about the potential effects of the development interventions as a conflict catalyst and/or the strategies have been designed on how to use development interventions (working on conflict) to prevent or transform the conflicts as well as to enhance the effectiveness of development interventions in conflict and post-conflict areas.

The attention has been also paid to (3) studying conflicts as factors influencing poverty. The conflicts and tensions started to be analyzed from the perspective of how they directly or indirectly contributed to setbacks in development. Conflicts are very costly and waste resources, especially when the resources are generated through their shifting from more productive sectors such as health and education, millions of lives are lost, people are wounded physically and mentally – sometimes for the rest of their lives. This impacts on the productivity capacity of the labor force; there is definitely a vast destruction of infrastructure suffered (both as collateral damage and also as a main strategy of the warring parties); livelihoods are destroyed; institutions and democratic processes collapse; the agricultural sector is especially hard hit; significant trade distortions occur and sometimes they are hard to reverse; including a drop in investments and also a transformation of productive sectors to focus more on the production of valuable illicit goods. (Collier, 2003; Stewart, 2004; Homer-Dixon, 1994)

Another research area was focused on studying (4) the (under)development and its effects on security and insecurity. Although poverty and underdevelopment is neither a necessary and automatic nor sufficient condition for violent conflict, poverty and underdevelopment, feelings of exclusion etc. may contribute to tensions. There is however, no clear-

cut understanding about the causal mechanisms at work between development issues and violent conflicts. Prolonged economic decline could produce stresses that may relate to tensions and instabilities, but on the other hand, economic growth alone does not prevent or resolve conflicts and tensions (OECD-DAC, 1997). Another link between security/conflicts and development that has constituted this research field is seen in the inability of the state to function and provide services to its population, i.e. the problems related to state failure. Moreover, in the absence of the government's/ state's control over territory and its security structures, the likelihood of political violence is also increased. It has been also maintained that development is a pre-condition for security.

Last but not least (5) the concept of Human Security emerged as a hybrid between the development and security realms. Human Security is an example of the integration of the "*freedom from want*" (development) and "*freedom from fear*" (security) concerns. The merging of development and security is therefore explicitly part of the Human Security concept. Exploring in more detail in what way the concept of Human Security is an example, a case, of the linking of the development and security concepts was selected for deeper inquiry in this thesis.

By exploring the conceptual links between development and security, this thesis makes a contribution to existing scholarship on Human Security, much of which can be described as problem solving (Newman, 2010), i.e. aimed at facilitating the adoption of the policy oriented approaches which seek to improve the human welfare and or/security within political, legal and practical areas of everyday life of the individual people and their collectivities, and/or trying to generate concrete actions. However, in order not to produce more harm than good in applying the Human Security concept, it is very important to understand the concept well and to stay critical and reflect on its essential conceptual and theoretical foundations.

The critical approach to Human Security taken by the author of this thesis is not driven by the idea of “*criticising*” the concept and/or to value its contribution to resolving the security/development problems. At the same time, however, the author of the thesis is taking into account that the efficiency of linking security and development could also be largely contested and also admits that the *development-security nexus* paradigm is often used as a political tool for manoeuvring between different interests and priorities within particular governments and institutions. As Spivak (1996, 158) comments, it has become virtually impossible to “*not want*” development or security. The same way it would be hard to “*not want*” security for humans (Human Security), but this does not mean that the concept shall not undergo the process of questioning and reflection in order to prevent its potential contribution to the processes in the society that are being generally challenged by the critical theories, i.e. the production and re-production of hierarchies and exclusions and structural violence.

By striving for greater conceptual clarity and self-reflection, this thesis might therefore help to situate the concept of Human Security as a critical approach to security, as well as to better fulfil its declared normative goals – i.e. the improvement of human wellbeing and/or security in line with the “*do no harm*” principle (*defined by Mary Anderson in 1999*) known both to the development as well as the security community.

The author of the thesis is well aware that the area of interest of this thesis is relatively broad in nature, ranging across two very complex disciplines of Security Studies and Development Studies, which is posing challenges to theoretical and methodological choices as well as to the possible scope of the study. While the interdisciplinary nature of this thesis represents a unique contribution and value added to the study of Human Security, it also poses a number of challenges and limitations. It cannot go to the matter as deep as if

grounded in one discipline. However, the approach taken by the author enabled “conversation” and “interaction” between the two disciplines and their discourses. Thus, the benefit of the thesis is the additional insight that is gained by overarching the two disciplines.

The International Security literature on Human Security is large, but mostly one-dimensional. The joint consideration using the theoretical approaches both from the development and security realms has been generally unexplored by the research community until now. And therefore the author of the thesis decided to stretch across the two broad academic disciplines with the goal to contribute to bridge them through dissolving the perceived, existing, and/or unrecognised disciplinary boundaries and enriching the debates held within each of the two disciplines.

2. Aim, Research Questions & Methodology

The topic of this thesis requires the employment of reflexive theoretical approaches. It stipulates the importance of experimenting with methods and modes of working, breaking the barrier of the rigid empiricism and instead encourages an open intellectual debate, which could lead to new kinds of knowledge about the complex society.

The critical approaches, relevant to the thinking about development and security, especially in relation to the “*developing world*”, are largely sceptical towards the “*Western/Northern*” project of modern scientific knowledge associated with the objective and universally valid truth, which is being imposed on the marginalised/less-powerful communities in the process of development and/or security promotion and interventions. Some of the development and security knowledge has even been created purposely with the intention to develop and/or make secure the “*underdeveloped*”/marginalised (Power, 2003; Peet and Hartwik, 2009; Majumdar, 2008). The hegemonies (power-relations) that are at the core of the attention of the critical theories can take not only the form of the political and the military, but also the intellectual character. This has been one of the motivations for the author in deciding to select the reflexive approach for the research of the Human Security.

The same way as Cox (1981) has, however, never been arguing for the exclusion of the problem solving theories at the expense of the critical theories, claiming that each of them serves a different purpose, even the author of this thesis is not denying the value added of problem solving approaches and empirical studies on its own and/or also as a base for the critical research.

In line with this approach, the main aim of the thesis is not to construct or test and/or re-build any hypothesis, but the *goal* is a deeper theoretical inquiry into the essence of the hybrid concept of Human Security – a case

example of linking of development and security; re-assessing the traditionally debated issues and arguments and contrasting them with the assumptions behind the critical theories.

To achieve the goal, the following *research questions* are explored:

- (1) What are the different security and development streams of thought that have preceded and/or influenced the concept of Human Security?
- (2) In what way is the hybrid Human Security concept a link between development and security, more specifically, a link between what development and what security?
- (3) What, if any, are the incongruities and contradictions of the concept of Human Security, as seen from the perspective of the critical theories/approaches?

In order to answer the first two research questions, a conceptual analysis of the two central concepts (development and the security) was performed. This analysis was motivated by the conviction that the meaning of the concepts matter. Working with elusive concepts and even merging the elusive concepts together could create confusion and incoherence. If we want to understand the nature of the Human Security concept better, we need to understand the development and security concepts first. Despite the widespread referral to the linking of development and security, both in policy and in different academic disciplines, there is not a shared understanding of what security and development is. Neither of the two concepts does have the straightforward definition, therefore the exploration of the concepts is highly relevant. Without understanding the crucial concepts in the security/development debate and without critically reflecting on them, it is hard to move forward in long lasting academic debate as well as in discussions among the practitioners/policy

makers, creating the alternative discourses and actions. This might actually contribute to the fortifying of the status quo in the society/international relations.

The conceptual analysis is methodologically founded on the desk study entailing reading of doctrinal theoretical works of the core development and security thinkers that have shaped the development and security thinking from the second half of the 20th century up today. The theoretical debates shaping the development and security discourses are explored to differentiate the diverse positions of how the development and security are understood and conceptualised within the corresponding academic disciplines.

As a second step, the schematic classification of security and development ideational strands was done to highlight the core features of the different conceptualisations and to trace and contrast the basic differences. The process of construction of the classification tables (i.e. the procedural steps and the associated limitations of the process and outcomes) is an integral part of the Chapters 3 and 4. The classification of the security theories has been inspired by the already existing general questions posed within the Security Studies (whose security?; security by whom?; security by what means?) and by the related divisions between the different streams of thought. However, in the case of organisation of the development streams of thought, there was not encountered any existing complex classification that would fit the purpose of the thesis and so the own typology was created by the author of the thesis. At the same time, the author is well aware of the problems and controversies associated to the choices made and described in Chapter 3. The limitations detected with respect to the security classification had mainly the character of simplifications through subsuming the internally varied theoretical families under one selected representative. In contrast, the multifaceted interdisciplinary character of the Development Studies as well as its inherent overlap with

the practice was reflected into more complicated methodological and theoretical problems that had to be resolved by the author of the thesis and represent one of the important contributions of the thesis.

The second part of the thesis (Chapters 5 and 6) builds on the findings of the above, contrasting the relevant development and security streams of thought and elaborating more in depth in what way the Human Security is an example of linking between development and security, more specifically between what development and what security.

The process leading to the answering of the third research question (Chapter 7) begins with an extensive literature review with the aim to select and include the academic works focused on the critical analysis of the Human Security concept and/or its underlying pillars. The majority of documents were obtained through combination of systematic internet-based search and snowballing methods. The Google search engine, as well as electronic database services, such as EBSCO, Wiley Online Library, J-Store etc., were employed, using the following search terms: *“human security”, “human security paradigm”, “human security debate”, “non-traditional security”, “human security concept”, “human security and critical theory”*.

As a part of the snowball method *“researcher identifies a small number of subjects [in case of our study, the small number of academic works] that are known to have rich [research relevant] information potential, and who in turn help to identify others in population [in our case, other relevant texts, authors]”* (Gray, 2009, 153). Snowball sampling is a form of convenience sampling, so it is unlikely to create sample representative of population (Bryman, 2008). However, in our case, the preference was not for creating statistical sample, but rather to enrich and complement the sources retrieved through the internet search and also to balance the limitations of the internet search. During the process of snowball

methodology (parallel to the systematic internet search), which included also the full text reading of the articles, the important limitation related to the use of the key phrase “*human security*” in the internet search was discovered. The considerable number of the works that relate to the topic Human Security and/or the underlying conceptual issues (especially from the development realms) does not include the term Human Security explicitly and thus does not appear in the outcomes of the search. Therefore the search terms have been extended to include also a combination of “*security*” AND (the Boolean operator) the selection of key concepts derived from critical theories, such as “*hierarchy*”, “*power*”, “*inclusiveness*”, “*emancipation*”, “*normativity*”, “*empowerment*”, “*universality*”. The point of departure for the snowball method was the set of the papers, identified through the thesis author’s competence in the two disciplines (development and security)¹. Among the many of the papers read in full text were the braking studies of Roland Paris, Edward Newman, Taylor Owen, Sabina Alkire, Gary King and Christopher Murray, Mohammed Ayoob, Amitav Acharya, Mary Kaldor, Mark Duffield, Edward Saíd, Arturo Escobar, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak etc.

The time span of the searched resources was bordered by the year 1994 (when the concept of Human Security has been popularised through the publication of the UNDP Human Development Report) and 2015 (to include the recent papers). Entries written in English language have been reviewed and included in the study, which might constitute certain limitation since many of the important critical works in development as well as security realms have

¹ As proposed by Creswell (2007), apart from the author’s prolonged engagement in the field (in academia e.g. participating in post-graduate programs focused on conflict sensitive development and peace-building; working at the Department of Development Studies), the consultations and debriefings with the thesis supervisor Doc. Oldřich Bureš (security realm) and also with the peer academic from Humboldt University Dr. Urmila Goel (development realm) were integral part of the process of selection of the key papers in order to provide for the external check for the choices made.

been originally published in Spanish and French languages (e.g. the Critical Security Studies works of Paris School thinkers and or the post-development works of Arturo Escobar etc.). However, most of the key works have been later translated in English and/or the authors later published in English.

The selection of the relevant documents to be included into the study has been strategic rather than random, the qualified decisions of the researcher, guided by the knowledge of the doctrinal works in the area of study (development and security realms and other relevant fields) was employed. As a first step, the exclusion of the unrelated entries, i.e. of the entries coming from the non-corresponding disciplines such as medicine, computer science, evolutionary psychology, pedagogy, human resource development was done. As a next step the works such as policy papers, other government publications, political agreements, news articles and press releases were to be excluded. The rationale behind this choice is based on the fact, that for the purpose of the thesis we are specifically looking for the theoretical debates in the academic writings. However, knowing that the Human Security concept has been closely linked to policy, it is only logical, that there has been also an array of works engaged in the policy and politics encountered to have been published by different governments and/or international organizations. Reading the introductions and/or conclusions of such documents, the strategic choice to exclude the policy and practice related works and to include the theoretical writings was made.

Next, the systematic and strategic screening of the abstracts and/or introductions and conclusions of the remaining academic writings (excluding the duplicate entries retrieved between and within the search tools) was performed. Such bibliography included journal articles, research papers, reports, books and book chapters. During the screening a number of underlying trends and perspectives on Human Security (i.e. debates *see below*) were

identified to be present and reflected in the scholarly literature. The entries related to the below debates were also set aside as not relevant for this part of the thesis.

First of the excluded debates on Human Security in academic literature has centred on the controversies related to the setting of the boundaries of the concept and looking at the problems of setting the definition and terminology (e.g. *Des Gasper, Thakur Ramesh, Emma Rothschild, Caroline Thomas, George MacLean, David Baldwin, Mary Kaldor, Lloyd Axworthy etc.*). Large body of literature appeared to be explaining the essence of the concept; finding the definition (e.g. wide/narrow); defending the utility of the concept both for theory and practice; or also challenging it.

Other group of the excluded academic works reflected the questions of measurement of Human Security. In an attempt to address the critical voices focused on lacking operationalization of Human Security as well as in seeking the enhancement of analytic utility and its possible auditing through objectively verifiable indicators, the different instruments and methodologies for (statistical) measurement of Human Security have been proposed (for details of the proposals and debates (e.g. *works of Taylor Owen, Gary King and Christopher Murray, Kanti Bajpai, Nicolas Thomas and William Tow, Olav Knudsen, Astri Suhrke, Lonergan Stephen etc.*)).

Another set of works has centred on the policy-related debates and institutionalization of the Human Security concept at the national (Japan, Norway, Canada and other countries such as Costa Rica, Greece, Ireland etc.) as well as on international level (United Nations agencies, European Union). The focus has also been on the foreign policy dynamics behind the employment of the Human Security concept (e.g. the role of the concept for the middle powers

diplomacy etc). The examples here could be *Lloyd Axworthy, Edward Newman and Oliver Richmond, Brian Parai etc.*

A large body of very varied literature has mushroomed around the sector/issue specific case-studies related to Human Security (e.g. HIV/AIDS, terrorism, migration, environmental collapses, economic inequalities, resource shortages, peace-building, human rights etc.) and/or on the region specific case-studies related to application of the concept of Human Security. Due to the huge plurality and diversity of topics as well as authors within this cluster of works, the listed names are not to be considered as representative, but rather as illustrative (e.g. *Ulf Kristofferson, James Wolferson, Alex de Waal, Nanna Poku and David Graham, Elen Walker and Noah Novogrodski for the first subcategory and e.g. Wayne Nelles, Lizee Pierre, Matther Richard, Peter Uvin for the second subcategory*).

After gradual excluding of all the above categories of entries (debates), the analysis of the full texts of the academic works was carried out using analytical categories/lenses stemming from critical approaches. The critical development and security studies are conceived broadly and embrace a number of different non-traditional approaches which challenge the conventional security and/or development (such as the theoretical frameworks of the various critical security schools of thought – see *Chapter 3, Table 2, pp. 55–56*; and post-development streams of thought – see *Chapter 4, Table 5, pp. 83–87*). Coming from various critical traditions, the selected critical approaches are not homogenous. The different schools or even authors accentuate different concepts they focus at; or they work with the concepts from differing positions. However, there are certain overlapping and/or complementing categories that could have been compiled and used for the analysis: exclusion/inclusion; power/hierarchy/ domination; emancipation. These categories served as an analytical tool that helps to guide the researcher to sort out the material, by

relating the texts and opinions to certain dimensions while exploring the variety of different contradictions and problems of the concept of Human Security as seen from the perspective of the critical theories, resp. exploring in what way the concept and its underlying pillars (constituting the essence of the concept) are considered problematic for the critical thinkers.

The findings were then organised and subsumed under the broader categories that correspond with the 4 basic pillars (a) universality; b) non-intervention; c) interdependence; and d) human-centricity) which constitute the essence of the concept of Human Security. These pillars not only represent the concepts and values that shall distinguish the Human Security from the traditional security and/or development but they also to certain extend represent the overlapping characteristics with the critical approaches (i) inclusiveness, ii) non-intervention and emancipation, iii) plurality, iv) humanity). While the organisation of the findings and linking them to the four pillars is valuable on its own, it also serves as a tool for a deeper insight, i.e. identification of incongruities and contradictions within and across the pillars.

2.1. Key Concepts & Theoretical Framework

Before we focus on the analysis of the security theories and development streams of thoughts as a base for understanding the nature of the central concept of the thesis – the Human Security, it is also necessary to define *the Human Security* itself and to expose the choice of its definition that is going to be used further in the thesis. It is also important to clarify the other essential term that is going to be used frequently through out of the thesis (i.e. *Developing World/Third World/Global South*). Afterwards the attention is paid to the

introduction of the theoretical framework this thesis works with, including the nature of the research paradigms and the critical theories approach.

2.1.1. Human Security: Definition

There is no consensus leading to one single definition of Human Security (*for the diverse examples of definitions, please see the Attachment, where different definitions extracted from document of the Global Development Research Centre are presented*). Both the members of the scientific community and also the representatives of policymakers (governments and/or international organizations) are not unanimous about the concept. Moreover different actors at different levels of analysis and from different fields, be it development and/or security or international relations, including the country governments, international organizations, academics and civil society representatives use the concept of Human Security for different purposes (agenda setting, advocacy, analysis etc.).

However, even if the different Human Security proponents might disagree on the exact definition, and the character of threats and also the means that shall be employed to tackle these threats, there is a basic agreement on the departure from the traditional security discourse, resp. on the general expansion of the notion of insecurity stretching beyond the physical violence; on the interdependence of the different insecurities and on the universality, i.e. on the focus on the individual security and equal application to all people (*e.g. see and compare the examples of the different definitions in the attachment*). All these aspects or principles are reflected in the most prominent and also one of the most encompassing definitions of Human Security that is present in the Human Development Report from 1994, published by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP). This Report became a significant contribution to the 1995

Copenhagen World Summit for Social Development and thus constituted one of the key-agenda setting initiatives relating the development and security, but also it became one of the most influential departure points for the academic debates about the concept of Human Security. These are also the reasons why the United Nations Development Program interpretation of the Human Security has been selected to be used in the thesis.

The essence of the Human Security, as envisaged by the UNDP (1994), lies in the four underlying principles (the four pillars of universality, non-intervention; interdependence; and human-centricity). The Human Security (according to UNDP), bringing in the freedom from fear and freedom from want is understood as having a *universal* concern. It is relevant to all people everywhere, to the Global North as well as to the Global South, to the rich as well as poor areas of the world.

It is based on the comprehensive multi-sectoral understanding of insecurities, entailing a wide variety of threats and causes of insecurities related to the following, more specific areas: economic security (e.g. persistent poverty, unemployment, structural constraints for entrance to the market etc); food security (e.g. hunger, famine, malnourishment etc.), health security (infectious diseases, unsafe water and food, lack of access to the healthcare etc.); environmental security (environmental degradation, resource depletion, natural disasters, pollution etc.); personal security (physical violence, crime, terrorism, domestic violence, child labor, etc.); community security (inter-ethnic, religious and other identity based tensions and/or lack of respect and recognition between the different groups, etc.) and political security (various forms of political repressions, human rights abuses, bad governance etc). The different types of insecurities reflected in the sector components of Human Security are seen as *interdependent* and mutually reinforcing, both in the root causes as well as in the strategies to be used to tackle them. The reinforcing can take the form

of the so called domino effect in a sense that one threat is feeding on the other threats. For example the violent conflicts could set back the development and the deepened poverty could in turn lead to resource depletion, further competition for resources, infectious diseases, and education deficits etc. Moreover the threats to one group/country/area could produce negative externalities for the other areas, wider regions and/or the international society.

Human Security is to be ensured through *early prevention (empowerment and emancipation) then later intervention*. It envisages the coherence and coordination among the traditionally separate realms (e.g. development and security). The prevention shall aim at the minimization of the impacts of insecurity, allowing for the long-term solutions through building capacities and empowerment.

Last but not least, the Human Security is presented in the UNDP (1994) document as a *people-centred* approach, i.e. the central idea of Human Security concept is the primacy of human life as an objective of security polity. It is contrasted with the long lasting primacy of state being the primary referent object of security. The human life has however gradually expanded to include also the groups and international systems (economic, environmental, institutional, etc.). People's interests or interests of humanity become the focal point including the enhancing or securing the conditions where the humans could live in freedom, peace and safety and also participate fully in the process of governance; having the excess to resources including the health, education and inhabiting the environment that is not endangering their health and wellbeing. The Human Security also emphasises the importance of the people's own perceptions of vulnerabilities reflected into the indentified needs of the populations under stress and it promotes the knowledge sharing.

Apart from bringing in the basic pillars or principles that formed the building blocks of the concept, the Human Development Report also introduces the following definition of the human security: *"In the final analysis, human security is a child who did not die, a disease that did not spread, a job that was not cut, an ethnic tension that did not explode in violence, a dissident that was not silenced"* (UNDP, 1994, 22). This definition could be worked with either literally to imagine all the different aspects of the security concerns envisaged in the new concept of security, but it could equally be interpreted as a metaphor (such as the one offered by the author of the thesis below) to illustrate better how the concept of human security is understood.

The *child that has not died* could illustrate that the Human Security is still quite a new concept that is highly contested, but manages to survive as a part of the academic as well as the policy discussions and still continues to attract the attention. It is also the *disease that did not spread*, i.e. despite the changing policy environment after the end of Cold War and despite the new security challenges being perceived, the concept never spread enough to become the mainstream approach to security both in academia as well as practice. The metaphor of *"ethnic tension"* could be representing the tensions between the different schools of thought both from the development as well as security realm. The concept as such has also acquired quite a radical opposition from the part of the traditional security proponents. The different scholarships are approaching the concept as if they were very distant and non-compatible, in the similar way as the different ethnic group often claim to be. However the tension has never resorted to become hot, the different groups of thinkers and practitioners are still participating in the discussions and exchange of ideas (*see the discussion in the articles by e.g. Des Gasper, Thakur Ramesh, Emma Rothschild, Caroline Thomas, George MacLean, David Baldwin, Mary Kaldor, Lloyd Axworthy etc.*). The nature of the human security concept is also normative and in its essence shall give the

voice and help the emancipation of the vulnerable /“*dissident*” groups of population and/or actors in order to have the capabilities and power to change their lives, not to be silent (overlooked) any longer.

For the purpose of this thesis, we have selected to work with the encompassing UNDP definition of Human Security, built on the four principles (pillars). However, in order to understand the UNDP approach better, we need to contrast it with other interpretations. Within the extended debate on definitions of Human Security concept, there are visible the two following main divisions – the so called broad and narrow approaches, which are briefly introduced below.

2.1.1.1. Broad Definition

The broader conceptual framework of Human Security draws on the United Nations Development Program’s work (e.g. UNDP, 1994) as well as the Human Security Commission (2003) and the Japanese government understanding of the concept (*see also Table 1, p. 32*). This approach encompasses the “*freedom from want*” as well as the “*freedom from fear*”. The former is including freedoms from chronic hunger, diseases, and repressions. All these issues come from the traditionally development realm and also require the development investments and long-term planning, typical for development policies, as well as the protection from immediate disasters). The latter component is related to the protection of the individuals from the physical violence.

For this approach, the development component is more central and more defining. This understanding of Human Security promotes sustainable development as the foundation for peace and security both within and among

the states in all areas of the world. The proponents of this very normative approach to security believe, that any other (i.e. less comprehensive) approach that would deny the attention to the wide spectra of the security challenges, would be necessarily neglecting the reality and thus would be ethically problematic.

2.1.1.2. Narrow Definition

The narrow definition or understanding of Human Security is based on the Canadian² approach restricting the insecurities onto the violent threats to human beings (*see also Table 1, p. 32*). These may still include a wide variety of issues such as organised crime, trafficking of human beings as well as illicit substances including the small arms trade, landmines, ethnic disputes, state failure. The purpose of this approach is largely based on the analysis of the so called “*new wars*” typical for the international relations in the post-Cold War period, targeting the civilians as the primary objects and making the differences between the wars and organised crime smaller etc. (Kaldor, 2007).

In contrast to the geo-political goals of the earlier wars and conflicts, the “*new wars*” are more about identity politics. The “*new wars*”, as defined by Mary Kaldor, are understood as protracted social conflicts, which have very deep roots. Edward Azar interpreted in Gawerc (2006, 436) see these wars as “*prolonged and often violent struggles by communal groups for such a basic need as security, recognition and acceptance, fair access to political institutions and economic participation*”. Such conflicts are many times happening between different non-state groups and sometimes including the state as one party of the conflict,

² Because Canada oftentimes emphasised the support of civilians in the times of the violence and sponsored the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, which has produced the landmark report on the Responsibility to Protect, the narrow approach to Human Security is oftentimes being labelled as the Canadian approach.

where one of these communities (economic, religious or ethnic groups) are controlling the state machinery and use it against the other groups. The deep roots of the conflicts are related to the basic human needs (dignity, recognition, security) of the participants which make it difficult to negotiate about the solutions. The analysis of the roots of the “*new wars*” and the appropriate approaches to tackle the associated problems could, paradoxically, bring us closer to the broader approach to Human Security.

The narrower approach to Human Security is more linked to immediate responses rather than long-term planning and investment for sustainable development. The whole debate on the Responsibility to Protect, as a response to the situations when states, resp. the national governments are not able to provide their citizens with security and moreover in cases when states (weak or strong and coercive) are themselves contributing to the security challenges for their own citizens, is linked to this stream of Human Security conceptualisation.

Even though the narrow approach might seem to be more interventionist, it does also include more non-coercive methods to deal with the security dangers, such as security sector reform, preventive diplomacy, post-conflict state building, structural transformation policies related to the good-governance etc. Some of the responses, however, bring it very close to the approach proposed by the proponents of the wider definition and eventually we could see many similarities and overlaps.

Within the narrow approach to Human Security, there has been an attempt to push Human Security to the sphere of the “*high politics*”. Which means that if the actions, based on such a political decisions, are taken in the name of the Human Security, they are oftentimes linked to what has been traditionally embedded in the state-centric traditional security concepts – protection of state and/or providing military solutions and/or oftentimes

lacking the emancipatory elements when the actions are being performed by the powerful on the behalf of the less powerful or even at their expenses.

Table 1: *Human Security Concepts*

	Focus and values	Conceptualization of threats	Strategies
UNDP 1994	Freedom from want and freedom from fear	7 components: Economic, food, health, environmental, personal, community and political security	Coordinated action by states, international community and people's groups
Canada	Freedom from fear (rights, safety, lives)	People focused but without major changes in definition and lists of threats (mirroring the traditional): armed conflicts, physical violence, human rights abuses, public insecurity and organized crime	Public safety measures, conflict prevention, governance and accountability, peace-support operations, small-arms regulations, humanitarian intervention, responsibility to protect, campaigns to ban land mines
Japan	Freedom from want and freedom from fear (lives, livelihoods and dignity)	Poverty, environmental degradation, illicit drugs, transnational crime, infectious diseases, migration flows	Concentration on protection from threats to livelihoods, dignity and everyday life, seeking empowerment to bring out potential (capabilities, empowerment)

Source: adapted from Tadjbakhsh. and Chenoy, 2007, 32–34.

2.1.1.3. Human Security: Japan's or Canadian Way?

Although the aim of this work is not to analyze practical realization and institutionalization of the Human Security concept, it is still important to briefly map into how the core leading actors took up the Human Security and made it part of its formal policies. The main reason for including this section is that the most of the Human Security is dominantly a problem solving approach having its origins in foreign and development policies and practice, not in academia (Newman, 2010). It is obvious that many of the defining characteristics of the concept and its differentiated definitions are somehow related to the issues of policy relevance, engagement in the policy and its intention to change the security and development policies. At the same time it shall be maintained that the increasing level of institutionalization (*for examples of institutionalization see below*) that is contributing also to the clarification of the concept, cannot compensate for its poor theoretical conceptualisation.

Japan, Norway and Canada as the individual national governments took the lead in linking the Human Security concept to the concrete political initiatives with the attempt to institutionalize it within the foreign and/or development policies. Each of the mid-power players, however, worked with the concept in a different way. (Liotta and Owen, 2006; Axworthy, 1997; Bosold and Werthes, 2005) The trajectories taken are closely corresponding with the broad vs. narrow definition of the Human Security (*explained above*).

In 1999 Canada and Norway created the Human Security Network (not dated) of their respective high government officials. The Network was to be summoned annually to discuss the priorities in security. The group has also included Austria, Costa Rica, Greece, South Africa, Switzerland and Thailand. These countries have decided to adapt the narrow definition of the human security focusing namely on the issues of threats of violence, political

repressions and human rights abuses pioneering the international agreements on prohibiting the anti-personal mines, international criminal court, control of small arms and light weapons, protection of the most vulnerable groups from the physical violence (e.g. woman and children) etc.

For Canada and the like-minded countries, the Human Security did not replace the traditional National Security, it has been rather perceived as a complementary element. In practice, promoting the so called narrower view on Human Security, the Canadian government advocated for strengthening of the international norms, e.g. *The Convention on Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personal Landmines* (the so called Ottawa Convention) and establishment of the International Criminal Court (Prosper, 2006). Axworthy (1997), the Canadian Foreign Minister also called for promotion of the Human Security through humanitarian inspired interventions. This attitude led Canada to create the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty which has later come up with the famous "*Responsibility to Protect Report*" in 2001. In the coming years this interventionist paradigm has gained the momentum and slowly also some international recognition.

Although there has remained international divide on the Humanitarian Interventions (the military operations breaching the state sovereignty in the event of the mass atrocities against the human rights), the Responsibility to Protect concept aiming at ensuring the freedom from fear of the individuals, and thus building on the narrower definition of the Human Security, gained the "*clear and unambiguous acceptance*" by all governments at the General Assembly in 2005. The United Nations member countries have moved to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity (United Nations General Assembly, 2005a). In 2006 United Nations Security Council passed the Resolution 1674 (United Nations Security Council,

2006) which re-affirmed the conclusions of the General Assembly from the previous year. However, for example Japan has distanced itself from the Canadian approach to Human Security with respect to humanitarian interventions.

On the other hand, Japan became the main protagonist of the broad definition of the Human Security taking the trajectory that has encompassed also the development and poverty issues and thus also choosing to use the development cooperation as the instrument of promotion of security at the local level. In 2003 the government re-visited the Official Development Assistance Charter, the main document guiding its Development Assistance and thus giving the framework for the Japanese approach to development, resp. support of the development processes in the world. The Human Security principles have become integrated as one of the most important integral parts of the document. (Howe and Jang, 2013)

In 1999 together with the United Nations established the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security. The activities of the Trust Fund were quite broad ranging from the educational programs, health awareness campaigns, repatriation of refugees and/or demobilization of the ex-combatants. Two years later the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs set up the special Commission on Human Security (chaired by the UN High Commissioner for Refugees Sadako Ogata and the development thinker Amartya Sen). In 2003 The Advisory Board on Human Security was created and in the following year, the Human Security Unit was established inside the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs with the special objective to place the Human Security approach in the mainstream of the United Nations Activities (MacFarlane and Khong, 2006).

Japan has also engaged in the task to introduce the Human Security debate at the United Nations General Assembly. In 2008 the United Nations General Assembly took the initiative to open the wider debate on the Human Security and two years later, headed by the Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon, they have presented the first official report on the concept. The report *Human Security* (2010) broadly defined the concept of Human Security and in the same year the General Assembly moved to continue the debate on the topic. In 2012, the General Assembly adopted a common definition of the concept (see the United Nations General Assembly 66th Session follow up to paragraph 143 on Human Security, A/RES/66/290). Where among others the General Assembly agrees that *“Human Security is an approach to assist the member states to identifying and addressing widespread and cross-cutting challenges to the survival, livelihood and dignity of their people”*. The General Assembly Resolution was adopted unanimously. This, however, does not mean that the result was satisfying for all the member states. On the other hand it leaves quite enough space for the different interpretations, when different parties do highlight different aspects of the definition when trying to put it into practice through their policies and international activities.

In general the Resolution is largely built on the Japanese broader understanding of the Human Security, as opposed to the Canadian narrow accent on conflict prevention, peacekeeping and protection in the events of the mass violations of human rights. The Resolution also clearly distinguishes between the Human Security and the Responsibility to Protect concept. The Resolution, however, does not create any new obligations for the United Nations member states. (United Nations General Assembly, 2012)

While the difference in Canadian and Japanese approaches was largely about priorities and political perceptions, nevertheless it was a precursor to the academic debate that was also developing itself. The main differences were in

defining the Human Security, the relationship between the Human Security and national/traditional security and how to achieve the Human Security.

2.1.2. Developing World/Third World/Global South

In many of the studied concepts of development/security it was necessary to refer to certain region of the world – “*the developing world*”. In the history there have developed different labels to name these countries (Dušková et al., 2011, 278–281). The so called “*developing region*” comprises majority of the world’s countries. From the geographical perspective, we could find the developing countries in all permanently settled continents. From the socioeconomic point of view the developing countries are definitely not a homogenous group. However, many of them would share certain commonalities, including the colonial past, poverty, low literacy rates, epidemics, lower life expectancy, conflicts and instabilities, high proportion of young people in population, etc. Many of the countries’ economic production is/was based dominantly on agriculture and/or mining, and they traditionally had relatively low level of industrialization and urbanization. However, we have to keep in mind that these characteristics will not be found all across the developing region, which is very diverse in character and also these characteristics (esp. the level of industrialization and urbanisation are changing rapidly).

The origin of the term “*developing countries*” is related to the 1964 United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, where it started to be used more widely. Before this time, especially in the colonial times, the dependent countries have been oftentimes labelled as “*backward*” or “*underdeveloped*”. This was largely disputed by the representatives of such territories. It became even more opposed during the time of decolonisation.

Later on there were created many other terms that were believed to describe the region more precisely. One of them was the famous Cold War division of the world into the *"First, Second and Third"* – that was supposed to include the developing countries. The *"First World"* comprised of the capitalist Western oriented countries, allies of the United States hegemonic power. The *"Second World"* referred to the socialist camp. The last term served to describe the less developed regions.

This typology was used in 1952 by French demographer Alfred Sauvy, who got his inspiration in the classification of the French society prior to the French Revolution. The parallel was based on several criteria: the economic characteristics of the least favoured class/counties (*"poor"*); also on the political characteristics (*"power-less"*) and social characteristics (*"marginalised"*). Other defining feature of the so called *"Third World"* was that the respective countries were not, at least at the beginning of the Cold War, associated with any of the security blocks headed by United States and/or the Soviet Union.

However, even this term is not very precise and useful for classifying the countries, because again it has included a very heterogeneous group of countries, from the perspective of the political regimes, economic situation, development etc. Moreover, not all the developing countries were historically labelled as *"Third World"*, and vice versa not all the *"Third World"* member were possible to be described as developing in its essence. For example Mongolia, Vietnam or Cuba belonged to the *"Second World"* and/or Switzerland or Finland fall into the *"Third World"*.

Moreover, after the fall of Berlin Wall the classification into the three worlds become obsolete. At the end of the 20th century, academic writings as well as policy papers and proclamations have been dominated with the term *"Global North"* and *"Global South"*. The *"North"* was to label the developed

industrialised countries and the “*South*” was to describe the developing regions. However, even this “*geographic*” labels are not entirely correct and precise. There are many countries located in the “*North*” that fulfil the characteristics of the developing country (e.g. Haiti, Mongolia etc.), on the other hand there are countries in the “*South*” that are scoring high in economic and also development indicators such as Australia, New Zealand etc. (Dušková et al., 2011, 278–281)

In this thesis, therefore, the labels of “*developing/developed, North/South, Third World/ First World or West and Second World or East*” are used alternatively without having a specific connotations and links to the historical periods and/or without showing any preference of the author to any of the above sets of categories. The author recognises the ambivalence of all the terms mentioned above. Moreover, the critical theorists (Foucault, Escobar, Esteva, Spivak, Babha etc.) argue that any such labelling anyway explicitly implies the inferiority of the “*developing countries*” and thus legitimises the interventions and control from the part of the “*developed countries*”, esp. because the creation and use of such categories is creating also the discourse of problems that need to be solved. On the other hand, the author is aware that there does not exist any more comprehensive category or definition of the region, so it is necessary to resort to the already existing terminology/labels.

2.1.3. Nature of Research Paradigms: Positivism vs. Non-positivism

Since the analysis and comparison of the research paradigms is by no means the main task of this thesis, the author would simplify this overtly complex issue and just focus briefly on the basic division of the research paradigms into the *positivist* and *non-positivist* approaches and on providing an introductory statement on what are the main implications of such a choice for

research generally as well as for this thesis. The ontological and epistemological pre-suppositions that the different security and development approaches rely on are going to be used in order to understand better the nature of the concepts and also to distinguish between the traditional and non-traditional schools of thought. The brief insight into these research paradigms is also important prerequisite for understanding the nature of critical approaches.

The different research paradigms have different view on the world. They might differ in the basic ontology, i.e. finding different answers to the questions: *What is reality; What is truth? What can be recognised about reality and truth? And what can be known about reality?* They can also differ in the epistemological inquiry, i.e. in answering the questions such as *what is the relation between the seeker of the knowledge and reality/knowledge and truth?; who could be the seeker of knowledge?; and what could be known?* They might also differ on the methodological part of the research in a procedural path taken to discover *what is to be discovered.* (Aliyu et al., 2014; Merriam, 2009)

Positivism could be seen as a research strategy that stems from the ontology of the objective reality independent of the observer (realist approach). The world, then, is operating due to the unchanging laws and processes that are to be uncovered by the modern scientific research processes (Gray, 2009; Comstock, 1994).

The concept of positivism has been central to the philosophy of science since the beginning of the 19th Century, when August Comte in his work "*Course on Positive Philosophy*" introduced the term. For the positivist science approaches, the reality is something automatically and objectively given, something that simply exists and is to be uncovered. So the task of the researcher is to gather the data, information about such a reality and systematize it, which could be done through the process of induction.

Positivism also adopted Descartes' epistemology of hypothesis, theory, and knowledge reasoning (the deduction approach). (Gray, 2009; Disman, 2008)

For the non-positivist approaches (*social constructivist approaches*), reality is not something automatically and objectively given and there are a number of ways such ontology could be operated. The observer contributes in a number of ways to the establishment of "*reality*". The main distinction between the non-positivist approaches is according to Creswell (2002) constructivism and subjectivism.

The positivistic approaches to science have dominated research for long periods of time, but since the 1960s/1970s there have been attempts to challenge its dominance. Structuralism, hermeneutics and phenomenology started to be used in opposition to the dominant positivist research approaches. The non-positivist approaches to reality started to develop with the aim of going well beyond "*reality*" and looking at the deeper underlying processes found behind the manifestations of observable reality. The structuralists were interested in tracing the "*structures*" that have influenced reality, seeking to understand the (often) hidden driving forces and mechanisms that contribute to the development of such structures/systems. They have maintained that observable reality is not the only thing that "*is out there*", but there are many layers to the reality (reality is multifaceted). The reality presented by positivists was thus seen only as a reduction of observable (measurable). However, if there are hidden patterns and processes that contribute to the manifestations of the observable reality, the critics of the positivist thinking/science were keen on disclosing them.

Positivism usually resorts to the use of epistemologies encompassing empiricism. As for the epistemology linked to non-positivist ontology (since there is an assumption that certain ontological standpoints shall be connected to

the corresponding epistemologies), these approaches are likely to employ phenomenology and/or hermeneutics (Aliu et al., 2014). Cresswell (2002), however, declares that it is the personal responsibility of each of the researcher as to how he/she combines and mixes the positivist and non-positivist anthologies with the different epistemologies and methodologies; however the random, as he calls it, "*pick and choose*" strategy, is not very suitable.

The non-positivist authors also started to question the foundations of knowledge, pointing out to the inter-subjectivity rather than to objectivity. They have started to challenge and reject the positivist, universalising knowledge and their claims about "*value-free truth*" and they argue further that knowledge is socially constructed and related to power. One of the founding fathers of the power-truth-knowledge "*discourse*" is the French philosopher Michel Foucault. "*Foucault shared with Nietzsche his fascination with the [relation between] power, truth and knowledge [...] and with Husserl and Heidegger [their] critical and suspicious attitude toward the modern project...*" and all its attributes including rationalism, the existence of objective truth and science regulating the experience, interpretation and understanding of the objective reality (Peet and Hartwick, 2009, 204). He has based his critical approach to modernity on a questioning of the "*universal humanity*" which has been largely created around the unique European experience and culture. Moreover, he has been sceptical towards the universalising effects of the values that have come from the European enlightenment (autonomy, freedom, human rights) that have become the ideological base for the so called "*normalising*" discipline that has been imposing the "*appropriate*" identity on "*modern*" people. (ibid, 204)

Foucault has seen the danger of the modern rationality becoming coercive rather than liberating; it could become a force that is used to control the minds of people rather than to open them to opportunities. In his work "*Archaeology of Knowledge*" (1972) he has elaborated his critique towards the so

called “*speech acts*” – expert statements backed by validation procedures that might produce the “truth” which is then legitimised to be taken as scientifically backed objective knowledge about reality and therefore important, worth of respect and strong enough to underpin the responsible action as a solution to the world’s problems. So he claims that modern “*Western*” knowledge is involved in the process of domination. Instead, Foucault favoured the local varieties of knowledge and/or the transformation of knowledge production including the openness to various forms of knowledge and methods to acquire knowledge.

Michel Foucault has influenced both those who study development and those who have focused on security discourses with the concern to analyze the power at various levels (Baldwin, 1997).

Foucault’s *knowledge-truth-power* complex has been taken up by many post-structuralist authors, critical and cautious towards the *universalising, neutral and objectivising* “*Western/Northern*” modern scientific knowledge (e.g. Saïd, 1978, 2006, 2008; Escobar, 1988; Selvadurai, Choy, Maros, Abdullah, 2013). They have been reinterpreting the modern reason critically as a mode of control, i.e. modern scientists are creating the rules of the game for the production of knowledge and thus in fact controlling what becomes knowledge in a sense of what becomes the “*objective*” understanding of reality upon which actions could be taken (Loomba, 2005).

2.1.4. Critical Theories Approach

The aim of this part of the thesis is to provide for the general introduction of the essence of critical approaches and the function they play with respect to the understanding of the world.

It is important to establish, that “critical theory is not a general theory but is instead a method of analysis deriving from non-positivist epistemology” (Antonio, 1981, 332). Critical theories are generally a very broad approach, starting from the structural critiques in the first couple of decades of the 20th century and expanding throughout of the second half of the 20th century and even more at the beginning of the 21st century when they were additionally influenced by the post-structuralism and post-modernism. They cover areas of literary criticism, linguistics, semiotics, feminism, psychology, philosophy, international relations and security and also the development studies.

Critical theorists have significantly borrowed from the debates in German sociology in the 1920s and 1930s, in particular from Horkheimer’s distinction between the traditional and critical theory (elaborated in his essay “*Traditional and Critical Theory*” from 1937). These ideas were then taken up again in the 1980s and reflected clearly in the works of Robert Cox³, the proponent of the division between “*Problem-solving*” and “*Critical*” theories relevant to the study of International Relations/International Security and also to some extent the International Development.

³ The main difference between the traditional theoretical schools of social science (that are more oriented towards the investigation of the empirical facts) and the critical schools (that are focused at the critical reflection of the principles), was depicted by Cox (1981) being inspired by Horkheimer, Gramsci and Frankfurt School of thought. Cox has pointed out the most significant distinction between the problem-solving and critical theories in his work “*Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory*” from 1981. The problem solving theories are working with the world realities as they are and focus on the correction of the possible dysfunctions of the systems, looking at the specific problems within the existing reality/system. On the other hand the critical theories, as understood by Cox, are more concerned with how the world shall operate, and it does so through the questioning of the “given” frameworks, i.e. the structural conditions, that underpin the functioning of the world. It looks at the “facts” that the problem-solving theory operates on and questions them from inside. The critical theories are fuelled by the assumption that there is no universal theory or approach, that there is also not a universal validity and “truth” (post-modernism). Critical theory, as understood by Cox, is critical because it stand apart from the prevailing order, believing that the existing institutions and power distribution shall not be taken for granted.

From methodological perspective, the key target of the Critical Theory was the “*enlightened approach*” to the social sciences, which was at the time based on the only recognised and thus possible approaches of naturalism, empiricism and positivism. The legacy of Horkheimer for the different critical approaches is that even science is, however, a social practice and as such it definitely cannot be exercised un-reflectively (Brincat, 2011). In critical approaches, the subjects and objects in science are mutually interrelated, one influencing the other, so that even the social theories need to grasp the interplay between them rather than separating them into divergent realities. Moreover, theoretical and scientific activities were not the independent discovery of the objective reality, but product of the ever changing multiple realities. The changing reality concept builds on the Heraclites’ understanding of the dynamic ontology. (Brincat, 2011; Merrian, 2009)

Every piece of knowledge is a representation made by particular person/groups in particular socio-historical contexts and for particular reasons, i.e. with particular interests. For Horkheimer (interpreted by Brincat, 2011, 8) “*the motivations of traditional positivist sociology were located in the political and economic needs of the bourgeois society that rewarded knowledge that had instrumental and practical applications while neglecting those whose use-value was not immediate for production purposes*”. Similarly, later, for example Michel Foucault and Edward Saïd and Arturo Escobar developing and analyzing *knowledge-truth-power* systems in order to disclose the interlinked effects of knowledge creation and power reflecting the motivations of those that at the core of knowledge creation. From the critical theorists’ point of view even the other theories and approaches that have been created within, as they claimed the objectivist positivist framework of science, do in fact possess normative and political implications. Horkheimer and the other critical scholars that have been inspired by his legacy, pointed out that the positivists, insulating themselves from the

speculative and reflexive aspects of the reason, had come to perpetuate dogmatic systems and structures. The critical theories approaches and concepts, on the other hand shall provide for the emancipator process and the questioning of such given orders (Brincat, 2011; Comstock, 1994).

The function of the critical approaches is to increase the awareness of all sorts of social actors concerning the contradictory conditions of their actions which could be distorted or hidden by the everyday “*normalised*” understandings of the world (Comstock, 1994; Essed, 2002; Todorov, 2009).

Critical theories require critical methods. It is impossible to apply investigative logic and the methods developed by the positivist research methodologists. Such critical methods would be based on critical reflection and dialogue rather than on the observation or experiment, developing the interpretative understanding of the studied concepts. Critical approaches also refuse to accept the positivist practices including the processes of validation. The intention is rather to emancipate the subjects from the frozen concepts and conceptions in order to allow for the more conscious political action and or more reflective education. It is also very important to admit that the critical knowledge is never neutral. (Comstock, 1994; Brincat, 2011)

Critical approaches question “*reality*” as its main goal. They raise questions about power, setting of the structure that might be defining/limiting the individuals and/or the weaker or marginalised or silenced groups. The aim of critical approaches is to question and challenge the prevailing/mainstream structures of power and power-relations including the prevailing discourses often interpreted as the only “*scientifically*” proven objective truths incorporated into mainstream thinking (Escobar, 1988, Booth, 2005).

The “*Critical Theory*” is in itself a multidimensional term; i.e. there is no one single critical theory or a concrete number of well defined and classified

critical schools. Rather there is a variety of critical streams of thought existing in different forms in various academic disciplines as well as in wider philosophical debates. The different modes of critical theories are being used by different authors and groups in many fields of inquiry not only within the different academic disciplines, but also in different parts of the world. The debate on critical approaches has catalysed the normative shift also in International Security/International Relations and in International Development Studies, offering alternative methodological and normative systems in opposition to the objectivist, positivist classical theories of realism, respectively the classical (economic) modernization theories of development that have been dominating both disciplines up till now. (*For concrete examples see Chapters 3 and 4*).

The inter-disciplinary focus of this thesis allows for the exploration and engagement of the different critical approaches existing within the security and development realms. The author of the thesis is crossing the borders between the two disciplines while combining them in one work with the purpose to critically reflect the Human Security concept. It has to be noted that in the security and development fields, the critical approaches encompass a rich variety of different theoretical strands (including the critical security studies, post-modernism, post-developmentalism). Each of these is further divided into different more or less coherent streams of thought (e.g. the Welsh School, Paris School, various post-modern approaches to security; different non-modern or post-development streams of thought; *more details and the concrete differences are explored further down in Chapter 3 and Chapter 4*). Despite the considerable plurality and the different legacies reflected in the critical works of development and security thinkers, it is still possible to identify some core concepts, themes and values that guide the *emancipatory* struggle of these approaches. The critical security and development is challenging the ontology

and epistemology of the traditionalist (realist/modernisation) approaches. They are focused on the *humans* and their *empowerment* with the aim to be able to emancipate them from the structural constraints of insecurity and/or underdevelopment and pursue their choices and ambitions. They are encouraging an open intellectual environment allowing for the *questioning of the creation and consequent use of knowledge* and interpretation of reality (*power-knowledge nexus*). Their reflexive epistemologies are focusing on uncovering the *power and domination* in the systems that are producing the *inclusion/exclusion* effects and also legitimising the *interventionism* of different forms.

3. Interpreting Security

In order to trace the evolution of elements inherent to the concept of Human Security in the security discourse and also in order to understand better how the concept has come about and how it has been constructed, it is necessary to understand the earlier approaches to security, earlier security discourses.

Even though the International Security Studies are much more settled than the Development Studies, still when attempting to study the security, there is a prevailing general problem of how to define and understand security. A schematic classification (*see Table 2, pp. 55–56*) was therefore made to identify and highlight the common features in the different conceptions of security. It was done also in order to be able to clarify their meaning; and to trace, understand and contrast the basic differences between the selected streams of thought; as well as in order to understand better how to relate them to the central concept of this thesis – the Human Security.

The central questions already existing within the Security Studies (see e.g. Baldwin, 1997) were asked in order to guide the choices in the process of construction of the classification, i.e. *“whose security?”*; *“security by whom?”*; *“security by what means?”*. Related to these core questions⁴, the dividing lines have been made along the state vs. other non-state referent objects at the centre of attention; state vs. other non-state agents of security (in that case also identifying which ones); security within the range of military sector and/or beyond (i.e. wider security including the identification of wider in what sense). The scope and/or perception of the international system as well as the epistemological and ontological pre-suppositions, that the different approaches

⁴ The three questions were selected from the whole set of the security relevant questions, offered by Baldwin (1997), with the specific aim to be later able to explore the analogical debates in the area of development.

rely on, were added to the analysis in order to be able to distinguish better between the traditional and non-traditional schools of thought.

According to the above dividing lines, the classification of the main security schools of thought follows: a) the traditionalists; b) the Copenhagen School of wideners; and c) the Critical Security Studies schools proposing the re-examination of the basic premises beyond the understanding of the security. There is one more interesting school of thought that provides quite a unique approach to security debate, especially while drawing attention to studying of specific security problems in the so called developing world – d) The Third World Security Studies which has been added to the body of the text to complement the picture of the Security Studies.

Some limitations were encountered in the course of the process of creating the overview of the security approaches. The nature of the classification limitations has been different and a lot less problematic when compared to the classification of the development streams of thought (*for problems and limits of the classification of development see Chapter 4*). Still, in the attempt to grasp the important trends and features, the considerable simplifications had to be made with respect to the classified theories. In most of the cases the simplification has been made in the form of subsuming the rich and varied theoretical families under one representative and/or selecting one relevant concrete representative within the much wider stream of thought.

The realist and liberal traditions in the international security are much broader and much more varied (both content-wise as well as with respect to different typologies) than depicted in the table, encompassing many different historical and up to date cleavages⁵. However, for the purpose of this thesis, the

⁵ Although the intention was to capture the major perspectives and defining characteristics of the traditional approaches to security, the author does not want to give impression that the different schools of thought are monolithic and homogenous. The realism is much more than

two streams of thought have been boldly simplified and classified under the (neo) realist and (neo)liberal schematic and general categories having in mind that both streams of thought do offer a relatively coherent set of principles and propositions that allow us to contrast these traditionalist approaches with the other security related streams of thought that have developed in the second half of the 20th century.

The special attention should be also paid to another security school– the Third World Security Studies. There could either be a special column devoted to this school and/or it could be (sub)related to the (neo)realist section of the table. The latter option was selected due to the fact that this school could be evaluated as to largely building on and extending the (neo)realist view on security. However, it shall be noted that it differs in drawing the special attention to the regions that have been omitted or understudied by the realist traditions during the Cold World period – the so called Third World, or periphery. During the Cold War the realists were mostly concerned with bipolarity and nuclear deterrence and the issues of the Third World were addressed almost exceptionally and to the extent that they impacted on the superpower relations. Moreover, the distinction also needs to be made with respect to what kind of state we are talking about – “western” (as dominantly

a single theory; it is a school of thought that contains numerous related branches. Moreover, the different scholars do have different views on how to classify and label the different branches of the realist theories. Just as an example, Glen Snyder (2002) speaks about the classical realism and structural realism that is further subdivided into the several streams of offensive and defensive realism and the neo-classical realism. Other authors engaged in the studying and classification of the realist theories are for example John Mersheimer, Stephan Brooks, Gideon Rose etc. The neo-realism is generally considered identical to the structural realism. The liberal streams of thought in the international relations/security are even more pluralistic and less coherent than the realist tradition, the internal variations are differing in explaining the conditions under which international cooperation becomes possible (e.g. economic interdependence, international law and neoliberal institutions, democratic peace theory, integration, regime theory etc.). For more elaborate discussion over the classification of liberal approaches see e.g. Charles W. Kegley (ed), 1995. *Controversies in International Relations Theory: Realism and Neoliberal Challenge*. New York: St. Martins.

understood in realist traditions) and/or state in non-western parts of the world which is characterized by other specific qualities (taking into the consideration the ideas of the post-colonial approaches distinguishing between the two). *For more see Chapter 3.3.*

Another necessary comment relates to the constructivism in International Relations/International Security. It is not a theory in itself, but it is rather theoretically informed way of thinking about international relations/security based on common assumption that behaviour, interests, and relationships are socially constructed and can change with time. It shall also be noted that it is far from being a single unified stream of thought. As Ulusoy (2003) points out, the English School⁶ as well as Copenhagen School, among many other approaches, have considerably contributed to the debate on the constructivism in relation to security. The Copenhagen School was selected by the author of the thesis to be specifically included as a one example of the structuralism approach, because of its contribution to the securitization theory relevant for the discussions on Human Security. The Copenhagen School is, however, a result of the merger of the constructivist realists derived from the strategic studies background (e.g. Buzan) and more post-structuralist realists (e.g. Weaver) that have been largely influenced by the works of Derrida. Merging of these ways of thinking produced the mix of more objectivist vs. more relativist elements within one school of thought.

It was also quite problematic to make a decision where to place (how to classify) the feminist approaches to security. Since they are not representing

⁶ Buzan (2015, 5), is also admitting that the English School shares common ground with the constructivism. This school of thought focuses on the societal elements of international relations, which it approaches through history, political theory, and law. It studies the primary institutions (meant durable, routine practices, such as sovereignty, diplomacy and international law), and also its relation to the so called secondary institutions (meant as international organisations, such as the United Nations and/or other more regional organisations such as ASEAN etc.) (Buzan, 2015; Buzan, 2004; Holsti, 2004).

a unified stream of thought or specific school (there are some feminist streams of thought that could be subsumed to constructivism, there are others that are more post-structural in their thinking, there are western feminists and/or post-colonial and/or subaltern feminist approaches). However, due to their significant influence of the Critical Security thinking, they deserve at least a brief note (*see in the footnote⁷*).

Another problem encountered while creating the classification was, that it is generally quite problematic to decide on how to label the category of approaches to security developing within the post-structuralist and/or post-modern streams of thought. One reason being the huge diversity and plurality in the thinking of the individual authors, the other the non-clarity in the classification of the individual authors (when some would even reject any labels at all). It is, however, important to emphasise the critical aspects of the security theorising typical for all the different mentioned authors.

It was also impossible to fill in some of the boxes in the table, since the studied schools of thought do not explicitly ask themselves the posed questions.

⁷ Since the 1980's the International Relations theory and analogically the International Security, resp. Critical Security Studies have been importantly influenced by the feminist approaches focused at analyzing the power/patriarchy/hierarchies and strategies of empowerment, cooperative approaches to security (Wibben, 2010). The feminist insights into the security are of interdisciplinary character, deriving not only from the security studies, but largely also from anthropology, history, philosophy and sociology. The value added of these approaches lays in the self-reflexive stance of the authors and the focus on the normative emancipator agendas related to the bottom up approach to security. The feminist writers (e.g. Tickner, 1992; 2001; 2011 reprint in Art and Jervis; Hansen, 2000 etc.) were pointing to the incomplete understanding of the security put forward by the traditional approaches (stricken by the masculine bias, both from the perspective of understanding the international system, resp. its constructed notion, but also from the perspective of the strategies to resolve the conflicts and insecurities, e.g. the cooperation and collective self-reliance). Not only that they were addressing the issue of state being not only the agent of security, but at the same time also a security threat to its own population (esp. through producing structural violence), they have also accentuated the specific needs of the vulnerable segments of population (oftentimes silenced – this term has been used by L. Hansen) with respect to security and/or the effects of wars as well as non-war related insecurities. Or taken from the other viewpoint, the feminist thinkers have studied the role of woman and other marginalised segments of population in the conflicts and or the questions of gendering the violence (e.g. Sjoberg, 2013, etc.).

In this case, the box had to be marked N/A and the explanation was provided in the footnotes.

Table 2: *Classification of Security Approaches*⁸

Theory/theoretical approaches to security	(neo)realism ⁹	(neo)liberalism	Securitization theory = represented by Copenhagen School	Aberystwyth School	Paris School	variety of localised streams of thought
Philosophical approach	Rationalism, objectivist	Rationalism, objectivist	Constructivism, inter-subjectivist i.e. relative-objectivity determined by the securitising actors ¹⁰	Reflectivism (more objectivist then reflectionist), security is emancipation	Reflectivism, security is subjective, controlled by institutions	Post-structuralism ¹¹ ; (security is discursive)
International System	Anarchical, self-help. Zero-sum game	Managed (somewhat regulated) anarchy through economic interdependence and/or regimes, rules, democratic peace; positive-sum game	Inter-subjectively constructed	Hierarchical, dominated by elitist actors	Hierarchical, dominated by elitist actors and their practices	N/A ¹²
Object of security/referent object (whose security)	State	State, liberal values and norms	Determined by the securitising actor (widening the objects)	Individuals and their collectivities	Individual	

⁸ For the limits and rationale for simplification of the typology see Chapter 3, pp. 50-54.

⁹ *The Third World Security studies* could also be sub-summed under this category, however with huge limitations described in the Chapter 3.3.

¹⁰ There is an „epistemological incoherence“ in the Copenhagen School’s approach to studying security. Its representatives claim that the „social production [construction] of security is sufficiently stable to be treated objectively“ (Collins, 2007, 62).

¹¹ Radical post-modernists claim that it might as well be impossible for the external actor to understand the dynamics, i.e. you have to be internal in order to understand the dynamics.

¹² Since security is criticized as inherently negative phenomenon.

Subject of security/agent of security (security by whom)	State	State/cooperative alliances, international regimes and organizations	Securitising actor (state)	Emancipated individual	Security institutions and security professionals	
Security by what means	Power and military capabilities to protect state	Economic interdependence, international cooperation/institutions, collective security through interstate cooperation for example through international institutions	N/A ¹³	Emancipation and empowerment	N/A ¹⁴	Without security there will be no insecurity
Inspiration from	Hobbes; Machiavelli	Kant, Angel	Durkheim	Frankfurt School (Habermas) and Gramscian critical theory; neo-gramshian Robert Cox)	Foucault, Bourdieu	Foucault, Derrida, Heidegger
Representatives	Morgenthau, Waltz, Mearsheimer, Walt	Keohane, Nye	Weaver, Buzan	Booth, Wyn-Jones, Linklater	Bigo, Huysmans	e.g. Walker, Campbell ¹⁵

Source: Author of the thesis, 2015.

¹³ The authors of the Copenhagen School are rather focussing on understanding the actors and mechanisms of the process of securitisation to which the process of de-securitization (i.e. when particular issues are removed from the security realm and can thus re-enter the “normal” (everyday) politics, i.e. to withdraw them from the policies and actions defined by exceptions) is complementary. The concept of “*asecurity*” described by Weaver (1998) constitutes an “optimal” situation in which the issues are firmly politicised and there is little chance they could become re-securitized again.

¹⁴ The authors of the Paris School are engaged in studying the actions, processes and effects of the in-securitizing actors/agents (security forces); they are also concerned with the effects of such processes on the so called “*other*” (i.e. groups that can be marginalised by the practices of the in-securitizing actors and ipso facto by the society and its institutions in the effect of “*governmentality*”).

¹⁵ R. B. J. Walker and David Campbell cannot be seen as representatives of this stream of thought in the generalising sense; they are mentioned just as examples of thinkers that have contributed significantly to the very diverse and pluralistic post-structuralist thinking in international relations/security.

3.1. Traditional Understanding of Security

The most traditional understanding of security, and probably still remaining to be the mainstream discourse of security, is linked to national security – the military security of state, proposed by the so called realist (neo-realist) theories dominated by classical thinkers Hans Morgenthau (*Politics among Nations*, 1948) and neo-realist counterpart Kenneth Waltz (*Anarchic Structure of the World Politics*, 1979). As a product of the Cold War, national security is being defined as “*objective*” seeking of survival and autonomy of political units and their territorial boundaries – the states. The maximization of power is thus forming the ultimate goal of international politics. The primacy of state is central in this discourse and security of individuals (defined as citizens) is derivative, i.e. strictly tight to security of states. It was only after the end of Cold War when the referent objects of security (other than states) become largely subject to discussion.

The state system/international system is understood as intrinsically insecure. Even if states do not always go to wars with one another – due to the stabilising mechanisms of skilful diplomacy and balancing of power etc. – the fear (or better to say the *security dilemma*) is endogenous to the system (Herz, 1951; Waltz, 1979; Grieco, 1988). States – the main security units – are not able to predict reactions of other units in the anarchic system; insecurity is thus forming perpetuating cycle. The traditionalist approaches to security are essentially “*reactionist*” – in a sense that the reactionary actors respond to threats being the systemic pressures, using military force if necessary. Secure relations might exist between different groups of actors for the given period of time, but cannot be universal; security is understood to be a relative entity, never absolute.

In spite of the fact, that traditional security studies were claiming its complexity and relation to objectively existing world order, they have failed to fully conceptualise the world security. Especially with the end of Cold War, there appeared to be security challenges that were not explained by the mainstream theories (*for more see Freedman, 1998*).

The rise of intra-state conflicts coincides with the changes in the way the wars were fought and with inclusion of different variety of actors participating in the conflicts. It became hard to distinguish between the combatants and non-combatants. The new threats both to the state (the traditional security referent object) and also to other entities (individuals, communities, and environment) become to be part of the discussions. (Kaldor, 1999; Duffield, 2001)

The failure of scholars to anticipate the end of Cold War, as well as the need to re-examine the current international relations to include non-military threats (such as poverty, organised crime, natural disasters and epidemics striking across the national borders, international migration flows, resource shortages etc.) that have become more imminent in the changing circumstances, led to questioning of dominant theories, concepts and assumptions about security. The end of Cold War has risen the question of how much is the military security important in comparison with other potential threats. Despite of these discussions, security specialists have still been quite reluctant to the tradeoffs between the traditional military security and non-military policies. They tended to promote the primacy if the military security. However, the other specialists – economists and development implementers have asserted the primacy of economic/development welfare, since states were believed to worry little about the external military threats when the citizens are suffering poverty and lack of economic welfare. Likewise the environmentalists were pushing for the primacy of environmental concerns, believing that the availability of fresh

air and drinkable water is more important than security from the external attacks. (Baldwin, 1995; Wyn-Jones, 1999)

Since many of these threats to security are not amendable by military means, the traditional security studies would have a little relevance. The space was therefore opened for more critical approaches. On the other hand, the traditional security approaches, that have dominated the International Relations/International Security for long time, are closely linked to the realist paradigm and thus it was/is still very hard to think about the possibility to incorporate the new problems that are many times closely related to the domestic affairs.

3.2. Intention to Re-conceptualise: Towards More Critical Approaches

The attempts to re-conceptualize security, in the sense of widening the security agenda, have started slowly at the beginning of the 1980s, but definitely outside of the mainstream discourse. The more critical theories assumed that security is interpreted differently by different actors and thus it is more subjective and ambiguous and it does not have a precise meaning to everybody. The analysed Human Security concept, however, is not the only attempt to challenge the traditional state-centric and military oriented security scholarship.

The other than Human Security examples of the attempts to re-define security could be the different critical schools generally rejecting the positivist and universalizing knowledge that is claiming the “value-free” understanding of security and seeing the international politics as “a historical”, recurrent and non-contextual. The critical approaches were thus challenging the ontology and

epistemology of the realist/neo-realist approaches. According to these critical schools of thought, the security is a constructed concept. Such construction is often seen as biased by interests, motivations and power quest etc. The critical schools intend to encourage the open intellectual environment, allowing for the questioning of the creation of the knowledge and interpretation of the reality.

There are several streams of the critical approaches within the Security Studies, all having in common the basic opposition to the traditionalist, realist (neo-realist) approach to security. But they differ in defining of what should be understood as the security referent objects and also in distinguishing between the different issues to be considered as security threats.

3.2.1. Copenhagen Security School

One of the non-traditional streams of thought is being represented by e.g. Barry Buzan and Ole Weaver (Copenhagen Security School). Barry Buzan, in his milestone book *People, States and Fear* from 1983, is talking about individual human beings and their security to be of an important concern; however he maintains that the core referent of security shall stay the state – both as the central unit to security but also as a main actor to address the security and potential insecurities. Therefore he does not distance himself from the traditional neorealist account of security (Smith, 2000). Moreover, although the Copenhagen School shall be credited for expanding the areas of interest of the security studies, bringing in other existential dangers such as political, economic, societal and environmental, and its protagonists kept to be thinking about the security in the way that was putting still too much emphasis on the military aspects.

The Copenhagen School thinkers pointed out that the assessment of threats is inter-subjective. In their understanding what is, or better to say, what becomes a security issue depends on the process of “*securitization*” (Buzan, 1997). According to this school, security issues are product of political speech – when the issue becomes labelled as a security problem, the political action (oftentimes an emergency action requiring the special measures) could, or better to say, should follow to deal with it. The securitization, i.e. discursive construction of threat, shall be understood as a more extreme version of the process of politicization (political agenda setting process), *see Table 3.*

Table 3: *Securitization Model*

non-politicized	politicised	securitized
state does not work with the issue (the issue is not included in the public debate)	the issue is managed within the standard political processes (it is part of the public policy; it requires the government decision and resource allocation)	the issue is framed as a security question through an act of securitization (a securitization actor articulates the already politicised issue as an existential threat to a referent object)

Source: adapted from Collins, 2007, 112.

Not all attempts of securitization, however, become successful in a sense of making certain problem/issue to be a security issue labelled as (respectively presented as) existential threat. In order to be successful there is a need of the objects of security to accept such a problem to be a security issue. Only then the issue could move above the normal politics allowing the elites to accept the emergency measures to deal with it (*see Buzan et al, 1998; Balzaq, 2005; Weaver, 1995*). Thus the securitization consists of both, the discursive component (speech act and created shared understanding) and the non-discursive component (the policy implementation).

“De-securitization” (Buzan, 1997) is an opposite process to the above. When an issue is no longer considered as an existential threat it thus falls into the ordinary public space (*“low politics”*), resp. normal politics. As Weaver (1995) notes, when the speaker (securitizing agent/ elite) proposes that there is no threat (in existential sense), then the problem could be further addressed and managed within the normal political processes again.

The process of securitization, i.e. the process when an issue is gaining status of urgency and importance, goes hand in hand with process of legitimisation of use of special measures to tackle the problems. This however, does not automatically mean that the traditional military response shall be activated. The referent object is maintained to be the state which, voiced by its political leadership, is also the one that defines the security threats (in the process of securitization) and then develops the measures to combat these threats.

The extraordinary emergency measures (extraordinary politics) are, however, not specified in detail by the Copenhagen School thinkers. Such extraordinary politics is performed outside of normal politics, where the normal politics could be interpreted (e.g. by critical security thinker Claudia Aradau, 2004) as *“routine procedures”*, i.e. established legitimate mechanisms of decision-making and policy implementation followed within the liberal democratic states. Such legitimate mechanisms are characterised by the debate and deliberation. On the other hand, within the process of securitization, it is necessary that the measures are decided and implemented relatively quickly, since the issues at stake are tied to the survival. Such *“exceptionalism”* (according to another critical voice from the Paris Critical Security School, Huysmans, 2004) puts the elites (securitizing agents) under pressure to speed up the decisions, which does not usually allow for the contest of opinions and/or consultations with the actors outside of the state (that might generally have

more expertise and background for drafting the long-term and more sustainable measures).

However, what makes the Copenhagen Schools' understanding of state and its role with respect to the security different to the traditionalist is the emphasis placed both on domestic as well as international politics (Buzan, 1983). What may be considered to be an existential threat very much depends on the sector, but ultimately the threats are assessed according to their immediate impact on the security of state. The state, resp. the governments are tasked to provide the solutions/security standards to their citizens.

The different types of security sectors, having its corresponding security referent objects, are (according to Buzan, 1991) the following:

military security – concerned with the interplay of the military offensive and defensive capabilities of the state;

political security – concerned with the organisational stability of the states;

economic security – concerning the access to resources, finance, markets necessary to sustain the welfare and state power;

societal security – concerns the sustainability for the societies, including the acceptable conditions for further developments of traditional culture, language, religion, national identity and the customs;

environmental security – concerns the maintenance of the planetary biosphere as an essential support system on which all the human-kind ultimately depends.

The responses to security threats that become considered to be vital – constituting the emergency, depend very much on the sector, wherefrom the

threats come, e.g. threats from the military security might involve, and often do, the forceful military response; the political threats might be tackled by economic sanctions and/or other economic measures; the political sector dangers might be tackled by diplomatic means and negotiations.

Therefore, sometimes it is mentioned that there is just a very little critical about the attempt to broaden the agenda of security studies in the way it has been attempted by the Copenhagen School. It does not engage in challenging of the philosophical underpinnings of the traditional security, it just redefines the national security for the main actor – the state – to be able to react to the new threats. On the other hand, the Copenhagen School thinkers elaborating the concept of securitisation, have managed to move away from the strictly objectivist approach of the earlier realist/ (neo-realist) schools.

3.2.2. Aberstwyth School

One of the less questioned Critical Security Schools (from the perspective mentioned in the above article), The Aberstwyth School, represented by Keith Krause, Michael Williams, Richard Wyn-Jones, Andrew Linklater and others, coins that state-centricity of security studies shall be generally disputed and there shall be more focus on humans – individuals and their “collectivities”, as the ultimate security referents (Booth, 2007). The security is thus about protecting “real people” in “real places”. The state shall be considered means rather than end to the security, helping to facilitate the security of the other referent objects. Krause and Williams stressed in their book *Critical Security Studies* (1997), that security comes from being a citizen and insecurity from citizens of other states. The dangers thus emanate from political calculations of other people rather than from the “system” (in the Waltz’s understanding of the term) itself. Thus it is the emancipation of the human beings from the structural

constraints and their empowerment that produces the security, not the power and order as it was portrayed by the realist (neo-realist) schools (Booth, 1991).

The authors of the Aberstwyth School, inspired by the original work of Jurgen Habermas, were also dissatisfied with the dominant scientific orthodoxy of the traditionalist schools, criticising the narrow positivistic view on security. They got inspired to promote the importance of allowing for the development of the emancipatory critical philosophical approach to security and thus created a genuine knowledge, freed from the realist and neorealist ontology and epistemology (Wyn-Jones, 1999; Booth, 1991). The role of emancipation has been seen in producing the environment where the humans could be freed from the physical and human constraints that prevent them from doing what they choose to do (Booth, 1991). I. e. for Booth the security is not the mere survival (or overcoming the existential threats, in a sense it is understood by the Copenhagen School) of the individuals and/or their collectivities but it shall also include creation of such conditions that would allow them to pursue the political and social ambitions (including the space to make empowered choices).

The emphasis on the emancipation and empowerment in the Aberstwyth School's world view has strong affinities to Anne Tickner's vision of security. She, as the protagonist of the feminist thinking in international relations/security, in her works (*see e.g. Gendering World Politics: Issues and Approaches in the Post-Cold War Era from 2001; Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving International Security from 1992*) puts forward the importance of the elimination of the unjust social relations and the extension of the spectrum of the insecurities well beyond the limited realist military securities (to include e.g. ecological destruction, structural (incl. gendered) violence, poverty etc.).

This rather normative approach aiming at the improvement of lives of people brings the Aberystwyth school of thought also closer to the ideas developed by the development thinkers associated with the human development and/or the capability approach to development.

It needs to be mentioned that the ontology of Aberystwyth School is more objectivist (i.e. close to the more traditional ontology) than reflectionist. The Aberystwyth school thinkers claim the true/real/objective meaning of security and they see it to be reached through the process of empowerment and emancipation (i.e. the state where the individuals and their communities are in control of their social relations and contexts).

3.2.3. Paris School

Another critical direction of the security studies is the Paris School represented by Didier Bigo and Jef Huysmans. Differing from the Copenhagen and/or Aberystwyth Schools that have been based largely within international relations realm (and its related disciplines of international security, strategic studies, and peace research), the scholars associated to Paris School came from varied range of disciplinary backgrounds including political sociology, criminology and law (disciplines traditionally focusing more on the internal than external/international security).

The school builds very strongly on the ideas of French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu, a critical scholar making use of the reflexive epistemology and focusing on uncovering of the power and domination in within the society (Adler-Nissen, 2013). It also derives its inspiration from Michel Foucault who focuses on the relation between the power and knowledge, in a sense that knowledge is not free of value judgements and thus the objectivity of

knowledge, including the discourses of security, is very problematic. *“There is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations”* (Foucault, 1995, 27).

The representatives of the Paris School, learned from the ideas of Bourdieu and Foucault to study the practise of danger and threat production by the so called (in)security professionals. In contrast to the Copenhagen’s securitization theory (which focuses on the speech acts that make the issue to be the security theme), the Paris School scholars focus on the everyday security-related practices which could contribute to the production of (in)securities and this invoke the further security-related actions. It implies certain shift in security thinking, when security is being seen as having the role of legitimising the thinking, policymaking and actions of the dominant actors. Thus the definition of what security is and how it is defined is underpinned by the capabilities of the different actors to declare with authority whose security matters and what we need to protect from the insecurities (Bigo, 2008). The Paris School thus maintains that there is a very strong link between the security theories/studies and the security policies through the analysts directly impacting the character of the policies undertaken. Thus also it is very interested in the empirical practice of the security through exploring the conduct of everyday activities and security practices of various security-related actors respectively agencies, especially those lying outside the traditional security realms. The representatives of the Paris School do question the traditional divide between the internal and external security focusing on the trans-national (trans-border) threats (e.g. organised crime, terrorism, migratory flows).

According to the Paris School thinkers *“the normality”* is constituted by professionals, who are empowered by the privileged information (knowledge),

through technologies of managing social (now security) problems. This represents a power shift from the political agency to the institutionalised professionals that are defining the threats as well as strategies (technologies) to deal with them. Such processes are accompanied by the monopolization of “truths” about dangers and risks. Moreover, “many of the things that define the discourse of such professionals are not scientific concepts but rather very general and universalising terms of democracy, freedom, equality” (CASE Collective, 2006, 457).

(In)security thus is not the opposite of security, i.e. how security is defined and practiced conditions what is considered as insecurity (risk, problem, threat). (In)security that the members of the society feel is a result of the security discourse and security policy practiced by the professional security (policing) agencies/institutions. Authoritatively defining the threats and also exaggerating the existing fears, such security professionals are at the same time promoting their own institutional interests (Bigo, 2002).

The critical approaches to security, however, cannot be reduced just to the three schools of thought (presented above), the critical perspectives are also inbuilt into the post-structural/post-modern works of e.g. David Campbell, Rob Walker, Michael Dillon and others engaging in the power/knowledge nexus debates. However, it is quite difficult to draw clear dividing lines between the different streams of thoughts and produce a clear definition and/or typology of these thinkers, especially due to the relative lack of homogeneity within the individual approaches.

3.3. Third World Security Studies

There is one more security school that deserves to be introduced prior we devote our attention to Human Security discourse. The Third World Security

Studies, emerging already during the Cold War, also provide critique of the traditionalist view on concept of security. The main critique lies in the fact that the traditional security studies scholars have focused and preoccupied themselves dominantly with issues that have been relevant only to one part of the world, i.e. a segment of the international political system. (Acharya, 1997; Thomas in Jervis and Art, 2003; Ayoob, 1995; Ayoob, 2002) The issues typical for the developing regions were not incorporated in the study of security. Acharya in his chapter "*The Periphery and a Core*" in Krause and Williams (1997) also points out that it is ironic that the security studies have neglected the region where the most of the conflicts have been developed during the given period of time.

However, upon closer examination it is possible to conclude that, similarly to the Copenhagen School; it rather builds on and extends the traditional neo-realist view of security. It only differs in drawing the attention to the regions that have been omitted and under-studied, resp. that have only been at the edge of attention during the Cold War. The Third World Security Studies School brought the specific problems inherent to the developing regions to the forefront of the attention. These issues included also problems of underdevelopment and poverty, thereby coming very close to the idea of merging the development and security problems (as was later focused on more thoroughly within the Human Security concept). However, the issues of weak states, poverty, etc. kept to be referred to as non-traditional threats to the state security, only pointing out to the different character of the developing states (Thomas in Jervis and Art, 2003).

The main misconception of the traditionalists, as the Third World Security Scholars are pointing out, are the ethnocentric and misleading assumptions about the states – that all the states have been constituted in the same way, having the same history, purpose and structure. The centralisation of

the authority, the loyalties of the citizens, the legitimate use of power and violence are at question. (Ayooob, 1997; Thomas in Jervis and Art, 2003) The traditional security scholarship also assumes that states are able to provide security at the domestic level and thus they shall be predominantly concerned about the external military security, i.e. the protection against external threats. However, the Third World Security Studies point out that this is not always the case in the developing regions.

Caroline Thomas in her book *In Search for Security* (1987, 4) identified the insecurity of the developing countries stemming from their “*relative weakness, the lack of autonomy, the vulnerability and the lack of room for manoeuvre which the Third World states have on economic, political and of course military levels*”. The security of state is maintained to be central and is assessed by the immediate danger of the military threat i.e. violent conflict produced by the different security threats including the poverty and structural instability.

These two assumptions are bringing the Third World Security School close to the traditionalists, as mentioned above. What makes the schools different is the perception and understanding of the concepts of territoriality (ethno-national loyalties and identifications), sovereignty, and separation/non-separation of the domestic and international policies. The role of the state in this approach is little diminished, especially due to the organisational and structural problems mentioned above; therefore this school look to the earlier liberal institutionalist approaches for solutions, assuming the importance of the role of the international organisations as actors that might be needed for the provision of the security.

The authors of this school, however, in contrast to the traditionalists and/or even the Copenhagen School, admit that the threat assessments is influenced by normative, subjective, judgements having implications on the

ways the dangers are being tackled (in sharp contrast to the realist/neo-realist camp and in deepening the subjectivity and normativity as compared to the Copenhagen School).

3.4. Human Security

The Human Security approach is also considered to be the conceptual challenge to earlier (realist/neo-realist) approaches to security that have long dominated the theory, policy and practice of International Relations/ International Security (see Table 4, p. 72). While the proponents of traditional security privilege the state (its values, territorial integrity and sovereignty) as primary and most important security referent object, the Human Security is reflecting over the situations when the state itself could constitute the danger for the security of their own citizens. The Human Security is rather proposing to focus on humans as the main security referents. The states, respectively those states that have repressive regimes or those that are on the other hand too weak, could generate insecurity through repression, denial of human rights and opportunities, but also by inability to generate and distribute or re-distribute the resources etc.

The second challenge to realist approach is the intention to broaden the narrow conception of security threats arguing for more holistic understanding of security including what is traditionally been considered to be development challenges. The security shall newly constitute not only the “*freedom from fear*” but also the “*freedom from want*” and moreover recognize their interconnectedness. Mary Kaldor, however for example, emphasises the aspects of “*freedom from fear*” more than the “*freedom from want*”, referring mainly to the protection of individuals from direct threats to their safety and integrity. Thus also the “Kaldorian” approach to Human Security resorts to be more

interventionist, tackling the direct threats, having the states as the main reactionary agents (i.e. it is considered to be more of the top-down approach to Human Security, i.e. mainly the physical security).

Table 4: *State versus Human-centered Security*

	State-centered (traditional security) – (neo) realist	Human-centered security
Object of security	State – if state is secure, assumption that those living within are secure as well	Individuals are co-equal to state
Security	Sovereignty, autonomy, power, territorial integrity	Personal physical safety and well-being (provision of basic needs), individual freedoms (economic and social rights)
Security threats	Direct organised violence by (mainly) states and sometimes non-state actors threatening the states' integrity	Direct violence: death, drugs, de-humanisation, discrimination, WMD Indirect violence: deprivation, disease, natural disasters and degradation, poverty, underdevelopment, population displacements, inequality, sectarian oppression
How to achieve "security"	Power and military capabilities or threat to use the force, balance of power, strengthening of the economic might	Promoting human development (basic needs and equity, sustainability, empowerment and participation), promoting political development (global norms and institutions, collective use of force as well as sanctions...)

Source: adapted from Tadjbakhsh. and Chenoy, 2007, 41.

Although there is not one single approach to Human Security, the proponents of the concept believe that this new understanding of security will allow for more progressive and more suited policies to be planned and implemented.

The Human Security concept is not negating the traditional security because it has managed to keep the traditional security threats and the referent object incorporated within just broadening its spectra and bringing about different accents and prioritization within both the threats and referent objects.

4. Interpreting Development

“Development” similar way to *“security”* is quite difficult term to explain, it is highly contested theoretically as well as politically. Over the course of time it has been understood differently – as modernization of production sectors leading to economic growth; as liberalization and internalization of economies believing that market forces are the most effective tools for development and growth; as structural transformation of unjust international system; as a liberation of people through empowerment and emancipation and creating conditions for their self-fulfilment; as a project for which the best synonym shall be the misconception and misunderstanding of the nature of human lives etc. All these different views on development have reflected into the different development theories and approaches. There have also been different views on the agents or *“promoters”* of development, be it the state, free market forces, or empowered and emancipated people, communities.

One of the basic questions related to the conceptualisation of development is reflected in the discussion whether or not the *“development”* and *“progress”* are the same or dichotomous processes. For some development was seen as an intentional process that is leading to human progress within more advanced conditions in different stages of the process, others would believe that development is strictly internal process: immanent and endogenous to the communities themselves and shall not be initiated from outside. In case that the development shall mean a *“good change”*, then the question arises what does *“good”* mean and what actually is a desirable social change and *“for whom”* it is beneficial. (Cowen and Shenton, 1996 in Summer and Tribe, 2008; Chambers, 2004 in Summer and Tribe, 2008)

In some cases, development may also involve decline, crisis and other problematic situations. Thus any perception to development, though sometimes claiming the objectivity, is normative.

The idea of progress, advancement of conditions and well-being was also associated to different processes in different times. For the long time (within the Modernisation and/or Neoliberal Theories of development and also the Dependency Theory) it has been underpinned by the enhancement of economic growth related to the improvement of infrastructure, industrialization and overall modernization of society. The relatively uncritical faith in science and technology has become imperative for development thinking for both the Modernization and also the structural Dependency Theories. The distinct perspective comes from group of scholars that identify themselves as post-modernists. According to them development is defined as a discourse (set of ideas) that actually shape the reality and power relations in the world. It is because the discourse values certain things more than the others. For example those who do not dispose of the economic and other means to develop are viewed as inferior and there arises an automatic need to change this through the outside interventions.

The multi and/or inter-disciplinary field of Development Studies since its constitution in about the 1940s has been characterized by the series of changes in the thinking about the what is "*development*" resp. "*underdevelopment*" and how it should be achieved resp. re-battled. The "*development*" is covering both the theory but also the practice of stimulating the growth/change/development. Development theories are therefore to be considered as normative, since they focus on what shall be or could be possibly done in order to enhance the well-being. And the development shall be then also considered as a "*political project*".

Having in mind the limits of the classification of the security approaches, it is important to devote even more space to the problems and limitations related to the organization of the development streams of thought, because there is a huge controversy in the attempt to construct any taxonomy or even to classify clearly the development approaches/theories into one single table. There are several existing reasons which have been identified in the attempt to do so.

The Development Studies constitute a very multifaceted interdisciplinary academic field within which the economic and wide range of other social theories are absorbed and thus shaping the development thinking. The development has been the concern of economists, political scientists, sociologists, anthropologists and lawyers over the decades of its formation and/or also the security thinkers in more recent times. Summer and Tribe (2008) imply that the Development Studies could be rather seen as an umbrella over its constituent disciplines.

The related problems lie in the ontological and epistemological variability within the different disciplines which reflect also into the different development approaches and contribute to the methodological and theoretical “confusion”. This is even more complicated by the inherent theory/practice overlaps in the field of development, because the development approaches/concepts have been also strongly shaped by the non-academic actors: policymakers and practitioners of development. Moreover, many categories that are described in the literature as different concepts of development, for example the Steidlmeier’s (In Haque, 1999) categories of “trickle down”, “revolution” and/or “fulfilment of basic needs”, “self-reliance”, represent specific strategies to achieve development rather than fulfilling the scientific definition of theory per se. Many times there is also a strong connection between the “theories”/“approaches” and the politically underpinned

values and norms and thus the “*theories easily diverge to ideologies*” (Peet and Hartwick, 2009, 14).

There is also a problem in the scope of the analysis. Some authors distinguish between the so called “big” and “small” development (or in the case of our classification table “*grand theories*” and “*more context specific approaches*”). The former refers to the development thinking streams of the overreaching nature, i.e. to the realm of grand theories or meta-narratives of social change aiming to transform the entire societies through the given universalising strategies. In contrast, the latter approaches have been constructed with the aim to address the more context-specific needs and problems of the development constituencies, often times covering wider variations of the units of analysis. However, even these general categories exhibit some lapses and limitations (e.g. within the basic needs approach there have been reflected the universalistic visions about basic needs as well as the more context specific ones; the Human Development Paradigm puts an emphasis on the decentralisation and importance of local contextualisation, but at the same time it is proposing the universalising need to extend the understanding of development beyond the economic growth).

There were also attempts to classify the development approaches in terms of the historical appearance with respect to context and time of their emergence as well as the time of their application. However, even this approach is quite problematic, since the approaches co-existed along one another (e.g. neo-liberal approaches and the participatory alternative development approaches; alternative development and the post-colonial alternatives to development); some approaches were related to one another either as critical counterpoints to the previous (e.g. modernisation school being followed by the structuralism; dependency theory being followed by the neo-liberal counter-revolution; neo-liberal strategies being contrasted by more human-related

alternatives); and/or expanding and adapting the already existing theories (dependency and world-systems theory elaborating on the economic structuralism; human development building on the needs based approaches to development).

Another problem related to the classification of the development theories encountered is the lack of the logical sequence and the significant overlaps of the categories and their mutual repetitions, e.g. the modernity/evolutionist/progress related theories could be overlapping with the modernisation school. Or, as in the case of the classification/organisation of the theories by Peet and Hartwick in their *Theories of Development* book from (2009)¹⁶, there is an obvious overlap between the classical economies and modernisation approaches; as well as feminist approaches to development are already partially covered within the post-structuralist development chapter. They are also missing a specific section/category of alternative development(s). There is then a confusion whether it shall be included (sub-summed) under the modernisation school and/or it shall constitute a specific category of alternative development(s) due to its human-centered orientation.

The classification/organisation of the theoretical approaches to development by Katie Willis in her *Theories and Practices of Development* book from 2005 is putting together classical and neo-liberal development theories; then structuralism and neo-Marxism; and creating the separate category of grass-roots development. This approach seems to be too general, not allowing for example for the distinctions along the lines of state interventionist/non-interventionist approaches. The grass-roots development subsumes also the post-development approaches which differ significantly

¹⁶ Peet and Hartwick dividend the theoretical approaches in to the following sections: classical and neo-classical economics; Keynesian economics and neo-liberalism; development as modernisation; Marxism, Socialism and Development; Post-structuralism, Post-colonialism and Post-developmentalism; Feminist theories of Development; critical modernism.

along the lines of linearity/non-linearity of development and also the goals of development/ or rather the dismissal of development as a project in the case of the post-development approaches.

Nederveen Pieters (2001) proposes the classification of the development approaches according to the basic development paradigms (as he calls them). He works with 6 categories: "*modernisation theory*", "*dependency theory*", "*human development*", "*neo-liberalism*", "*alternative development*" and "*post-development*". However, for example Foster-Carter and Elguea (In Haque, 1999) have raised objections against the use of the Kuhn's paradigms' approach in development because of the problems of aligning with the definitions of the paradigm, especially due to the assumed impossibility of co-existence of two or more paradigms in the same historical periods of time which proved not to be the case in relation to "*development paradigms*". There is also a problem of the commensurability of such "*development paradigms*".

Paul Streeten (1983) commented on the different character of the development approaches from the perspective of the single cause vs. multiple causes of under-development (i.e. obstacles to development and also the corresponding objectives of the strategies for development). He was labelling the development approaches with the metaphor of hedgehogs ("*knows one thing creatures*") and foxes ("*knows all thing creatures*"). For example the single objective neo-Marxist dependency theories were pointing to the dependency development caused by colonialism/neo-colonialism to be at the core of the underdevelopment. He was contrasting it with the lack of physical capital and lack of modernity, industrialisation and urbanisation impacting the inadequate economic growth promoted by the modernisation schools. From the perspective of the aims of development the different theories/approaches focus on single objective – economic growth or multiple objectives – economic development/ social well-being understood as economic growth and expansion of

opportunities and capabilities; or even more pluralistic blend of participation, empowerment, and liberation including the tolerance to the different visions of the “good” society.

Due to the above problems and also due to the implicit huge variations within the development approaches and their different character (including the different levels of analysis and/or even their mixtures typical for many of the development approaches), it was virtually impossible to build the coherent classification table encompassing all these issues. Therefore the author attempted to construct the very simplified table (*see table 5, pp. 83–87*) using terms that are relatively easily comprehensible and that are covering the various explanations of and interpretations of development (along different dividing lines, *see below*). The table is built beyond the domain of pure academic theoretical frameworks; there are also concrete models, approaches and strategies of development included when necessary.

Looking at the historical/temporal developments of the development approaches, we could determine the shifts from global to local, from grand theories to more location-specific theories, from state-centred to human/individual-centred levels, from macro (in the sense of top-down) to micro (bottom up) approaches, from growth-related approaches to the social transformation approaches and/or to economic development/social well-being; from linearity of the modernity (including its alternatives) to the (a)historicity and (a)political nature of post-modern ideas on alternatives to development (or even non-development).

From these different sets of dichotomies, the specific dividing lines have been extracted by the author of the thesis for the purpose of creation of the classification table in order to facilitate the realisation of the envisaged

objectives of the thesis for which it was necessary to shed light on the different conceptualisations of the development.

The selected dividing lines that were guiding the choice and classification of the theories/approaches to development were as follows: exogenous vs. endogenous development (helping to define the distinction between the modernity (development as project) and non-modernity); state-centricity (interventionist vs. non interventionist) vs. human- centricity; top-down vs. bottom up strategies; single vs. multiple obstacles/strategies to development.

The author is well aware of the inbuilt limitations of the presented classification table. Among the most important ones are the taxonomic overlaps between the modernity development and the Modernisation school and the non-exclusivity of the Alternative development(s) category and the Human Development Paradigm. It was necessary to add this specific category, since the understanding of the Human Development Paradigm was essential for the analysis of the concept of Human Security.

The classification of the Human Development Paradigm is also misleading with respect to the following limitations. This approach to development relies on the multiple levels of analysis, combining the micro and macro perspective (*see above*). And also it is combining both the decentralisation and context specificity with the universalising believes in the importance of the development beyond the economic growth and its focus on the expansion of opportunities and capabilities both as the means and end of development. However when compared with the more over-reaching Modernisation school, Dependency- theories and/or Neo-liberalism, it has been finally decided to subsume this approach under more context-specific approaches. The reason for the above faults is that the table does not allow for construction of the

“floating” border-lines between the categories. Thus, every time when in doubt, the classification choice was made in relation/in comparison to all the rest of the classified approaches.

It was also quite difficult to put the lifetime work of some of the development thinkers into the single category/box, since they have contributed to developments within several approaches (e.g. some authors that have inspired Human Development Paradigm and Neo-liberalism; Alternative development(s) and post-development etc.).

Table 5: *Classification of Development Approaches*

	Grand "theories"/meta-narratives			More context-specific approaches		
Theories/ approaches to development/ concepts of development¹⁷	Modernity (Development as a "Project"), i.e. intentionally implemented development as a progress (moving forward); modern life style, education; pursuing "capitalism"					Non – modernity, i.e. development seen as immanent and endogenous processes (plurality and relativism)
	Modernization	Economic structuralism¹⁸/ dependency theories/world systems theory¹⁹	Neo-classical (neo-liberal) counter- revolution	Human development	Alternative development (critical modernism)	Alternatives to development, i.e. variety of localised streams of thoughts
Philosophical approach	Rationalism, objective reality	Constructivism, subjective reality	Rationalism, objective reality	Relational ontology ²⁰ , inter-subjective	N/A ²¹	Post-structuralism, discursive reality

¹⁷ Due to the relatively young and diverse field of development studies, many times in reality it is very difficult to distinguish between the development theories, strategies and/or ideologies, since they are tightly intertwined. Therefore it was difficult to come up with the single heading. Due to this reason it is sometimes also very problematic and may be also not entirely correct to determine the philosophical approaches related to the different streams of thought.

¹⁸ The constructivist dependency approaches are critical towards the development; however do not question the development per se, rather the underdevelopment (the structurally dependent development).

¹⁹ World Systems Theory shares many characteristics (builds largely on) with the Dependency theory; however it adds the dimension of the semi-periphery to the hierarchic international system of centres and peripheries.

²⁰ Relational ontology is a philosophical approach that puts an emphasis on that what distinguishes subject from subject, subject from object, or object from object is mutual relation rather than material substance. In relation to the Human Development paradigm, it could be interpreted in a sense „that particular capability is an outcome of the interaction of an individual’s capacities and the individual’s position relative to others in society“ (Longshore Smith and Stewart, 2009, 214).

²¹ In relation to the different variations of alternative developments, it is very difficult to subsume it to one concrete philosophical approach. One of the reasons being the huge diversity of the alternative development approaches stemming both from different academic disciplines as well as from the field outside of the academia, some of them extending from the rational/objective modernization approaches as their practical critique, some of them being themselves mainstreamed/engulfed as an inspiration for improvement of the dominant paradigms; the others attempting to extend the level and importance of local/context specific participation and respect to localised knowledge as well as empowerment well beyond the rationalism/objectivity becoming more relational and subjective.

What is at the core of development	Economic growth with the assumed “trickle-down effect” and modernization	Economic growth/ Economic growth/ Economic growth	Economic growth and liberal democracy	Social (well-being) and economic development ²²	Bottom-up participatory approaches not challenging the “modernisation”, but focusing on more small-scale local activities	Development is product of particular sets of power/knowledge relations ²³ Development is a “dangerous” ethnocentric concept that destroys the local cultures and environments (in its radical form)
Development by what means	To plan macro-economic growth through modernisation (including induced social change), industrialization, urbanization, reproduction of experience of the first world liner development seen as the series of successive stages through which the states need to pass	Import Substitution Industrialization, Import Competing Industry; protection of domestic markets from global markets and competition because of the global inequalities / Break away from the global economic and political system (short-term) and/or change of international structure (long term) = the economic	Free market, open economies and privatisation of the inefficient public enterprises	Combination of widening of peoples choices, expansion of capabilities and structural reforms on the state/society level) supported by economic growth	Grass-roots activities supported by large-scale organisations; Rural agricultural development as well as support for urban informal sector (small-scale activities) Not calling for	Rejection of intentional development in favour of immanent development Locally “defined” and locally grown grassroots activities, local-level participation ²⁵

²² The Human Development approach puts emphasis on the production and distribution of resources as well as on the expansion and use of the human capabilities, scope of choice, livelihood security and participatory process.

²³ In their approach, the post-structural/post-development thinkers see the modern development as a monolithic system of knowledge, technologies and practices and power-relations that serve to regulate the objects of development resulting in overriding of the cultural variations.

		disadvantage of the periphery is result of the exploitation from the core/centre/reform of the global political and economic institutions			ending the modernisation project ²⁴ , but emphasising the dimension/role of the smaller-scale activities	
Development "agent"/actor	State (government) initiated authoritative intervention and market	National state (government)-led	Minimal state (small government) shall provide the regulatory mechanisms within which the private sector (market) and civil society could operate	State and people #	Non-state actors as providers of services, but also contributing to formulation of development policies	Social movements, communities, individuals = no institutionalization of development
Whose "development"	State-centred	State-centred (national) development with the focus on	State (resp. market)	People-centred (# people are seen both as	People-centred	Very small scale, people-centred, harmony with

²⁵ Rather than imposing ideas of "progress" and "development" on individuals and communities throughout of the world, people themselves should be able to choose the way they want to live without being made to feel that they are somehow "inferior" or "backward" in case they choose not to follow the directories of development that have been adopted in other "more developed" places.

²⁴ The idea is to transform the development, not to abandon it as proposed by the post-modernists/post-structuralist. The past modernist experience is worth considering, we can learn from it. But more space shall also be created for the other types of knowledge (combining in the popular experiences). The very broad spectrum of its alternative components such as participation and sustainability, have been gradually adapted to the mainstream development (the alternative developments did not cease to share the same goal of development, but they are rather proposing different means to achieve the set goals).

(development on what level)		the states on periphery/ (national) development with the focus on the states on periphery/ State and system centered development with the focus on periphery, semi-periphery, international system		ends and means)		nature/environment/ spirits
Inspiration from	Positivist study of economic systems; economic growth theories (Keynes ²⁶); positivist study of social systems; positivist study of political system (Lipset ²⁷); humanities (elucidation of patterns of culture)	Structuralist economics; neo-marxists; centre-periphery motif (Latin American Social Science)	Classical economy (Smith, Ricardo)	Human good approach; wealth as a means not end of development(Aristotle, Kant); Basic-needs approaches to development with humans at the centre of attention ²⁸ ; Human Rights Based Approach to Development with the empowerment at the centre of attention	Activist participatory research (Freire); Agro-ecosystem analysis (Conway); Applied anthropology (Rhoades); participatory democracy	Foucault , Orientalism (Saïd), post-colonialism (Chakrabarty, Spivak...)

²⁶ The post-war modernisation approaches make use of the Keynes' ideas of generation of wealth through the multiplication effects as well as the emphasis on the key role of government in the promotion of growth.

²⁷ Being inspired by Lipset, the modernisation approaches discuss the positive interconnection between the democracy and economic growth.

²⁸ The limit of the basic-needs approach to development is that the humans are seen as the beneficiaries of development interventions/processes rather than active participants of the development processes.

Representatives	Lewis (traditional vs.modern sectors of economy); Rostow (progressive linear growth) Harrod-Domar Marshall	Prebish, Singer/ Furtado, Frank, Cardoso/ Wallenstein	Bauer, Lal, Krueger	Ul Haq, Sen, Nussbaum	Chambers , Rahman, Korten, Henderson ²⁹	Escobar, Esteva, Fergusson (anti-political machine) Gudynas (Buen Vivir), Rahnema, Prakash, Mohanty ³⁰
-----------------	---	---	---------------------	-----------------------	--	--

Source: Author of the thesis, 2015.

²⁹ The alternative development is not coherent stream of thought, it is intellectually very segmented. Coming from the diverse disciplinary backgrounds, the listed authors are representatives of different insights into the alternative developments, e.g. David Korten is an NGO strategist contributing to local development through sustainable mobilization of resources on local level; Anisur Rahman focuses on the grassroots development; Robert Chambers advocating for the participatory development (*"putting the last first"*); Hazel Henderson is an alternative economist focussing on the global alternatives to mainstream development strategies.

³⁰ The listed authors cannot be seen as representatives of this stream of thought in the generalising sense; they are mentioned just as examples of thinkers that have contributed significantly to the very diverse and pluralistic post-structuralist thinking in development realm.

4.1. Classical Approaches: Towards Modernisation

Shortly after the launch of the “*Development Project*”, associated with the famous Truman Doctrine and/or the Marshall Plan of 1947, the development was seen as a process that cannot happen by itself. However, at the same time, it was believed to be a gradual process that would be possible to achieve within not more than one decade. There has been an expectation that the countries that would “*be helped to get on the trajectory*” of development (understood as an economic growth and modernization) would later become self-reliant and responsible for their own policies and actions for development (Brautigam, 2000, 9).

Throughout the decade of 1950s it was believed that the poverty and underdevelopment of the “*Global South*” was in large extent caused by insufficiency of the physical and capital resources, skilled labour and absenting economic infrastructure. The preferred development strategy was believed to be to induce the economic development in these areas (Economides and Wilson, 2001). The first goals among the development initiatives were to increase the aggregate incomes (WB, 2002). However, the aggregate income did not necessarily give a clear picture of changes in living standards, especially because the population rates varied enormously. Therefore it became rather decided to count in per capita incomes instead of the aggregate incomes (ibid). It was believed that through growth and modernization, the social inequalities would be eliminated.

For the development thinkers and even more for the development practitioners, the other economic and social objectives were just complementary, if not directly resulting from the economic growth. It was

assumed to happen through the so called “trickle-down” effect³¹. These assumptions had been reflected in such theories as the W. W. Rostow’s “*Stages of Economic Growth*” (1960) that envisaged the development as a number of stages that the developing countries need to pass on their way to development and modernity: a) traditional society, b) the pre-take off societies, c) take off, d) the road to maturity, e) mass consumption society. Another underlying theory was the Rosenstein-Rodan’s *Big Push Theory* which emphasised the importance of economies of scale in basic industries (Pronk, 2001).

This set of ideas has underlined the formation of one of the first complex theories of development – the Modernization Theory. This approach to development has dominated the development thought in the 1950s and 1960s but the discourse of modernisation remains very vivid even today. The theory has seen development from the evolutionist point of view, i.e. to be a linear process based on the set trajectory that needs to be followed in order to allow for the change. The intentional change was supposed to be stimulated by the impulses and/or interventions from the “North/Centre” in the belief that it is possible to transform the less developed countries from tradition to modernity. The “South” was expected to follow the development path that has historically allowed the North/centre to develop (*for more see Rostow*).

The main assumptions for the development are the industrialization (*see the Big Push strategy above*), transfer of human capital from agriculture towards industrial sectors of production, access to modern technologies and enhancement of infrastructure. The educational systems were supposed to give up on the traditional approaches and to adopt the western, i.e. modern strategies, the family size and organization of the private life was supposed to

³¹ The wealth generated by the GDP growth is expected to trickle down to the different sectors of the society, even towards the poorest ones and this will allow them to improve their well-being. The accumulation of wealth by the rich is perceived to be beneficial as well for the poor.

follow the example from the “*West/North*”. Modernisation Theory has seen underdevelopment in the internal problems of the countries that need to be solved within the top-down process (*see above*).

The philosophical background for the Modernisation Theory is the positivist approach of naturalism (it is natural that some people, in this case states, develop earlier and some later following the same progressive path) and rationalism – a preferred form of thinking that has speeded up the development. At first sight it may seem that the principle of rationality goes against the previously quoted naturalism, i.e. through reason it is possible to escape the influences given by nature/biology. But in the development theories of modernisation we find these principles interacting. The rationalism and modernisation thus mean that the humans are able to use the reason in order to control and win over the natural forces. (Peet and Hartwick, 2009)

4.2. Structuralist Critique: Away From Dependency

The Modernization Theory has been subject to the strong criticism from social scientists from developing regions, especially the Latin American continent. The criticisms have been directed to the absence or slow speed of the promised “*trickle-down effect*” In reaction to the Modernization Theory, perceived as strongly hegemonic, another state-centric theory of development was formulated. It was based on the idea of the “*centre – periphery*” structure of the world economy within which the developing nations have to find its place and establish themselves. The Dependency Theory was represented by Raul Prebisch (head of the UN Commission for Latin America) and Hans Singer (the American economist). The Dependency school later become significant also outside of its region of origin – Latin America, and it was thanks to Gundar Frank. He helped to disseminate the ideas to USA while opening the broader

debate about the constraints for development when claiming that the underdevelopment was not the initial stage of development as was shown in the Rostow's model, but it was rather a created circumstance (Hettne, 1990).

In opposition to the Modernization theorists, who believed that the poverty and underdevelopment was caused mainly by inherent internal barriers, the Dependency theorists argued that currently and in past the international trade had been working against the developing countries that only relied on the exporting of the primary products and imported the manufactured goods which lead to quite unfair transfer of economic gains. Their theory has been based on wide gap between developed central areas and underdeveloped peripheries (being two separate entities). The producers and exporters of raw materials were linked with the industrialized centre (which had the advantage of earlier technical progress) in the dependent relationship, where the centre areas were serving their own interests while using the dependent counterparts. According to them this roles in the scheme of world order were inescapable without restructuring it, i.e. the main reasons for the poverty and underdevelopment of the "*Global South*" has been seen in the external/structural factors of destruction of the development or in their words the process of impoverishment. (United Nations University, not dated; Preston, 1996; Pronk, 2001)

Though the main philosophical inspiration for Dependency Theories comes from the structuralism (neo-Marxist) theories, there are many common characteristics with the modernization theories. Both approaches are strongly state-centric, believing that it is the state that it at the centre of attention and is the main driver for development, setting the rules of the game and regulation mechanisms for the market, overseeing the implementation of these rules. Both approaches see industrialization to be the central development strategy, despite the fact, that the roads to industrialization may differ. The proponents of the

Dependency Theories and/or the structuralists have foreseen the necessity to establish the “*import substitution industrialization*” (i.e. a trade or economic policy theory advocating for replacing imports with domestic production, using the rationale that countries should reduce their foreign dependency through local production of industrialized products to create self-sufficient economies, for more see e.g. Baer, 1972). Dependency Theory generally proposes the following strategies for development: in the short term economic separation of the “*Southern*” region from the world economy and in the long run, the countries shall seek the re-structuring of the international economic and trade systems.

4.3. Classical Economists & Neoliberal Approaches: Away from State

The classical mainstream economists (e.g. Adam Smith, David Ricardo, Thomas Malthus, John Stuart Mill etc.) argued that it would be the market forces that would provide the essential source of power for the economic growth. The interplay between supply and demand in both domestic and international fields would ensure the economic growth. For them it was not governments but definitely market that was to be the ideal tool for the economic and social management. They believed that the right solution would be the integration of the “*Third World*” into the world international market. This was suggested specifically by the Ricardo’s theory of “*comparative advantage*” and later worked out more precisely by Ohlin and Heckscher. However, this idealistic approach of the world order was vigorously being undermined and challenged by the fact that economic relations seemed to be dominated by the mechanisms of domination of the “*North*” and submission of the periphery countries in the “*South*”. (Preston, 1996)

By the end of the 1980s the neo-liberal economists, largely inspired by the classical economist ideas (especially by the anti-state attitudes associated with de-regulation, privatisation etc.), came up with the list of recommendations for developing countries. In 1989 John Williamson from the Institute for International Economics came up with the so called "*Washington Consensus*" which referred to the policy reforms that were to be imposed on the debtor countries (countries that had extensive debts with the international financial institutions – the World Bank and International Monetary Fund). The "*rules of the game*", resp. the conditionalities included the fiscal discipline, reduction of public expenditures, tax reforms, competitive exchange rates, trade liberalization, encouragement of foreign direct investment, privatization, deregulation and securing the property rights. (Peet and Hartwick, 2009)

4.4. Critical Approaches: Reflected Dichotomy?

Starting from the 1970s onwards, in relation to the perceived failure of the economic growth approach to development and especially the absence of the promised "*trickle-down*" effects of such a growth on the well-being of the world's poor, and also in relation to the effects of the oil shocks, there has been a considerable public debate on the re-conceptualisation of development discourse. (Peet and Hartwick, 2008; Preston, 1996)

The critical theories of development emphasised the well-conceived development rather than economic growth. Some of them did propose the importance of growth, but necessarily accompanied by also the development of other aspects of human life than economic (in a sense that economic growth simply is not enough). Some critical theories have seen development as a better ways of re-distribution of the existing resources, emancipation etc., the other,

lot younger critical approaches disapprove of the entire concept of “*development*” as a project (as we have known it so far).

Between the 1960s and 1980s, the original critical thinking in development was dominated by the Marxist and neo-Marxist (structural theories, *see e.g. the Dependency Theory above*). The development was understood as a form of transformation of the societies including the estimated transformation of the global political and economic formations (power – structures).

However, the appearance of the Saïd’s book “*Orientalism*” (in 1979) has marked the significant moment of change in the thinking about development, starting to apply the post-structural critique/ideas on the relations between the “*North*” and “*South*”. Since the 1980s the post-structural theories have started to shape the “*development thinking*”, slowly bringing about the completely different conceptualisation of development (resp. post-development in its most radical form). The development in a sense of externally promoted and intentionally implemented “*Development Project*” set on with the famous Marshall Plan and Truman’s doctrine, is newly seen as essentially negative, consisting of “*bad*” changes and outcomes through the imposition of certain non-native patterns of behaviour and institutions.

The post-structural criticism brought several innovative insights into the development studies. Among them there was the change of attitudes towards the development previously seen as something progressive, beneficial was now looked at as powerful, controlling and detrimental. The question was also raised if the “*development*” was beneficial, then for whom? The post-structural development theorists, such as Escobar are criticising the development project as a project of “*development industry*” promoted by the development researchers and practitioners – policymakers and the development experts. (Escobar, 1988,

428–433) He has criticised that the “*Development Project*” has defined the problems in the “*Global South*” as abnormalities that need to be treated “*clinically*” through the intervention of power. The top-down, ethnocentric and technocratic approach to development has treated the people and the cultures as abstract concepts, statistical figures to be moved up and down on the charts. The processes of “*industrialization of development*” (formation of network of new sites of power/knowledge that bound people to certain behaviours and rationalities) and “*professionalization of development*” (the experts through controlling the knowledge were taking over of what would otherwise be the political problems and making it “neutral” scientific issues) of the development industry has been at hand to the above. Instead, Escobar as well as other development thinkers such as Esteva, favoured the local and autonomous movements allowing for the multiplicity of models for development respecting the local contexts and needs, local knowledge etc.

As mentioned before, this post-structural critique of development, draws upon the works of Michel Foucault equating the development and underdevelopment to the social construct existing in the form of ideas and concepts underlying the power relations. He focused on the fact that the use of particular language and imageries of the “*developing world*”, “*poverty*”, “*underdevelopment*” does carry on certain connotations that are translated into certain behaviours and policies. Thus the “*Development Project*” is a mechanism of how to produce and manage the Third World/Global South, organising and producing truth about the South (Saíd, 2008; Escobar, 1988).

Those who construct the discourse have in mind the inherent elements of inferiority and superiority (e.g. modernity being presented and insisted on as something superior). Using the words of Edward Saíd (1979), the Third World has been subordinated through the process of orientalisation. “*Orientalism is a systematic discipline by which the European culture was able to manage – and even*

produce- the Orient politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, scientifically, and imaginatively during the post-enlightenment period" (Saïd, 1979, 3). By substituting the word "Orient" with the "Third World" or "Global South", the definition explains the power of the development discourse (reflected into the "development project") of the "Global North" resp. "West" dominating since the 1945. The "underdeveloped" areas were portrayed as passive, as victims of diseases and poverty in contrast with the dynamically developing "Global North/West" making use of the modern knowledge (scientific knowledge) and technologies. Thus there was a clear moral appeal to "help" the "underdeveloped" world to get on the same path of development. On the other hand, the post-developmental thinkers, e.g. Latouche (in Mathews, 2004) calls for the abandoning of the thinking about the developing areas as if they were children, that need to be taken by hand and brought up to develop by the adults (i.e. the developed, industrialized countries and their experts having the monopole on knowledge and truth).

The post-structural resp. post-development approaches are critical towards the established science (Rahnema, 1997). As a result, the protagonists of the post-development approach, e.g. Gustavo Esteva, support to local actions and local initiatives defining their own vision of development realised through the local grassroots groups and communities in opposition to the global forces and outside interventions. Re-thinking development also meant making explicit and valuable the existence of the multiplicity of models for economic and other improvements of the lifestyles of the people.

4.4.1. The Most Radical Approach(es): Towards Plurality

The most radical among the critical approaches to development is the Post-development. Most of the previous criticisms to the "Development Project"

were related to its inappropriate application, its negative effects or lack of results that led to improvement of the well-being of people. The post-development thinking about development goes well beyond these negative or non-sufficient results of the classical interventions, and questions the entire concept of development, its legitimising discourses and institutional frameworks and the goals that have been set to be the defining end of the progressive development. (see e.g. Sachs, 1992; Latouche, 1993)

Rather than searching for alternative development (i.e. alternatives in the way how the traditional development aims are being realised) the post-development approaches are speaking about the alternative development (i.e. endogenous development stemming from the local communities themselves whereas these very same communities are defining their vision of development).

The visions of development foreseen by the post-development thinkers have been oftentimes criticised for its nihilism, extreme plurality and relativism and endless de-construction associated with the inability to come up with the real life solutions and strategies. (Peet and Hartwick, 1999; Rahnema, 1997) However, there could be found concrete examples of the materialization of the post-development thinking.

The examples of such movements could be the de-growth movements or simple living (political, economic and social movement based on the ecological economics and anti-consumerism/anti-capitalist ideas) (see e.g. Prakash, 1995a; Prakash, 1995b; Esteva and Prakash, 1995) and/or the Buen Vivir (Gudynas, 2011; Ruttenberg, 2013). The Buen Vivir concept will be briefly described below as illustration of the different approach to “development”.

The Buen Vivir, as one of the many examples, is a concept of development that is itself not a monolithic approach; there are many variations

and approaches existing in different communities. One of them is for example the Ecuadorian “*sumac kawsai*” – the kichwa peoples label for a “*fullness of life in a community, together with other persons and Nature*” (Gudynas, 2011, 442).

The principles generally linked to Buen Vivir approaches are unity, equality, dignity, freedom, solidarity, reciprocity, gender equality, social justice, responsibility, etc. The concept is also paying attention and recognition to the contributions of the local indigenous knowledge that is different to the Western/Northern knowledge rooted to modernity. It shall, however, not be understood as a return to a distant past, it is more keen on questioning the sources of knowledge and acknowledging its multiplicity. The Buen Vivir approaches are also “*questioning the modern utility, reductionism to economic values and comodization of all the aspects of life*” (Gudynas, 2011, 445). They rather ground themselves more in the emphasis on ethics and considering different ways of giving the value such as esthetical, cultural, historical, environmental and spiritual. The nature as a context for living becomes a subject and not the object of the human lives. The utmost value of the community is the respect to plurality.

Generally speaking the post-development approaches reject the thinking produced and re-produced by modern development and seeking the alternative through integrating the local philosophies and practices.

4.4.2. Towards more Human-centred Development

Early perspectives on development were almost exclusively focused on the economic growth, and then came the critical approaches proposing the other strategies to development or even other understanding of the development in its entirety. The Modernisation approaches and also the critical

structuralist Dependency Theories were state-centric proposing the top-down vision of development. The latter post-structuralist approaches including the post-development approaches, on the other hand, have more focused on the bottom-up approach to development which is inherently a very human – centred perspective on development. For the post-development approaches it was more humans in the context, resp. in the symbiosis with their environment and nature that become the centre of attention.

4.4.2.1. Alternative Development(s)

Since the 1970's, parallel to the post-structuralist/post-development critique (which was rejecting the development as a whole on the accounts of its primary intentions, misguided world-view and mindset), there was also a growing dissatisfaction with the limited achievements of the mainstream development that was promoted by governments and/or financial institutions (top-down) and practiced dominantly by state and/or market. The critique of the results of development policies translated into reflections over its possible alternatives.

The alternative development approach(es) have been concerned with alternative practices of development that are more people oriented, more participatory, and focusing more on the bottom up processes in the societies (i.e. the development from below, including people as well as the grass-root organizations and/or non-governmental organizations). The idea beyond the alternative development(s) was not to abandon the modernization which constituted the dominant approach at the time, but rather to seek alternative ways of achieving development. Aiming to transform the existing paradigm, the alternative approaches shared the same goals with the mainstream modernization approaches.

It was believed that the development efforts become more successful and effective if they actively involved the empowered communities. The alternative approaches to development including the alternative methodologies mushroomed largely, forming a huge variety of alternative components of development, where the main emphasis was placed on the agency of development, in the sense of the enhancement of people's capacities to effect the social change happening in their lives. The non-governmental organizations become to play crucial roles on the ground in supporting them. (Friedman, 1992; Edwards and Hulme, 1995)

The alternative development approach(es) got the impetus from the development practitioners and thus tend to be more practice oriented rather than focussing on the deepening of the theoretical base for analyzing the development and (under) development. Yet, the activities of the practitioners have been also accompanied by growth in the academic literature. The much diversified streams of thought included alternative economists such as David Korten, Manfred Max-Neef (*see e.g. Human-scale Development from 1991*) or Hazel Henderson; thinkers devoted to studying and advocating the grass-roots practices such as Anisur Rahman or John Friedman (who was focussing at the community and regional planning). The significant contribution to the methodological apparatus of the alternative development approaches has been brought in by Robert Chambers (*see e.g. Rural Development – Putting The Last First from 1983 or Whose Reality Counts? Putting the Last First from 1997*) who focused on the participatory development and sustainable livelihoods. The very broad spectrum of the alternatives, however, never settled to constitute a coherent theory (and/or even a paradigm shift).

Despite that, as pointed out by Hettne (1990), the alternative approach(es) to development (combining the basic-needs, participation, self-reliance, sustainability and enlarged space for the endogenous knowledge and

approaches contrasting the strictly expert knowledge) could represent the significant counterpoint to the top-down, state/ market oriented mainstream development. Interestingly, many of such approaches and practices have been slowly adapted and become gradually absorbed by the mainstream approaches. Nandy (1989) called this process as “*standardization of the dissent*”.

The mainstreaming of the alternatives did not, however, escape the criticism. The main critique of such mainstreaming was related to the practiced “top-down” donor driven emancipation, where the participatory processes have been seen as instrumentalized practices used by the large multilateral organizations as well as donors, giving limited space for the local communities. As Majid Rahnema (In Peet and Hartwick, 2015) or Cooke and Kothari (2001) pointed out, the participatory approaches become relatively more attractive for the larger, mainstream, actors in development, since they became useful fundraising devices. Rahnema as well as Esteva and Prakash (1997) argued against this mainstreaming, since there was a danger that the individual or community views become incorporated in the large-scale projects just to enhance its legitimisation and improve the image before the donor constituencies.

4.4.2.2. Human Development Paradigm

Talking about the human-cantered approaches to development, another, rather specific and relatively coherent approach that came to the forefront of the development scene was the Human Development Paradigm. Human development is referred as a “development by people and for people” allowing for the expansion of the options that are accessible for the individuals and considering the human welfare to be well broader than the economic growth. The human development ideas become part of the discussion more prominently

in the 1980s in response to various negative influences resulting from the previous development policies induced by the Modernisation and Neo-liberal Theories, but most importantly as a critical reaction to the negative experience with the economic Structural Adjustment Programs that were conditioning the financing of the development from the part of the most important global financial institutions.

Despite the significant differences, the Human Development Paradigm paradoxically shares some important ideas with the neo-classical paradigm (economic neo-liberalism) which it tried to distance from. Both approaches to development are partly based on similar liberal philosophy and economics roots. In particular it is the focus on the importance of the individual choices and the well-functioning market conditions allowing the individuals to pursue their choices. In both cases there was also a great emphasis placed on the importance of the development of human resources. However, in case of the Human Development it is understood as more than the mere investment in the human capital, a productive factor in the market economy, with the objective to maximize the economic efficiency and economic growth/well-fare (i.e. the investment with the high return). For the Human Development the individual is not only the means of development but also the ends of it. The strengthening of the human capabilities, empowerment and emancipation of the humans lies at the core of development. The neo-liberalism tends to propose the minimum state whereas the Human Development Paradigm stresses the importance of those state functions that are necessary for the strengthening of the capabilities and also for the ensuring of the fair distribution of opportunities and thus the income (and/or vice versa), and also for creating conditions for development and healthy functioning of the decentralised institutions that are necessary providers of opportunities, allowing for participation of the individuals and communities on the health and education services.

The discussion resulting into the conceptualisation of the Human Development Paradigm was originally led by two scholars: Mahbub ul Haq and Amartya Sen (in cooperation with different international organizations and social movements, but most importantly by the United Nations Development Program).

The concept of Human Development was made more politically visible in 1990 when the first UNDP Human Development Report had explicitly proposed to shift the focus of the development economics from the national income, accounting the people-centred policies seeing the societal development as something more than the mere economic growth resp. economic well-being. (Ul Haq, 1995)

Development was defined broadly as expansion of people's choices. These ideas were followed up by publication of the Human Development Index, where the income per capita component still had quite a strong position, but it was newly accompanied by life expectancy and educational attainment.

The core of Human Development paradigm, resp. the inspiration for Human Development paradigm lies in the Amartya Sen's pioneering works in welfare economics, social choice, poverty and famine and development economics. Amartya Sen (1983, 1984 and 1999) was talking about the economic growth that should not be viewed as the end of the development, but he has seen the development as a way of expanding of the peoples' entitlements and capabilities. Sen's theory of development as expansion of capabilities means removing all the possible obstacles to what people could achieve in their lives. The obstacles were being understood as the illiteracy, ill health, lack of access to resources, including the ill distribution of resources, lack of civil and political freedoms etc.

Sen and Ul Haq were not the first thinkers that have attempted to enlarge the development beyond the economic growth. It was Dudley Seers, the British economist specialised in development economics (see e.g. *The Meanings of Development: Four Critical Studies from 1979*), that stood up to the neo-classical overemphasis of the economic growth (the “growth fetishism”, as he calls it), about a decade before Ul Haq and Sen. Questioning the neo-classical approaches implemented within the neo-liberal development policies, Seers contributed to the more social-oriented concept of development. He believed that the economic growth is still a pre-requisite for development, but it is far from being the only and most important component. Inspired by the Raul Prebisch’s work (see Chapter 4.2.), Seers was also reflecting over the limitations produced by the world system of the dependent peripheral regions and the core of advanced countries. However, eventually, he rejected the prescriptions of the import substitution offered by the “dependistas” Prebisch and Frank, because such policies discouraged innovations and slowed down the competition which led to problems with respect to the lack of access to sophisticated equipments and development of technologies necessary for the advancement of the developing societies (Seers, 1983).

Amartya Sen was deriving his concept of development from the intellectual tradition of philosophy and political economy dating back to Aristotle, Kant and Smith. According to Aristotle, in his book “*Nicomachean Ethics*”, the social arrangements must be judged by the extent to which they promote human good, distinguishing the good and bad political arrangements according to the successes and failures in enabling the people to live flourishing lives (Aristotle, transl. by Irwin, 1985). The wealth, according to the Aristotle is not the end good the people shall be seeking but it shall be understood as a means to achieve something else.

Kant has in his works continued the tradition of treating the human beings as the real end of activities rather than means to achieve something, in other words, putting the humans first. According to Kant (In McCarthy, 2009, 53) *“the ultimate end to human development is thus the full development of the natural capacities of the human being”*.

Another essential principles mirrored in Human Development approach could be also traced to the works of Adam Smith. When he was writing about the development and economics in 1776 *“An inquiry into the Nature and Causes of Wealth of Nations”*, he has focused on the broad, inclusive goals for human achievements and well – being rather than on the pure economic growth approach (King and Murray, 2001–2). It was only later, after the Second World War, when the policymakers and practitioners in international aid agencies together with scholars and NGOs, narrowed the understanding of development down to the growth of national income as the main object on the progressive trajectory.

4.4.2.3. Basic Needs Approach

The previous traces of people-cantered approach to development (i.e. the bottom up approach) that have inspired the Human Development Paradigm could be seen also in the Basic needs approach to development, which was re-emphasized in the international agenda in the 1970’s as a result of the perceived failure of the economic growth oriented policies of development. This approach is closely related to the policy activities of the International Labor Office that has suggested (at the 1976 World Employment Conference) that the priority in development shall be given to meeting basic needs of people defined, at the time, as combination of minimal consumption requirements (food, shelter, clothing); access to essential services (safe drinking water, sanitation, transport,

health and education) and access to adequately remunerated employment opportunities. (ILO, 1976) It was argued that fulfilment of the basic needs shall contribute to the elimination of the absolute poverty which was perceived not only desirable per se, but also effective in the struggle to create sustainable growth through allowing the poorest members of the society to also start to participate actively on development, providing more effective labor as well as to contributing to the expansion of the pool of potential consumers and/or savers. (ILO, 1976; Overseas Development Institute, 1978; Streeten and Burki, 1978)

There was, however, not universally accepted definition of basic needs created as there is no single coherent set of theories behind the concept. With the time there developed many strands of thought around the understanding of the basic needs concept ranging across the divides between universal (represented e.g. by Masini, Galtung) and country specific/dynamic approaches (represented e.g. by ILO); and/or offering variety of content specific lists of categories of basic needs.

However, the focused emphasis on the basic needs provision in terms of services and commodities was seen only to be allowing a little space for the capabilities basis of the human wellbeing that was promoted only later through the Human Development approach based on the Sen's ideas. Although the Basic-needs approach puts more emphasis on participation than the previous state-centric approaches (Modernisation Theories and/or Dependency), it was still more focused on meeting the material needs of the people than on the promotion of their rights and changing the structural conditions that might be at the root of their poverty and underdevelopment. Moreover, one of the negative outcomes of the Basic-needs approach to development was an extensive pressure on the governments to provide the services which often (without broader structural reforms) led to the overspending that needed to be

covered from the borrowed money borrowed putting the developing countries in the debt trap. In the response to this problem the countries later engaged in the Structural Adjustment Programs of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund that have been conditioning the further loans with the objectives to cut the public expenditures again in order to stabilize their economies.

Despite the mentioned problems, the needs-based approach to development has become an important source of inspiration, if not component, of the latter alternative development approaches and/or also the Human Development.

5. Linking Security & Development: Times before Human Security

For most of the time development and security discourses, reflected into the different theoretical approaches, have been evolving separately (*see Chapters 3 and 4*). However, we could also trace the security elements, themes and motivations in the development practice which has been influencing the development discourse over the different historical periods of time (*see below*). Later, since the 1990's, the development and security started to be linked more intensively both in policy as well as in the discourse.

5.1. Colonial Times

Attention to security was “*a pinnacle of much of development strategies during the colonial era*” (Stern and Ojendal, 2010, 10; *see also Abrahamsson, 2003; Hettne, 1995*). However, contrary to the contemporary debate on *development-security nexus*, none of these linkages were done consciously in a sense of explicitly articulating the connection between the two fields. The very first development initiatives were motivated by security concerns (or better to say by securing the economic and/or political interests of the colonial powers in their overseas territories). The first notes about development activities in the form of financial aid flows (with the intention of development of the target territories although motivated by the security concerns as mentioned above) to the less developed countries can be traced back even to the 19th century. Amongst the first ones who were concerned about the problems of development were the colonial authorities and those living under the colonial rule.

During the colonial times large amounts of money and other assets were transferred from colonial powers (mother territories) to the corresponding overseas territories, much of which was however coming from the private hands, not the governments of the colonial powers. Although, the flows were in reality encouraged by the colonial governments, for example by guaranteeing various monopoly rights for exploitation. In addition, special large-scale infrastructural projects such as railroads were financed directly by colonial governments. At the same time the general philosophy that prevailed was that the overseas territories should be more or less self-financing and self-supporting (Baird and Frank, 1975).

So in the colonial times, the general policy was that the development issues were intended to be entirely the matter of colonies themselves and thus were to be financed from the proceeds of sales of the export crops. The assistance from the motherland was only given in cases of national emergency (i.e. in the event of the security concerns) and was purely of the temporal nature. (Cassell, 2003)

During the colonial era, the issues like eradication of poverty and working for sustainable development of the colonies were definitely not the factors that influenced the policymaking in the developed countries and correspondingly their counterpart governments in the overseas territories. The attempts leading to the improvement of the colonial life and the standards of living were conditioned by the need and want to extract as much wealth from the colony as possible and/or by the management of the security in the territories with respect to sustain the ability to extract from the territories.

However, it would not be entirely true to say that the colonial authorities were not interested in "*colonial development*" at all. The investigation of the development in the colonies became the principal task of newly established

discipline – “*colonial economics*”, which was, compared to nowadays development institutions and agencies, mainly concerned with finding the conditions for enabling to maintain the status quo in the territories overseas. Colonial economists, however, could not avoid seeing the reasons for the enormous differences between the situation in colonies and the mother lands. This led to the questioning and analyzing the universal validity of the economic principles existing in the developed (or industrialized) world, stressing mainly the wide differences between the social and economic organization of the society in the developing world which was to cope with the “*co-existence*” of two distinct systems – one imported and imposed forcefully by the colonial powers and the other one developed by the native populations. The colonial economists’ approach was based on the ethnocentric viewpoint and belief in the supremacy of the developed and industrialized territories in the motherlands that had to show the developing world the direction to go in order to evolve from the current backward state. The “*developed part of the world*” was in fact forcing the “*developing world*” to follow their models based on the “*Northern*” experience evolving over many centuries (see the *Modernization Theory in Chapter 4.1*). It was believed that the developing countries shall implement the modernization and industrialization schemes. The “*civilizing*” role has even been formulated in the official documents of organizations such as the League of Nations’ Pact of 28th June 1919, which was talking about the development in the context of “*helping people who are not able to run their own affairs themselves in the particularly difficult conditions of the modern world... The welfare and the development of these people are a sacred mission of civilization... The developed nations are entrusted with the supervision of these people.*” (United Nations University, not dated).

By the interwar period (between the First and Second World War) it has been widely believed that industry was more important in bringing about

development than agriculture. The theories had been inspired by the Saint Simone and were often discussed at the conferences from Baku 1920 to Bandung of 1956, gathering together the representatives of countries rebelling against the colonial status quo.

Generally said, during the colonial era the development and underdevelopment were understood as purely domestic and definitely not international issues. The end of Second World War has marked the beginning of the serious concerns and interests among scholars and policy makers in studying to understand better the development process as a basis for designing and establishing appropriate development policies and strategies, however even in this period of time we could trace the security motivations and ends behind and/or parallel to the development thinking/resp. the development policies. We could for example contrast the development intentions with the immediate security needs of the “*West*”, after the end of the Second World War.

5.2. Early Post-war, Cold War and beyond

The early post war development policy was primarily focusing on reconstruction of European and Japanese economies that were totally destroyed by the world war catastrophe. Here we can see the strong security motivation underlying the development again. At the time, directly after the end of war, the “*Third World*” countries were not again the first priority of the development intentions. The sharpest focus was on the increase of production and income of the war-torn areas, in order to prevent further insecurities as well to prevent their intention or temptation to join the communist camp (Economides and Wilson, 2001, 126). These negative preconceptions were, however, soon swept away by the success of the so called *The Plan for Reconstruction of Europe* (the Marshall Plan).

The famous Marshall Plan was aimed at recovery and stimulation of development in Europe with the help of about 17 billion US dollars which were pumped into targeted economies. How was the Marshall Plan brought about? On 5th June 1947, the secretary of state George Marshall had his famous speech at the Harvard University, in which he outlined his ideas that later came to be known as the mentioned Marshall Plan (Marshall, 1947, 1). The Europe at the time was not only terribly devastated by the war but also had to go through one of the worst winters ever. The countries found themselves in situation when they were not able to produce anything to be sold by hard currency. Moreover, the democratic socialist governments ruling in most of the states were not very keen on accepting and implementing the proposed recovery programs drafted by the classical economists (US Congress, 1947).

In his Harvard speech, Marshall said: *“America felt something has to be done not only for humanitarian reasons but also to prevent the rise and spread of communism”* (Marshall, 1947, 1). He proposed that United States would offer various forms of humanitarian assistance, supplies of which would be provided by the UNRRA, Red Cross and also few countries individually. As a second step he proposed serious of governmental long and short-term loans and credits. These various loans and credits were preliminary for the later established Breton Woods institutions. And next he spoke about long term loans for reconstruction which were planned to be arranged through the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. And finally the monetary system should have been assisted by the International Monetary Fund. (Marshall, 1947)

He has also foreseen that before United States would proceed to such a massive help, there must be a certain agreement made among the countries of Europe. The Marshall Plan was not a unilateral deed of the United States, they rather wanted it to be based on the joint program for reconstruction and

a rational plan how aid should be used agreed by as many European states as possible. Marshall Plan in its planning phase did not exclude even the Soviet Union and East Europe, but Stalin denounced the plan and refused to participate. The idea of the joint program was very advanced. The type of agreements made together with idea that the European states could act as a single economic unit, and the framework of cooperation established during the implementation of Marshall Plan later served as a great inspiration for the Schumann plan for the European integration. (US Congress, 1947)

The success of the Marshall Plan helped to create a positive attitude towards the institute of development policies (the intentional externally promoted system of development as a progress), as an important factor of the international economic system. Since the Marshall Plan succeeded in stimulating the development of the European economies it became the model and inspiration for the latter affords to develop the countries of Latin America, Africa and Asia, for the economic "*cooperation*" of the rich "*North*" to the poor "*South*" during the past several decades. However, the situation and the background of the "*Third World*" were completely different from what was typical for the countries of the war-torn Europe of the 1940's. One of the most important reasons why the Marshall Plan for Europe could have been successful is that the assumptions, plans and strategies planned, including the value premises of the targeted areas were quite similar to those of the United States themselves. Unfortunately, later, the "*Western*" nations used the Marshall Plan and subsequent economic theories of development models for the development aid to formally colonized nations, which were based on totally different principles of functioning (Whites, 2002).

The "*developing countries*" proud of their success in gaining the sovereignty and independence on their former colonial rulers, would not be keen on accepting the implementation of quite strict principles inherent to the

Marshall Plan scheme (Pakdaman, 1994). In the concepts being drafted with respect to the “*developing countries*” it would have been rather better to react to the challenges of the developing world itself and to incorporate the values that were inherent in various cultural backgrounds of the developing world. Marshall Plan played an important role in bringing up certain experience that could, if nothing more, served as the sprinkling board for the development initiatives, later in this thesis also associated with the so called “*Development Project*”, challenged by the Post-structural theories of Development.

It was not only the famous Marshall Plan and the following development initiatives of the “*Western*” nations that have coined the development policies. It was also the United Nations Organisation that has been contributing to the evolution of the development policies and its focus, including the traces of the importance of the security for development and development for security debate. In the United States secretary of state Edward Stettinius’s report from the San Francisco conference in June 1995, we could read: “*the battle of peace has to be fought on two fronts. The first is the security front where victory spells freedom from fear. The second is the economic and social front where the victory means freedom from want. Only victory on both fronts can assure the world of an enduring peace... No provisions that can be written in the Charter [UN Charter] will enable [...] to make the world secure from war if men and women have no security in their homes and their jobs.*” (Wheeler, 2011, 37)

During the Cold War the development policy was indirectly, but very importantly tied to the issues of security, officially it was seen as an external factor/area to security. The development policies had the function to guarantee the political support and preserve the “good relations” with the “allies” within one or the other spheres of influence. Apart from supporting the economic growth; the underlying motivation was to secure the political loyalty of the developing countries.

After the end of the Cold War, we could observe the intention of the development thinkers and practitioners to “*re-invent the development as a form of conflict prevention*” as Mark Duffield calls it in his book “*Global Governance and the New Wars*” (2001, 121) in the sense of seeking to improve the institutional background and support the good governance processes that were seen more suitable for providing for the sound development policies (within the economic and social sphere) but also having more stabilising effects.

Although it was clearly intended to dismantle the development initiatives from the strategic interests tied to the Cold War security architecture, it was clear that the ties between the development and security would not disappear. The links between poverty and insecurity started to be mentioned more often (and they become known as a *development-security nexus*) and definitely more openly after the end of the Cold War, however, this discourse was primarily tied to the perceived insecurity of the Northern region.

From the historical overview related to the tracing of elements of security in development thinking and development initiatives, we have learned that these security pre-occupations of the more dominant actors in the system had already a long tradition, dating back to the Marshall Plan and the Truman’s doctrine of 1947 (Truman, 1947) that have foreseen that the poverty could be not only a development handicap for the populations of the “impoverished” areas but they were also perceived as a significant security threats to the local population but also to the regions on the other side of the world, i.e. the more prosperous areas.

As Mark Duffield (2001, 36) puts it, since the 1960’s the economic instability of the South has been slowly internationalized and the idea of security has become more protracted in the thinking about development: “*security threats to the North are no longer seen solely in terms of interstate conflict to*

be approached through the politics of alliance and nuclear deterrence. At the same time, the demise of political alternatives in the South, together with the declining remit of nation-state competence, has further internationalized the effects of the instability....modalities of underdevelopment themselves represent the security issue". This thinking has been more intensified with the process of globalisation and the perceived increasing interconnections between the North and South.

Overcoming the political and ideological constraints characteristic for the period of the Cold War, the development discourse began to shift to also include the other than traditional security related issues, the development actors were making themselves ready and active to engage in the conflict prevention, post-conflict peace building resp. transformation (changing the relations between the actors, transforming the societies and the institutions that have been structurally governing them), security sector reform (justice and police reform, reintroduction of the ex-combatants to the society, etc.) as a way for them to contribute to the security challenges that were believed that are underpinning the development of different economic and social sectors and (many times) connecting it to the improvement of the public sector governance – as a more structural approach to development. In the complex peace operations in the 1990s, the traditional actors in peacekeeping/ peace building were not able to address the long term tasks of the transformation of the societies including the tackling of the root causes of the conflicts and so, after their departure, the development actors started to engage in the re-construction of the war-torn societies. (Schnabel, 2012)

Since the 1990s the security-development implications also become very intensive in the debate over and the formation of the Human Security concept, which has formalised the linkage of the development and security both in the form of discourse but also in the form of concrete policy and practice implications.

6. Linking Security & Development: Nature of Human Security

Human Security concept formulation is closely linked to the changes related to the end of the Cold War. It is a normative concept arguing that there is an ethical responsibility to change our thinking about security/insecurity in order to be able to respond to the wider security (including the development problems). The proponents of Human Security (UNDP, Japan, Canada and other members of the Human Security Network) argue that it offers a more “*realistic*” resp. real picture of the security around the globe and the factors challenging it. They believe that there shall be a very close link between the theoretical concept and policy/ practice in order to be able to improve the welfare of the people. The close link between the theory and practice has been central to development of the concept. Therefore in search for the origins and the context in which the concept was developing we cannot strictly separate the academic writing from the policy related proclamations and/or documents, as both have played an important role with respect to the constitution of the concept (*see below*).

6.1. Human Security: Origins & Context

The events leading to the end of Cold War eroded bipolar construction of international architecture. The new political and security arrangements (with the threat of the global nuclear conflict and annihilation was removed) together with the new security challenges (intra-state conflicts, financial crises, elevation of international terrorism, trans-nationally spread diseases, environmental hazards striking with the unprecedented strength etc.) contributed to the problematization of the state-centric, power-based international relations/ security and there opened the window of opportunity both in academia and

policy/practice for the new ways of thinking about security and/or development.

However, it is worth mentioning that the so called new threats were not completely new, they did not appear *ex nihilo* at the end of the Cold War. On the contrary, they have long been real and present not only to the individuals but also states, but due to the dominance of the traditional security approaches and due to the primacy of the bi-polar conflict of the Cold War, these issues were not part of the definition of the security and thus also were not at the top of the international security agendas. (For more details, see the works of Ayoob, Acharya, Thomas, Collier, Stewart etc.)

The concept of Human Security has become to be more openly used in academia and in policy area since the beginning of the 1990s; however the discussions about the most defining aspects of this concept are even older. The traces of the factors that later become defining pillars of the Human Security – such as the focus on human beings/individuals and the focus on the wider security threats (defined not only by the fear but also by the want), could be found already in the earlier in the history.

For example the idea of individual humans being at the centre of the attention is not a completely new issue in the security discourse. On the other hand, the more elaborated concepts of state, as a main referent object to the security, is only linked to the events of French revolution following the Napoleonic Wars in the 18th century (MacFarlane and Khong, 2006; Fukuda-Parr and Messineo, 2011). In these turbulent times the individuals were understood as closely linked to the state. And the security of the states against the external military attacks were seen to be also defining for the security of the individuals living in the state, i.e. the security of the individual was subsumed under the security of the state, resp. the nation.

Before this period, however, the understanding of security was much wider – encompassing also the individuals. For the ancient Romans, for example, the security of individuals was related to “*the inner state of tranquillity*” (Rothschild, 1995, 61), i.e. they saw the security not in the realist military protection of the territorial borders of the political units (state) but also in the securing the safe conditions within the territory. For the ancient philosopher Cicero, the security was understood as an object of supreme desire for the individual beings in their lives. Montesquieu has in his work “*Spirit of Laws*” (in 1748) also understood the security to be an objective of individuals and is related largely to the political freedoms (Rothschild, 1995). In Adam Smith’s work “*An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*” (1776), he was conceptualising the security to be closely linked to the liberty of individuals and the refrain from the prospect of the threats to their person as well as their personal property. The requirement to secure the dignity and freedoms of individuals was also been embodied to the 1945 UN Charter. The need for such protection rose in response to the atrocities related to the Second World War. However, such a requirement was sometimes bringing about the tensions between the two guiding principles of the international relations – the respect and protection of the state sovereignty and the respect and protection to the individual as well as the collective human rights. The Charter tackled the relations between the peace/security and development, when it linked the social and economic problems such as mass unemployment and poverty associated with the period before the 1930s to the insecurities brought about to the world nations and their populations by those actors that have become the driving forces for the Second World War (Kohler, Gasper, Jolly and Simane, 2011).

In response to violence, genocides, crimes against humanity associated with the Second World War, the United States president Roosevelt (1941) has

mobilized the allies and proposed the vision of what later become known as “*freedom from want*” (at that time defined as “*economic understandings that would provide all the nations a healthy peacetime life everywhere in the world*”) that was to complement the what later become known as freedom from fear (at the time understood as “*reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in the position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbour everywhere in the world*”). These issues have later become the building stones of the concept of Human Security, formulated more explicitly in the 1990s.

In the 1970s and 1980s, coming more from the socioeconomic development realm than from security realm, there have been couple of important reports published addressing the principles that were later attributed to the concept of Human Security. The examples could be the 1972 “*Limits to Growth*” by Donella H. Meadows, Dennis L. Meadows, Jorgen Randers and William W. Behrens. The authors have presented some challenging scenarios for global sustainability and/or security related to the interaction of several key factors such as population, food production, industrial production, pollution, and consumption of non-renewable natural resources. Another example is the “*North-South: A Programme for Survival: Report of the Independent Commission on International Development Issues*” known simply as the Brandt Report from 1980. The Commission was chaired by Willy Brandt, the former Chancellor of West Germany). The Report became one of the most comprehensive analysis of global economic issues in the time when published. Among other issues, it pointed out that the national states failed to address the human deprivation, environmental stress, political repression and the spread of arms and diseases.

The ideas of extended security, however, could also be traced in more security oriented reports and academic writings. It was for example an integral part of the “*Report of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security*

Issues” (1982), known as the Report of the Olaf Palme Commission. Apart from the call to the nations to organise the common security in response to nuclear dangers (traditional military understanding of security), the report was also speaking about the economic and political aspects of security of the individuals as a condition for the peace and order.

Other examples could be the thoughts on re-defining security in a sense of widening the spectra of threats, including other than traditional military threats, i.e. economic and developmental issues, brought by Richard Ullman in his breaking article “*Redefining Security*”, published in 1983 . He brought in the arguments about the trap related to the false and misleading image of reality in case that the security would only entail the military aspects which means *„ignoring the other even more harmful dangers and thus reducing the total security and [thus] it contributes to the militarization of the international relations that in the long run can only increase global insecurity“* (Ullman, 1983, 129). His definition of the security would be: *„threat to national security is an action or sequence of events that (1) threatens drastically and over a relatively brief span of time to degrade the quality of life for the inhabitants of a state, or (2) threatens significantly to narrow the range of policy choices available to the government of a state or to private, nongovernmental entities (persons, groups, corporations) within the state. Within the first category might come the spectrum of disturbances and disruptions ranging from external wars to internal rebellions, from blockades and boycotts to raw material shortages and devastating “natural” disasters such as decimating epidemics, catastrophic floods, or massive and pervasive droughts. These are for the most part fairly obvious: in their presence any observer would recognize that the well-being of a society had been drastically impaired“*(Ullman, 1983, 133). The second important article with same headline – “*Redefining Security*” was published in 1989 by Jessica Mathews Tuchman. She was proposing the broadening of the security towards the environmental, resources and demographic issues.

The concept of Human Security as a wider conceptual framework has been also mirrored in the *“United Nations Agenda For Peace”* of 1992 which was focusing on the topics of the prevention and conflict transformation which need to incorporate the also the civilian aspects of security and the developmental concerns as the essential component. In 1995 the Commission on Global Governance published the report *“Our Global Neighbourhood”* calling upon the international community to shift the way of thinking about security from the military to protecting the environment and welfare of the people. The concept of Human Security was also later mentioned in several United Nations Reports such as *“A More Secure World”* of 2004 and/or *“In Larger Freedom”* of 2005b.

However, the most comprehensive approach to security at the time was provided by the Copenhagen School represented by Berry Buzan, Ole Weaver, Jaap de Wilde and others who have combined the traditional military factors in security with environmental, economic, political and societal factors and thus making the security multi-sector phenomenon. Apart from this broadening of the security threats, the Copenhagen school (known as *“wideners”*) also brought in the broader range of the security referent objects, other than the traditionally perceived national state and the integrity of its territory. The new referent objects were the individuals, local communities, groups of people characterised for example by ethnicity, religion, ideological features, but also global community and environment.

6.2. Human Security: Human Development & Human Security

Since the 1990s, development and security have started to be inevitably linked both in policy and discourse (Hettne, 2010), since their current conceptualisations do share similar concerns and goals and react to similar global problems and developments.

Human Security is standing somewhere between the security and development discourses, it could be seen as a meeting point between security and development. The concept of Human Security has emerged both from the Development Studies as well as the Security Studies (Duffield in Peoples and Vaughan-Williams, 2001). It is borrowing both from security and also development theories. It also includes the aspects of security that were not included in the traditional theoretical approaches or schools of thought. However, more importantly, the Human Security concept is primarily linked with the development policy and practice.

6.2.1. Human Security: Hybrid Concept

Human Security has evolved as a kind of the “*hybrid*” concept lying somewhere between the development and security discourses. According to Alkire (2003, 6) the two concepts Human Development and Human Security “*share the similar conceptual space*”. Comparing both concepts (*see Table 6, p. 126*), we find out, that they are people-centred and multidimensional and are defined in the space of human choices and freedoms. Both concepts are closely linked to human rights being part of the “*vital core*” of the human lives. Both concepts are creating the framework for new ways of thinking about the state sovereignty (Owen, 2004, 337). Traditionally the state sovereignty has been understood as government’s ability to control territory, state independence and recognition from the part of the other states. The role of the citizens was mainly to support this system in exchange for which the state has provided the security (in the traditional sense, i.e. protection from the external military interventions) to them. From the Human Security and Human Development perspective, the state sovereignty is also related to the condition when the state shall be able to provide certain level of human rights and welfare for the citizens, so that they

could feel secure. Both concepts could be characterised as subjective and very normative. They are quite strong in the motivation for advocacy and mobilization for change and thus are strongly policy and practice oriented, however both concepts are lying outside of the mainstream approaches, calling for the paradigm shift and tending to raise the alternatives and include the traditionally marginalised and oftentimes vulnerable actors (giving them voice) and expanding the spectra of opportunities to tackle the perceived threats in order to *“achieve a better coordinated resistance to the forces that make human survival so insecure”* (Alkire, 2003, 11). Both concepts are highlighting the empowerment – people are acknowledged to be the means as well as the ends to development and change.

Both concepts also do closely relate to the human rights component. The Human Security concept in relation to development also inevitable tackles the traditional development related dichotomy between the needs-based and rights-based approaches. Rights go beyond the needs to include the wider vision of human beings in their different roles including the social, economic, political and cultural. Moreover, the rights go accompanied by the duties, which is not always the case with the needs. On the other hand, if the Human Security comes into the debate, it may turn the perception of the right into the *“needs that are to be fulfilled”* (Howard-Hassmann, 2012). Both Human Development and Human Security concepts move the *“development”* from primarily *“the needs-based focus towards the rights-based focus in quest of improving opportunities and capabilities”* (Khagram et al., 2003, 300). Moreover, people and their communities are believed to articulate their aspirations and also the means to achieve these aspirations, i.e. way to participate actively in the decision-making about their development and security. On the other hand the top-down technocratic processes typical for the earlier approaches to development and

security, regardless how well intentioned they are/were, are seen to have little durability/sustainability.

Both Human Security and Human Development protagonists are claiming that the complex situations as a context for policy and action cannot be resolved any more with the help of partial approaches and thus interdisciplinary and inter-actors cooperation thus needs to be employed in order to be able to respond adequately. We cannot enjoy the development without security and vice versa we will not enjoy the security without development.

Table 6: *Human Development & Human Security*

	Human Development	Human Security
Aims:	Widening people's choices , enhancing capabilities, respective expanding opportunities through emancipation and with support of equitable economic growth	Enabling people to exercise choices offered by Human Development, allowing these choices to be made safely and freely
Focus:	Well-being; freedom from want	Security, stability, sustainability of well-being; freedom from fear as well as freedom from want
Orientation & scope:	Moves forward (progressive development) and aggregative development (development for all society), broad and multifaceted scope	Focuses on those who are left behind at individual level , relief and prevention oriented but also reacting to urgencies
Time-span:	Long-term	Combines short-term measures to deal with risk, but also long-term preventive and strengthening measures
Role of people:	People are seen both as means and ends; emphasis on participation and empowerment	Empowerment but also protection of people
Common aspects:	Human Development and Human Security are both human-centred and share concerns with lives of human beings, longevity, education, participation. Both are normative both in academia and practice.	

Source: adapted from Tadjbakhsh and Chenoy, 2007, 107–108.

6.2.2. *Human Security: Development in Security or Security in Development?*

In spite of many similarities there rises a question of how exactly does the concept of Human Security relate to the concept of Human Development? Is it an unnecessary overlap of the two (development in the form of human development and security in the widened sense) or is it a proof of the useful merging or nexus of development and security discourses, as the Commission on Human Security stated in 2003?

The Ul Haq's (Pakistani development thinker and economist) contribution to the very innovative Human Development Report of 1994 (the fourth one of the series of the Development Reports published by the UNDP) had brought about the expansive concept of Human Security as a partner concept to Human Development.

On the page 3, the UNDP Human Development Report, as a critical response to the dominant realist/neo-realist concept of traditional security, states that: *"For too long, the concept of security has been shaped by the potential of conflict between states. For too long, security has been equated with the threats to a country's borders. For too long, nations have sought arms to protect their security. For most people today, a feeling of insecurity arises more from worries about their daily life than from the dread of a cataclysmic world event. From security, income security, health security, environmental security, securing from crime – these are emerging concerns of human security all over the world."* (UNDP, 1994, 3). Further down the UNDP report (1994, 22–23, 25) envisaged adding 7 new dimensions to the traditional understanding/definition of security: apart from the military security there is mentioned economic, food, health, environmental, personal, community and political security.

The report is also bringing 4 crucial defining principles/pillars that shall constitute the essence of the concept – a) universal concern i.e. relevance for the

people everywhere; b) its components are interdependent, especially in the globalised context when the problems could not be isolated events any longer and moreover they are not restricted to national borders and do have influence across the globe; c) prevention, because there is a belief that it is easier to ensure the broadened security through early action and/or prevention than through the later intervention; and it is defined to be d) human/people-centered.

Reading the document, it might be quite difficult to specify the border between the development and security problems and issues. For the Human Development approach adopted by the UNDP, the response to the confusion mentioned above is the following: since the development is being understood as seeking to extend the human capabilities (*see e.g. Amartya Sen*) and the ability of people to exercise choices over their lives, (human) security is defined as safety and protection of the situations where these are/could be disrupted by the lack of food, disease, political representation etc. The (human) security thus means that the basic human needs/rights are met in ways that are safe to individuals as well as the communities whose ways of life can survive (UNDP, 1994, 23). (Human) development is then a much broader process of seeking the advancement of human capabilities and equality of opportunities through wide spectra of strategies – e.g. supported and sustained good governance, markets allowing for the creation of the conditions friendly to cultural diversity and local ownership of means through which the development is achieved.

The progress in one area (human development/human security) enhances the progress in the other respective area; similarly the failure in one of the areas enlarges the chance for the failure in the other area.

According to the UNDP, the growing challenge to human security (security of individual human beings) is that the new approach to development (new development paradigm) needs to be adopted as well – it needs to put the

people to the centre of attention and make the economic growth the means not the end of the development. The idea was to enlarge the human capabilities to the extent that could be best used in their lives in order to assume the responsibility for their own development as well as to create conditions for protection of the environment that shall stay rich for the next generations to come (UNDP, 1994, 4). The Human Development thus shall enable, empower people to participate actively and shape their lives.

Des Gasper (2005, 223) reflecting on the relation between Human Development and the Human Security concepts states, that as the changing of the development discourse to conceptualise it newly as a Human Development was more than just adding “*health and education*” dimensions to the traditional economic growth argument (i.e. it was more than just adding more objectives other than the GDP growth; the development goals shall be underlined by the concern for individual human lives, by adding the focus on the reasoned freedoms and there shall be more emphasis on the systems thinking reaching across the disciplinary boundaries and also across the national boundaries). The human security similarly meant much more than just humanizing the traditional state centred security.

According to Des Gasper (2005, 226) there are several ways the human development and human security concepts might be understood to be related: “...a) *Human Security is complementing the human development by the concern with the stability of the “goods” within the human development; b) Human Security approach is broadening the human development concept by including physical security of persons as crucial to development, c) Human Security is itself broadening the security studies beyond the state and military security shifting the focus to the personal security of the human beings; d) Human Security is narrowing the scope of human development concept, by concentrating on the basics of goods required for securing the humanity...*”

According to Makino (2006, 191) the added value of the Human Security concept for the Human Development lies in the adding of the component of “*risk downturn*” – i.e. apart from focusing on the guaranteeing the basic needs and or creating the conditions/context for the development of the human capabilities (see *Amartya Sen*), it also brings about the idea of guaranteeing that these things would not be lost in the future – endangered. Aspects such as fears from vulnerability and shocks were very closely correlated to the aspects of deficiency and poverty. Those that are usually the most affected by the external shocks are the most vulnerable people, suffering from poverty, education and health deficiency etc. The perspective of the Human Security focuses on these situations when the already poor are exposed to the security risks. So it offers to overcome the vicious circle of the fears and deficits. The concept of Human Security, if applied as an integral part to development strategies, shall help to face and cope with these dynamics.

King and Murray (2001–2, 603) see the interrelation between the two concepts in the following way: “*the Human insecurity can come from any source that increases the risk that people will remain in or enter into a state of generalised poverty*”. Paraphrasing the UI Haq, King and Murray (2001–2, 589) pointed out that the development community has seen the opportunity associated with the position of the security within the foreign policy (high politics) and superior financial resources associated and sought to link the development and security agendas to intersect through linking the human development to the human security. On the other hand those grounded in security were spotting the similar opportunity and seeking to “conquer” the new areas for their agendas as well.

Axworthy (1997, 184) remarks that “*...at minimum, human security requires that the basic needs are met...*”. But, the qualitative aspect of Human Security entails also the achievement of human dignity, personal autonomy, control over

one's life and unhindered participation in the community life (Thomas, 2001). This all also includes the emancipation from the oppressive power structures (global, national and local). Schirch (2012, 2) argues that human security can be understood as *"a theory of change; a way of thinking that appreciates the interrelationship between human development, human dignity, and peace and security issues"*.

According to Gasper and Gomez (2014) *"the Human Security is an essential part, or partner, of Human Development thinking. If we see Human Development analysis as including attention to basic needs, and to threats, disruptions and fluctuations,..., then Human Security analysis is a wing or dimension within it. If Human Development analysis is seen only as about creation and expansion of valuable capabilities, then Human Security analysis adds special attention to counterpart concerns: vulnerabilities, risks and forces of disruption and destruction"*. The Human Security concept covers both the deprivation and vulnerability. It focuses on the deprivations with the special focus on the vulnerabilities. The theme of vulnerability is seen by these authors as a much wider than the capabilities and reasoned choice (i.e. Human Capability Approach by Sen).

Hubert (in Gasper, 2008) suggests that given the development-security nexus (the interconnections between the traditionally separated spheres) it makes little difference whether the concept of human security adopted is wide or narrow, because the human security cannot be achieved without the human development and vice versa. The Human Security is thus perceived as necessary but not sufficient condition for Human Development. If Human Security would address the most urgent threats and co-create the secure and safe context, then the Human development would be able to address the well-being of the individual human beings then their communities. Human rights shall be then concerned as a third necessary component to the

security and development. (Duffield, 2001; Gleditsch et al., 2003; Collier et al., 2003)

7. Human Security: Critical Analysis of Key Pillars

Human Security was conceptualised and presented in the United Nations Human Development Report in 1994. The concept has evolved since then, but more than two decades after it has been introduced to the political and academic debate, it still keeps being quite controversial. It is contested for its conceptual ambiguity as well as for the questionable practical utility and also for its uncritical "*problem solving*" approach reinforcing the power-relations. Often it is accused of being just a term without the content or vice versa – a norm legitimizing the actions without actually having the coherent theoretical base. There also continues to be a debate about the purpose and scope of Human Security concept. A large body of literature has evolved focusing on the defending and/or challenging of the concept or explaining it and its value added. It is challenged by rich spectra of the critique coming from different theoretical approaches to security, but also being motivated by interests of the different policy and practice actors engaged in security and development realms.

Just as an example, Ayooob (1997) mentions the difficulty of the concept related to the fact that it merely involves re-naming of the problems that have already been recognised in other contexts. He is posing a question of what is then a purpose of combining the already defined issues under new label.

Paris (2001) is pointing to Human Security concept having no definite parameters and boundaries, therefore anything and everything could be considered to be part of the concept. This leaves both academics and also policy makers and practitioners without guidance and clear analytical tools. Moreover, if the concept is broadened to also include very complex issues such as climate change (where e.g. economic and natural scientific predictions often fall against each other); health and gender issues (where there exist huge ideological and

value oriented disparities in different areas of the world) etc., it very much starts to complicate the possibility to reach the international consensus on taking any action in relation to the threats (Paris, 2001; Ayoob, 1997; Deudney, 2001).

Knudsen (2001) comments that Human Security risks to engage the military, i.e. the traditional methods and actors of security in the issues that would be best tackled by non-military strategies and by actors on the different levels. Institutionalization of Human Security under the global organization United Nations also risks the raising hopes about the capacity of the international community to deal with the issues, which might not be fulfilled due to the organisational, financial constraints but also due to the continued different interests and motivations of the United Nations member states.

Reading from various critiques on Human Security, we could learn that the inter-disciplinarity and intended comprehensiveness proved to be the so called "*Achilles heel*" of Human Security. One of the problems is its huge complexity when trying to encompass theoretically all aspects of human life – falling into very broad field of different disciplines (many more then the often referred ones within this thesis – i.e. Development Studies and Security Studies).

Human Security concept aims to distance itself from the prevailing traditional understanding of the security, as the Critical Security Studies also intend. It is also trying to incorporate Human Development approach and its values into its conceptualisation of security (esp. within the "*freedom from want*" component), bringing the development and security fields closer together.

Human Security is considered to be a set of interesting ideas relevant for responding to problems occurring in current world, but Human Security is seen, by the critical scholars and also by the author of this thesis, not very

critical and reflexive within its own area of thought. How the concept of Human Security is being reflected and evaluated from the Critical Studies' perspective? What are, if any, the different incongruities and contradictions within the concept of Human Security from the perspective of the critical theories?

Critical theories question or challenge contradictions in society and prevailing structures of power and power relations and also the prevailing discourses and ways of thinking (Newman, 2010, 90). In relation to Human Security concept, it is being often pointed to its strong policy orientation and pragmatism of its proponents in the intention to offer policy relevant solutions. This makes the concept protagonists suspicious of accommodating with the mainstream power politics (being promoted and operationalized within the existing political and power structures) and thus contributing to the fixation of the current status quo and challenging the emancipatory ambitions envisaged by the critical theories as well as by the Human Security concept itself.

The critical theories believe, that discourses alone, as well as the related practices that are based on these discourses, produce specific realities and could serve as tools of power and domination through producing and re-producing the relations of inequality, injustice, inclusion/exclusion, insecurities and structural violence (Foucault, 1972 and 1978; Escobar, 1995; *for more on structural violence see e.g. Galtung, 1969*). The Human Security discourse may also potentially carry these inherent dangers.

From the point of view of critical theories we could search whether the assessed concept of Human Security does have transformative potential, emancipator value and/or it is rather continuation of the previous, more traditional, approaches to security/development engaging with strategic, resp. supporting the status quo and the older narratives of power dominance and

legitimised interventions. Moreover, we could inquire into whether it allows for and/or promotes the continuation of the engagement of the “North” in the “South” as in a region that is perceived as marginalised.

As Sabina Alkire (2003) points out, there are more than thirty different definitions to the Human Security and there has not been a consensus reached about the concept, both in the academia as well as in the policy and practice worldwide. The various definitions differ according to the nature of threats, values and priorities to be pursued, and strategies to be employed (including the disputes over the prevention and intervention strategies), however, there are also commonalities to be found – focus on individual security, interdependence, general expansion of the notion of violence extending beyond the physical violence (among others taking account of the Galtung’s structural violence) and universality. All these commonalities are reflected in the UNDP’s comprehensive conceptualisation of the Human Security - in its foundational pillars. Therefore the 4 basic pillars (as defined in the United Nations Development Program Human Development Report) that constitute the essence of the concept are taken as a point of departure for the critical reflection in this chapter. The 4 basic pillars read in the following way: a) universal concern (i.e. the equal implication to all people); b) the interdependency of the different security challenges; c) emphasis on prevention rather than intervention and d) the focus on people as the central referents for the security.

7.1. Pillar of Universality or Civilising Mission Continued?

The first of the main defining pillars and building stones of Human Security is the principle of universality. The principle’s declared contribution to the re-defined concept of security is that this type of security understanding shall matter and thus apply to all societies, transcending the political and power

divisions such as “Global North/South”, “developed/developing/transforming countries” etc. and could thereby function as a global approach to security and/or development.

However, building on the Foucault’s and or Saïd’s ideas about power and/or knowledge, we could see that Human Security, even if it is defining itself to be strongly based on the principle of universality, is not in fact able to escape the trap of being non-universal. Moreover, the trap is widened even more in cases when the principle of universality is being used as a leverage to serve needs of dominant actors in the international system. This makes it a mechanism to practice the hegemony and power in pursuit of the traditional security interests of the states. Chandler (2008, 9), in his paper, paraphrases Duffield’s words and argues that “...human security frameworks attempt to secure the rich consumerist West by containing the ‘circulatory’ problems of world market inequalities and exclusions within the post-colonial South. He argues that human security’s merging of development and security reflects the subordination of the human security agenda to the concerns of post-imperial control and ‘counter-insurgency’ practices. In the process, flagging up the limited nature of human security solutions to insecurity in the non-Western world and highlighting the limited impact of human-centred, gender-centred, sustainable, community-development, which merely reproduces subsistence societies and institutionalises poverty and global inequalities”.

Human Security concept cannot be separated from the wider power relations that structure the international system including also the intellectual base for the discussions and formulation of the concept itself. Not only that it has often become vehicle to promote certain interests, it has also itself been worked with, manipulated and transformed to fit such interests. The Human Security thus reproduces dominant norms and power-relations (Marhia, 2013, 20; Owen, 2004, 383).

Although the concept, as defined, claims to be universalistic, it primarily focuses, in theoretical deliberations and also in practice, on the “*Global South*” region. The region of the “*South*” is being often treated as the object of security and development rather than subject, in a similar way as is/was typical for the traditional security studies (the Cold War realist strategic studies) and/or the traditional Modernisation Theory of development. The legitimisation for such treatment, of course, is different to the previous (*see the prevention and non-intervention pillar discussion*).

Human Security is discussed in relation to problems associated namely with the “*Global South*” region. One of the often mentioned arguments is that the problems that are envisaged by Human Security concept (the wider security challenges) are unevenly spread around the world, so they in its essence create the different context for security thinking and the related actions.

However, for many scholars from “*developing countries*” (e.g. Arturo Escobar, Gustavo Esteva, Homi Bhabha, Grada Kilomba, Dembisa Moyo etc.), that are at the focus of Human Security concept, the above has become considered to be very controversial. The reason is that the Human Security challenges the understanding of some states’ sovereignty and it is undermining the cultural and political values of the other than “*Northern*” liberal democracies while justifying the interference and interventionism into the domestic affairs by other states and governmental organizations (state-centric).

Viewed from the perspective of actors that often become the object of Human Security (resp. the actors situated in certain regions of the world), the Human Security concept could be, rather than emancipatory tool, viewed as another “*Northern-centred*” way of the so called “*civilising mission*” (known from the earlier Modernisation Development Theories). The universalisation of such a type of life can be perceived as an attempt to expand the project of modernity.

Moreover, such an approach combined with the soft (*development conditionality*) and hard (*military humanitarian interventions*) interventions could subsequently lead to the increase of insecurity in areas that do not comply with these universalistic modernist principles/values. (Shani, 2014)

Moreover, the principle of universality is clashing with the post-colonial/post-development/post-modernist calls for context specific analysis and locally driven creation of appropriate and locally owned solutions for locally perceived and locally defined “*problems*” resp. “*development and/or security issues*”. The Human Security is thus being seen as “*as a rhetorical device used by dominant Western liberal powers to impose, sometimes violently, a narrow vision of peace [and development]*” (Peterson, 2013, 320).

According to Chandler (2007) and also other thinkers (e.g. Duffield, 2010; Kienscherf, 2011), there is a danger that development and enhancement of the security have become subject to the “*Northern*” security concerns. Securing the Human Security goals could be seen as subordinating the needs of the people/humans in the areas of the implementation of the Human Security concept to the traditional security needs of the “*Global North*”.

7.2. Pillar of Interdependency or Hierarchy?

The second pillar of Human Security concept is the intended interdependency of security threats and challenges, respectively vulnerabilities, rather than their hierarchy. The more traditional challenges associated with this aspect of Human Security are several. One of them being the fact that in the event of over expansive understanding of dangers and their overt interdependency, it leads to inability of the scholars (moreover, coming from the different fields of expertise) to navigate themselves and to communicate

with one another. In the end there is, what Baldwin (1997, 5) calls, the “*perpetual dialogue of the death*” produced. Such a dialogue is often hindering the ability to really describe and understand the problems and to seek the areas of interdependency in order to find the innovative and comprehensive solutions that would be difficult to find otherwise and contribute to the improvement of the security and hence development context of the individuals.

From the critical perspective the situation where there is a multiplicity of issues and their perceived interdependency is supposed to be beneficial for the flexibility of the concept. However, the question is to what extent is this multiplicity and interdependency being really part of Human Security concept. One of the paradoxical contributions of Human Security concept is that the labelling of something to be a security issue rather than e.g. development, social, economic issue (i.e. the traditionally development issues) increases the attention of the securitising actors (agents) to the problem and thus it helps to bring the issue to the higher policy agenda and to generate the financial resources for finding the possible solutions and then acting in response. However, the more the harms/vulnerabilities are labelled as security threats (including the direct and indirect harms/vulnerabilities), the more difficult it is to study the inter-relations between them (Owen, 2004).

Owen (2004, 390) building on Krause, Buzan and MacFarlane, points out that the “*security*” is label that is normally given to the issues of the highest priority. So when “*everything*” becomes the security issue, then it is very hard to act in order to fulfil the objectives of Human Security and sustain the conditions for the individual human beings to pursue their human development aims. This phenomenon is referred to as the danger of “*securitisation*”, the term known already from the works of Weaver and Buzan of the Copenhagen School. Another danger of this process is the securitization in more traditional security sense, i.e. militarization of the otherwise developmental/social welfare

problems, which may be going against the third pillar of the Human Security (the prevention rather than intervention character of the security provisions). Securitizing the issue, i.e. bringing it higher on the policy agenda, resp. making it an issue of "*high politics*", gives it the sense of higher urgency. Once becoming labelled as an issue with higher urgency, there rises the need to set special measures to tackle it (Buzan, 1997). This could sometimes lead to unnecessary actions/interventions from the part of state (as a more traditional actor), even in the cases when the problems might be more easily tackled by the other than state actors (communities, organisations etc.). In its consequence it may go against the principles defined within the last pillar of Human Security (the individualistic focus rather than state-centricity). Although one of the other goals foreseen by Human Security is the inclusion of other than state actors as the problem solvers, preventers, given especially their closer relation to the individuals and the estimated better knowledge of the local and/or immediate context. The exceptionalism is also closely related to the decrease in predictability which inherently leads to the further increase of insecurity.

Labelling too many issues to be security threats may also raise the subjective feelings of insecurity (the perceptions of insecurity) and therefore contribute to escalation of the problem (e.g. the securitization of the international migration flows), paradoxically leading to the generation of the zero-sum solutions typical for the traditional security concepts. The urgency label may limit the space for negotiating the best solutions and thus lead to less optimum actions and may divert attention from more holistic/comprehensive approach that is being foreseen by Human Security concept.

There is also a danger that some topics may become over-securitized and thus subject to immediate action, oftentimes intervention – including not only the military ones (e.g. the Humanitarian Intervention) but also economic and political. This is producing another paradox (i.e. in order to protect Human

Security) the security of the individuals might be infringed. In case that these interventions are dominantly happening in the areas of the “ *Global South*”, this might be accompanied by the fear that these interventions legitimized by the concept of Human Security might be or might be perceived as a certain form of neo-colonialism.

Yuen Foonkhong (in Debiel and Werthes, 2006) summarises this problem in the following way: the securitisation of the wide variety of vulnerabilities and challenges could either lead to the paralysis of the actors to find the solutions and act to tackle the issues (including the rise of the false hopes of the individual consumes of the security, the security referent objects) and/or to the overstretch in action as a response to the urgency and sensitiveness of the dangers leading to the expensive and may be inadequate solutions, that might be little conceptual and more interventionist than sustainable. In the most extreme cases these measures might end up with suspending the civil liberties and thus creating the atmosphere very similar to the one envisaged by the traditional security theories and policies. *“The category of exceptional can be invoked to justify and mobilize a range of violent and illiberal practices, including the detention without trial, derogations from human rights law, complicity in torture, extraordinary rendition, curtailment of civil liberties and securitization of migration...”* (CASE, 2006, 465)

In traditional thinking about security, security and rights of the individuals could be compromised for the sake of national security objectives, even in democracies (that by its mere definition are built on the respect to human rights). The example could be the policies enacted in different countries after the 9/11, when the civil liberties were sacrificed in order to strengthen the national security. There again the resources for providing security have swung to the political and military aspects: defence of borders, investment in quantity

and quality of military personnel, material and equipment, and supporting of the countries that do belong to the same ideological camp. (Schnabel, 2012)

Another problem associated with the securitization is the so called “*silent security dilemma*”. It is when there follows the inability to identify the potential subjects of insecurity as well as the specific potential security threats for those that do not have the chance to speak or do not have the power to be heard. This could also result into the development of situations when the threats that are not named by any of the actors might not be dealt with at all, although objectively they could constitute the real dangers for the very same actors. The problem also comes if the perspectives and motivations and thus the different security challenges do get the competing character among the threats themselves but also among the different actors that are both the referent object and/or objects that are supposed to act. (see also Sjoberg, 2010; Booth, 2007)

For Human Security and Human Development to function, it is required to include the historically disenfranchised and disempowered individuals and groups. However, the above may lead to the situation when certain issues perceived by certain under-represented (thus invisible) people/groups will be felt but not voiced. Another risk is that if the issues threatening the most vulnerable ones are taken up by more powerful actors, then it is again just the most-deprived people whose voice is being heard, and the “*little-above the threshold*” of un-visibility would not be heard. The securitization, sometimes does not serve the insecure, but it can create false hopes (Khong, 2001).

Mark Duffield’s work has been crucial in looking at the “*securitization of development*”. Securitization of development means that a traditionally developmental issue by falling into the security category (acquiring the security label) raises its prominence at the political agenda. This can lead to the mobilization of funds and the immediate action taken. But the problem might

be that it is then the traditional security actors that take over the action which could eventually lead to the funds moving from the development to the security policy and practice circles.

Another problem associated to the securitization of the development is the danger related to the shifts in the allocation of the development aid motivated by the security-related strategies, resulting into some countries being prioritized over the others due to the security interests of the external actors to/over the prioritized territories (*see e.g. Harborne, 2012; Amer et al, 2012; Duffield, 2010; Dillon, 2006; Owen, 2004*). Using the argument of selectivity, this is not only undermining the universality pillar again (*see above*), but also it brings the Human Security concept closer to the traditional ethnocentric security/development approaches marked with the interests of the external actors outweighing and thus neglecting the stated long-term human development/security objectives in favour of the short-term traditional interests. In addition, more one tries to securitize the social/development related phenomena in order to achieve security; the more the feeling of insecurity is created. Logical outcome is that the politics aiming at increasing of security leads to increased anxiety following the security dilemma dynamics. (CASE, 2006, 461).

Human security gives us a tool to connect the development policies with the traditional security policies (military and civilian crisis management), it serves as a kind of a bridge for the complex situations when just the traditional development approaches or just traditional military operations would not be enough to improve the security environment for people to be able to pursue their well-being. Since the different problems are strongly related to each other (interdependent), many disciplines are supposed to be involved to communicate and act, however, it seems that with the conceptual and methodological weakness of Human Security related to the difficulty to

comprehend, the interdisciplinary approach (i.e. different development and security actors and disciplines working together and not past each other) seems to be difficult.

The lack of common methodology and persistence of power hierarchies between the academic disciplines as well as the operational policies make the cooperation and communication among the different actors potentially quite difficult. This is in the end often leading to the competition and multiple parallel actions within the areas of humanitarian relief, development assistance, human rights advocacy and/ conflict resolution (Owen, 2004, 337).

On the other hand, there have been some recent attempts to improve on the methodological clarity of the Human Security approach. The authors (e.g. Alkire; Owen) have tried to specify the measurement of Human Security, create tools in order to improve the analytical capacity, but also the practical enabling capacity within the policy realm (Floyed, 2007).

7.3. Pillar of Prevention or Intervention?

The third pillar of Human Security concept lies in prevention rather than intervention assumption. Human security calls for prevention rather than intervention in looking for the solutions for insecurities, unlike the state-centric approaches (that are generally more reactive). However, since even within the concept of Human Security there is eventually a lot left from the state-centric approach (*see esp. human-centred or state centred pillar discussion*), Human Security often resorts to interventionist approaches as well.

The prevention is envisaged to be implemented through protection and empowerment. The empowerment according to Human Development approach requires both: the change of the existing structures that might serve as

a barrier to development and also emancipation and activation of those that are to become responsible for creating solutions for their lives. The perceived interventionism can in the end dis-empower local societies and states in the target regions and thus create even more insecurities for the human beings living and pursuing their well-being in those respective areas.

Apart from the dangers of securitization of development (*see interdependency or hierarchy pillar*), Human Security together with Human Development approach have created base for the continuation of development policies that are implemented in an interventionist manner. From the perspective of critical development theories, the interventions related to the conditioned good governance underlined by the “*universal*” principles of “*democracy*” could also be considered to be a counterproductive intervention to life and well-being of individual human beings in the target countries. Anthony Anghie (2006) in “*Decolonising the International Relations*” claims that “*good governance*”, similar way as “*development*” before, was gradually gaining the universal appeal; because all people and societies are sure they want and seek good governance much in the same way as they desire development. However, the following questions stay unanswered. What is the good governance and what is the development and how shall these be achieved in individual societies?

The good governance concept, same way as development concept, is perceived by the dominant actors to be “*neutral*” and “*objective*” and thus generally accepted as applicable and desirable to all societies. As Juhani Kaponen and others (e.g. Luckham, 2009) has mentioned, the promotion of democracy and good governance is desirable in order to change the structural violence related to the strong authoritarian states and/or on the other hand related to the very weak states lacking the functioning institutions. Moreover the sound good governance shall increase the absorptive capacity for the

development programs implemented in the so called developing countries. The stress on good governance and especially tying it to the development through the conditionality is to be classified as intervention policy.

Moreover, the problem is again the promotion of implementation of principles that have been developed and perfected in one part of the world accompanied by the interventions to apply them with the intention to “manage” the security and development in the other part of the world for the own sake of the target regions and even for the sake of the intervening actors (*see universality or civilising mission pillar discussion*).

In “*Development as a Freedom? From Colonialism to Countering Climate Change*” David Chandler (2012) looks at the discourse of empowerment and freedom in relation to the problematical development and state-building interventions. He points out that from more critical development approaches perspectives, it is not so much the material development as the individual empowerment, freedom and capacity-building that are believed to be crucial building stones for solutions for development and security. However, Chandler also claims that the current framing of development seems only very little different from the one of colonial period – i.e. it is very similar in its essence to the externally driven “*civilising project*”, using the universal values as legitimisation for intervention and thus making the assumed beneficiaries of the development and security to be still and again the “*objects*” of the interventions. After the end of the Cold War it is no longer possible to justify the interventions with the clear-cut national interests driven by the Hobbesian or Machiavellian imperatives, but there are currently many other reasons for legitimisation of interventions in pursuit of better security in the narrow sense but also as a condition for development.

Human Security concept is assuming that there are deprived people in Global South, and they are being portrayed as helpless victims, and therefore the Human Security provides a normative rationale for interventions to save the disadvantaged populations in the weak and less developed states and also homogenising the world around certain “universal” values and norms.

Some authors both from security as well as development realms (e.g. Shani et al, 2007; Mgbeoji, 2006) talk about the hegemonic forms of intervention and control in the form of cultural imperialism. As a result it contributes to the reinforcement of the global power disparities since the decisions on what and where is seen to be a development/security problem do reflect certain bias towards the existing power distribution between the, in Duffield’s words, “included and excluded” (see e.g. Duffield, 2007; Jabri, 2007; McCormack, 2011, Johnston, 2006 etc.).

For Duffield (2007) and other critical authors such as Grayson (2008); De Larrinaga and Doucet (2008); Dillon (2007), using the concept of bio-politics, inspired largely by the works of Foucault, the Human Security could be understood as a regulatory power that aims to support the development and/or security through controlling and intervening into the processes happening in the so called Global South countries, helping them to live in the problematic situations and derivatively mitigating the risks and insecurities that could emanate from the “underdeveloped”/“non-secure” others. By fostering “their” development and security, we improve “our” security (Duffield, 2007a, 225).

Apart from the debate on conditioned good governance and/or conditioned development interventions, there is another, even more radical example of interventionist approach – the Humanitarian Intervention. One of the extreme impacts of the prevailing debate about the Human Security is the creation of the legitimising argument for the so called Humanitarian

Interventions (i.e. *the military operations that are led to protect the rights and lives of the individuals and groups in case of mass violations, assuming the breach of the traditional state's sovereignty*³²). The concept of Human Security, though its basic building pillar is prevention rather than intervention, has been closely connected to the Responsibility to Protect debate. These two concepts are, however, not definitely identical, they are perceived to be complementary and thus reinforcing one another. The Responsibility to Protect (R2P) means the protection of the human security (i.e. security of humans) in the narrow sense (i.e. *freedom from fear*). On the other hand, the Human Security concept forms conceptual base and legitimising ground for the R2P doctrine. The R2P doctrine stipulates that *"it is the primary responsibility of the state to protect its people, but in case the state is unable or unwilling to protect its own people, or when the state itself poses a threat to its people, then the R2P rests upon the international community"* (International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, 2001).

Although there is a strong appeal in the R2P doctrine for preventive and re-constructive measures, encouraging the states to adapt policies that would lead to the prevention of the preventable human security challenges of their people, one of the manifestations of this doctrine is also the Humanitarian Intervention, which is the typical example when the clash between the states autonomy and the individual autonomy resulting into the intervention.

Conditionality, economic sanctions and humanitarian interventions could paradoxically bring the harm to the individuals whose security and well being was intended to be protected and/or promoted. Despite the idea of creating more security and safer opportunities for development, such interventions breed further insecurities, undermining both the development as well as security (Duffield, 2010; Hettne, 2010). The emancipatory potential of

³² This conventional definition of Humanitarian Intervention could be found e.g. in Murphy, 1996.

the Human Security concept, claiming to distance itself from the traditional security/development is thus undermined by the suspicions related to the interventionism. The suspicion and mistrust towards the universality argument often underpinning the interventions comes especially from the actors that are associated to the regions that are often “*objects*” to the Human Security debates and/or interventions. They are claiming that Human Security discourse legitimises the intervention of the “*stronger*” powers. However, similar argument is also suggested by academics and tinkers from the non-object areas. In “*Rethinking Intervention and Interventionism*” Linnea Gelot and Fredrik Soderbaum also characterize the today’s international system as being dominated with the interventions of the “*outsiders*” to the affairs of the “*insiders*” and these interventions are becoming a structural function of the international system. The questions, however, is whose goals are being pursued by such interventions. To what extent are the local voices and local dynamics taken into account? In “*Intervention or Interaction? Developing Ideas from Cambodia*”, Alexandra Kent (2012) looks critically at the way in which the development/security interventions are being used as a technology of control for the pursuit of security/development ends of the interveners.

7.4. Pillar of Human-centred or State Centred Security?

The fourth pillar is based on the principle of human/people, rather than state – centred security. According to Human Security approach, the state shall be extruded as a primary object and agent of security and the space shall be created for providing security to other actors, individuals, communities etc., especially in cases when they are not able to voice their concerns. Moreover, the action space shall be created for other than state actors – NGOs, MNCs, regional economic blocks, communities, ethnic and cultural groups etc. (Naidoo, 2001).

The human, resp. individual security is concerned to be more important than the state's security *per se*, especially because states, the traditionally primary referents to security, have sometimes become primary source of insecurity for many people and individuals. There is, however, a problematic tension between the focus on individual as a main referent of security and the continued dominance of state as referent but also competent agent of the security.

The state remains to be a cornerstone to security thinking, because it continues to be also the main pillar to international legal and organisational order. Yet the question is whether Human Security really represents a critical shift in security thinking and/or whether it is rather a complement to the idea of national security with an attempt to better define its purpose in order to fit the new challenges that are being faced in the post-Cold War times.

On the other hand, Booth (1991) proposes that states could also be analogically looked at as "*houses*" – and houses require maintenance in order to serve their purpose. States are thus just "*methods*" for security of others – individuals, environments, communities. However, again, it may be quite inconsistent to spent too much of energy for maintenance of such a "*house*" to withstand security threats if the security and well-being of those that are supposed to live in such house are being compromised. Moreover, the principles of people-centricity and universality of Human Security concept foresee that security is not about states (defined by their territories and sovereignty, i.e. by the basic building bricks of such a metaphorical "*house*"), but it is stretching beyond.

In spite of the declared human-focus of Human Security concept, its proponents prefer to stay pragmatic and as Newman (2010) mentions "*moderate existing assumptions and structures*" with persuasive policy-relevant insights in

cooperation with the traditional security actors (governments/states), rather than alienating themselves from "*high politics*" and becoming less influential. Incorporating themselves to the state structures, however, leads to cutting off the potential prevention/reaction space for the other actors (that might be possibly much more effective in seeking the solutions for the complex problems than the traditional security agent – the state). Moreover, being too close to the state structures also means that the Human Security is becoming an accomplice to the existing structural injustices (Newman, 2010; Chandler, 2008; Booth, 2007).

One of the declared aims of Human Security approach is to overcome the structural injustices oftentimes linked to state structures and/or state-sponsored structures. However, if the Human Security protagonists work so closely with the state, they may in the end find it difficult and impractical to seek the solutions beyond the state and/or criticise the "*set*" norms. If this is true, then the protagonists of Human Security may be mistrusted for its paternalistic, universalistic in the sense of ethnocentric understanding of the "*universalism*", being perceived to be too controlling in the name of protection (Shani, 2008 in Newman, 2010). The intention of Human Security to maintain itself a policy relevant concept is also limiting its ability to question the existing structures and institutions of power which may be eventually at the roots of the insecurities they are trying to understand and tackle.

On the other hand, the concept of Human Security has been oftentimes used as justification for the breach of normally rigid international law (also representing the current status quo – since international law, by definition, is very rigid and thus static). Although the existing international law is still granting the legal superiority to states, even if the very same are infringing the security and well-being of their own citizens, we could see that the normally rigid instrument is now slowly changing to put the focus point closer to the

individuals (Clapham, 2010). The focus on *“humanity”*, e.g. through the international criminal law has received much higher attention than ever before.

8. Conclusion

The main aim of the inter-disciplinary thesis was the theoretical inquiry into the essence of Human Security, a hybrid concept representing the linking between the development and security. Answering the research questions (1) and (2), the research began with exploring the different development and security streams of thought that have preceded and/or influenced the formation of the central concept of the thesis – the Human Security and also through looking closer on how is the concept representing the link between development and security and more specifically the link between *what* development and *what* security. Then, since the Human Security is a normative concept that is arguing for own ethical responsibility to change thinking and practices and break from traditional security and development approaches in its quest to respond to wider security challenges that also include development concerns, it was also important to respond to research question (3) and reflect the concept (resp. its main pillars derived from the UNDP definition: universality, interdependency, human focus and prevention) from the perspective of critical theories. The goal was to see what, if any, are its inherent incongruities and contradictions.

The value added of the inter-disciplinary focus of this thesis is the exploration and engagement of the set of different approaches derived from both – *security and development* – realms. The research therefore allowed for the new broader insights into the Human Security concept, previously unexplored by the research community operating within the single disciplines.

The traditional understanding of security, based on the dominant role of state as a security referent and also security agent (with respect to military threats to its territorial integrity and sovereignty as well as to survival in the anarchic international system), was contrasted with more critical schools of

thought (Copenhagen, Aberstwyth and Paris Schools). These schools have re-conceptualised security in the sense of widening the spectra of referent objects and also broadening the set of potential threats to security, in order to include the new security challenges associated with global developments occurring since the end of the Cold War. The selected critical schools were concluded to differ in the level of distancing themselves from the traditional understanding of security; disagreeing on what should be understood as the security referent object and on the concrete issues to be included in the pool of security threats. In relative terms, the Copenhagen School was closer to understanding the security in the sense of re-defined national security, whereas the Aberstwyth and Paris Schools shifted more away from the traditionalists. The former one did so in the sense of accounting more for the role of emancipation of individuals in order to be freed from the security challenges that prevent them from achieving the desired ends in their lives. This understanding of security has shifted this critical security school closer to the ideas developed in parallel by the development thinkers within the Human Development Paradigm and/or Capability Approach.

The latter one (the Paris School), making use of the reflexive epistemology and focussing on uncovering the power and domination within the society/systems, was found to be close to the direction of thinking promoted by the critical (post-positivist) development scholars such as Arturo Escobar, who has problematized the reduction of the poverty/ development onto what is being declared and promoted by the development professionals. The professionals, organised in the privileged institutions, engage in defining/creating not only the development strategies, but also in creation of the poverty, i.e. the problem itself. Through such a dynamics they are legitimising their own existence and function. The representatives of the Paris School studied the practice of danger and threat production by the so called

(in)security professionals. The definition of what security was (accompanied by the monopolization of “truths” about dangers and risks) is seen as having the role in legitimising the thinking, policymaking and actions of the dominant actors empowered by privileged information (knowledge). This represents a power shift from the political agency to the institutionalised professionals that are defining the threats as well as strategies (technologies) to deal with them.

The different understanding of development has been studied parallel to the changes in the perception of security. Due to the identified huge variation within the development approaches and their specific character, the particular problems have been encountered by the author of the thesis as an unexpected outcome of the classification process. The controversies include: the variability within different social science disciplines reflected in the interdisciplinary development studies resulting into ontological and epistemological confusions; the theory/practice overlaps; the confusion between the development concepts and strategies; the different level and scope of analysis ranging from grand theories to more context specific approaches and last but not least the lack of historical or logical sequence and overlaps of the different categories of development approaches. These highlighted findings resulting from the process of exploration of the development approaches with the aim to classify them do represent a unique contribution of the thesis on their own, but at the same time, the identified problems provoked further questions that would deserve more attention in the future follow up research to be focused on the classification of the development approaches outside of the Human Security debate.

Nevertheless, in relation to the exploration of the nature of the Human Security concept, the traditional approaches and their alternatives were studied and contrasted. The Modernisation Theory, bringing about the “*Development Project*” – i.e. the idea of development as a gradual progress which could be provided for by external interventions, dominated development thinking for

quite a long time, in a similar way that the traditionalist security dominated security thinking. The idea of the “*Development Project*” kept influencing development discourse also outside of the Modernisation Theory and continued defining and strengthening the hierarchies and power relations in the world. The Modernisation Theory understood the development as state-centric (respectively top-down) linear process where economic growth (understood as the Gross Domestic Product growth) would be reached through modernisation, industrialisation, urbanisation and other processes that would lead the “*developing*” regions (marginalised regions) out of the tradition (that was associated strongly with the underdevelopment) and would allow for their development through the so called “*trickle-down effect*”.

The influential Modernisation Theory has undergone a critique from the structuralist approaches to development, that have seen the condition of underdevelopment not inside the countries themselves, but rather in the “*centre-periphery*” setting of the international political and economic systems. Their vision of development was to challenge such a system and create the conditions for the “*developing*” regions to distance themselves from such a structure that is inherently pushing them towards the bottom of the hierarchies and thus hindering their opportunities to grow and develop. However, this structuralist critical approach to development kept sharing a lot with the dominant Modernisation Theory. Both concepts were state-centric (top-down oriented) – i. e. putting the state first as the main driver of development; both of them believed in the industrialization processes as a necessary condition for economic growth; and to some extent in “*modernisation*”. The important lesson learned from this approach is the idea of the necessity to break the status quo, the structures of power and hierarchies that are preventing certain actors from being able to maintain their well-being.

The more radical critical development theories – associated with works of Michel Foucault and Edward Saíd and therefore applying the post-structural approach, have pointed out the importance of transforming the way people think about development, and also how knowledge is created and is reflected in the proliferation of power and hierarchies. The post-structural critical approaches to development have started to question the “*Development as a Project*” – externally imposed change of the “*abnormalities*” described by the outsiders to the process, underpinned by the dominant discourses of modernity, etc.; the discourses that have inbuilt the inherent elements of superiority/inferiority thinking.

The alternative critical theories also aimed to distance themselves from traditional thinking about development. In contrast to the early perspectives on development, that were dominated by state-centric top-down approach to change focused at economic growth as a strategy for well-being, the alternative development streams of thought brought in a different perspective. They were more people-centred, believing in the participatory bottom-up approach to development. Such a development also includes the aspects of environment and nature to be brought to the centre of attention. However, paradoxically, even if they tried to transform the existing paradigm, they have sustained the shared goals with the mainstream modernisation approaches. Among many, the alternative shift in the traditional modernisation development paradigm is reflected in the Human Development Paradigm. It is focused on the expansion of the options accessible to individuals for them to pursue their well-being. This process included the removal of obstacles that were understood both as illiteracy, access to resources etc. but also as more structural constraints such as (in)security, civil and political freedoms that are in its essence assuming the combination of the top-down and bottom-up approaches.

The Human Development comes to the forefront of the international attention in the similar time as the Human Security concept and the two approaches influenced one another importantly. Combining the ideas stemming from Human Development Paradigm and those proposed by the security wideners, the Human Security concept has, to a great extent, taken its inspiration from the development and security streams of thought critical to the traditionalist ones. The Human Security concept has distanced itself from the traditionalist security schools (both in the sense of diverting from the state as a central focus of security and even more importantly reflecting the situations when the state could become the security threat itself; and also by vastly broadening the issues that could be considered security threats). Claiming that the security also encompasses the development issues and concerns, the Human Security has integrated the ideas and principles that have been brought by the Human Development Paradigm.

The Human Development and Human Security approaches share the similar conceptual space. They put individuals closer to the forefront of attention; they are multidimensional in consideration of development/security issues; both concepts are linked to the liberal principles of human rights and maintain themselves to be characterised as subjective and normative with a strong motivation for change and advocacy for political action. The idea that politics and economics could be contributing to the security of human beings is also inbuilt in political liberalism – related to the enhancement of the rights and needs of individuals – making the individual be the irreducible unit for security. Both Human Development and Human Security are very much linked to the practice and at the same time both approaches declare to be positioned outside mainstream thinking, and tend to raise alternatives and break from the structural power-relations expanding the possibilities for the traditionally marginalised.

In its essence the concept of Human Security is built on the four main pillars (a) universality; b) non-intervention; c) interdependence; and d) human-centricity) that not only define it, but also, seen from the perspective critical theories, represent its declared departure from the traditional security and development discourses. Reflecting on the main pillars of Human Security critically, through the prism of combined critical viewpoints stemming from both the development as well as security realms that are challenging the prevailing power structures, relations and hierarchies, we could conclude, that there are certain aspects inbuilt in the Human Security that point to the incongruities and contradictions of the concept and thus keep it closer to the older, more traditional, security/ development approaches supporting the status quo and power/dominance setting of the system where the engagement of the North in the marginalised South could be continued and legitimised.

Despite of its declared universality and transcendence over the political and power divisions such as the "*Global North/South*"; and "*developing/developed/transforming*" countries, the Human Security concept is unable to escape the trap of not being universal. It dominantly relates to only some regions of the world, making the target regions object of development/security rather than subject. Moreover, it sometimes continues to secure the traditional security interests of some actors of the international system, subordinating the Human Security agenda to the traditional security needs and thus becoming a legitimising vehicle for promoting such interests. In such a way it could carry the potential for the reproduction of the dominant norms and power-relations. Having such potential or being perceived to have such a potential, it could be seen as another form of "*civilising mission*", known to the earlier Modernisation Theory, rather than a tool for emancipation and empowerment. Combining the soft development conditionalities and the military interventions it has the potential to bring about instabilities and produce conditions that clash with the

post-structural call for context specific solutions for the locally perceived and locally defined development and security issues.

In the event of the over expansive understanding of the dangers and vulnerabilities, there may be paralysis in finding the solutions. On the other hand, at the time when the issues that have traditionally fallen into the development realm are labelled as security issues, they come to increase attention of the securitising actors (agents) to the problem, which is brought higher on the policy agenda. In the case where everything becomes a high priority agenda it could be difficult to seek interdependencies. Another problem is associated with the securitization of the development issues or wider security issues in the traditional security sense, leading to the militarization of the problems that might otherwise have been better addressed by other means. Moreover, in the case of securitization and/or (in extreme cases) militarization of the problems, it provides for interventionist solutions in the strict sense. Labelling many issues as security problem, could lead to the escalation of the subjective perceptions of insecurity and thus paradoxically to the urgent (zero-sum) solutions typical for the traditional understanding of security. The Human Security concept thus also contributes to the justification of the expansion of the roles of the traditional security actors.

Much of the above does have the potential to resort to interventionist solutions rather than prevention. The interventionist solutions underlined by the discourse of universality could also go against the possible empowerment and emancipation of local actors seeking to find their own solutions. There is also a very problematic tension between the state and the individual as a main referent for the security resorting into the continued dominance of the state both as a referent and also as the perceived competent agent of security.

As for the ability to change the current power structures necessary to allow for the flourishing of the declared central principles there is a problem that the proponents of Human Security claim they are pragmatic and closely linked to the state structures in the declared attempt to “moderate the existing structures”. Staying closely linked to the traditional security actor, operating within its structures, might contribute to the fixing of the status quo and limiting the potential for seeking solutions beyond the set system.

The contribution of Human Security concept to the advancement of thinking about security and development and incorporating the new aspect into it is acknowledged. However, in order to fulfil its declared aims and in order to stay in line with the schools of thought critical to traditional security and development, from where the concept derives its inspiration and base, it is necessary that it continues its self-reflection.

There are also several other paths opened for future research. One of the possible avenues is building on the research findings and moving beyond the conceptual issues towards policy and practice research and exploring the ways to engage with the Human Security in the manner that overcomes the limitations depicted in the thesis and at the same time responding to one of the most common criticisms directed to the critical theories, i.e. the fact that the critical theories are questioning the traditional approaches and the status quo situation without their ability to provide solutions to the problems they highlight.

Another possibility for future research is to expand on the current investigation through reflecting the variety of other relevant academic disciplines and thus contributing further to the improvement of the current remarkably weak inter-disciplinary conversation about the Human Security concept – that is the situation when the various disciplines and the respective

scholars are operating in relative isolation from one another. The idea behind this approach is to analyse the Human Security concept and inquire into what are its challenges from the perspective of these other academic disciplines (for example adding the perspective of Legal Studies and extending the analysis to include the human rights aspects of Human Security as its potential third dimension). It would be valuable to add another point of view and to connect the development–security–rights scholarly debates. Such research would necessarily require a creation of the multidisciplinary team(s) and/or a specialist able to transcend the disciplinary boundaries in order to bridge them. Both of the envisaged paths bring us back to the opening quote by Michel Foucault: *“There are times in life when the question of knowing if one can think differently than one thinks, and perceive differently than one sees, is absolutely necessary if one is to go on looking and reflecting at all.”*

References

- Abrahamsson, H., 2003. *Understanding World Order and Structural Change: Poverty, Conflict and the Global Arena*. New York: Macmillan.
- Acharya, A., 1997. The Periphery and the Core: Third World and the Security Studies. In: Krause, K., and M. C. Williams (eds.), 1997. *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*. London: Routledge.
- Adler-Nissen, R. (ed.), 2013. *Bourdieu in International Relations*. London: Routledge.
- Aliyu, A. A., Bello, M. U., Kasim, R., and D. Martin, 2014. Positivist and Non-Positivist Paradigm in Social Science Research: Conflicting Paradigms or Perfect Partners? *Journal of Management and Sustainability*, 4/3, pp. 79–95.
- Alkire, S., 2003. *A Conceptual Framework for Human Security*. CRISE Working Paper, WORKING PAPER 2. Centre for Research on Inequality, Human Security and Ethnicity, CRISE. Available at: <<http://www3.qeh.ox.ac.uk/pdf/crisewps/workingpaper2.pdf>>.
- Amer, R. , Swain, A., and J. Ojendal, 2012. *The Security- Development Nexus? Peace, Conflict and Development*. New York: Anthem Press.
- Anderson, M., 1999. *DO NO HARM. How Aid Can Support Peace or War*. Boulder, Co.: Lynne Rienner.
- Anghie, A., 2006. Decolonizing the Concept of “Good Governance”: Race, International Relations, and International Law. In: Gruffydd Jones, B. (ed.), 2006. *Decolonizing International Relations*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Antonio, R. J., 1981. Immanent Critique as the Core of Critical Theory: Its Origins and Developments in Hegel, Marx and Contemporary Thought. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 32/3, pp. 330–345.

- Aradau, C., 2004. Security and Democratic Scene. *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 7/4, pp. 388–413.
- Aristotle; transl. by Irwin, T., 1985. *Nicomachean ethics*. Indianapolis: Hackett.
- Ayoob, M., 1995. *Third World Security Predicament*. London: Lynne Rienner.
- Ayoob, M., 1997. Defining Security: a Subaltern Realist Perspective. In: Krause, K., and M. C. Williams (eds.), 1997. *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*. London: Routledge.
- Ayoob, M., 2002. Inequalities and Theorizing the International Relations: The Case of Subaltern Realism. *International Studies Review*, 4/3, pp. 28–48.
- Axworthy, L., 1997. Canada and Human Security: The Need for Leadership. *International Journal*, 52/7, pp. 183–196.
- Baer, W., 1972. Import Substitution and Industrialization in Latin America: Experiences and Interpretations. *Latin American Research Review*, 7/1, pp. 95–122.
- Baird, M., and C. Frank, 1975. Foreign Aid: Its Speckled Past and Future Prospects. *International Organization*, 29/1, pp. 133–167.
- Baldwin, D. A., 1995. Security Studies and the End of the Cold War. *World Politics*, 48/1, pp. 117–141.
- Baldwin, D. A., 1997. The Concept of Security. *Review of International Studies*, 23/1, pp. 5–26.
- Balzaq, T., 2005. The Three Faces of Securitization: Political Agency, Audience and Context. *European Journal of International Relations*, 11/2, pp. 171–201.
- Bigo, D., 2002. Security and Immigration: Toward a critique of the Governmentality of Unease. *Alternatives*, 27/1, pp. 63–92.
- Bigo, D., 2008. International Political Sociology. In: Williams D. P., 2008. *Security Studies. An Introduction*. Abingdon: Routledge.

- Booth, K., 1991. Security and Emancipation. *Review of International Relations*, 17/4, pp. 313–326.
- Booth, K., 2005. Security In: Booth, K. (ed.), 2005. *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*. London: Lynne Rienner.
- Booth, K., 2007. *Theory of World Security*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bosold, D., and S. Werthes, 2005. Human Security in Practice: Canadian and Japanese Experiences. *IPG*, 1/2005.
- Brandt, W. et al., 1980. *North-South: A Programme for Survival: Report of the Independent Commission on International Development Issues*. London: Pan Books.
- Brautigam, D., 2000. *Aid Dependence and Governance*. EDGI 2000/1. Washington: American University: Expert Group of Development Issues.
- Brincat, S., 2011. On the Methods of Critical Theory: Advancing the Project of Emancipation Beyond the Early Frankfurt School. *International Relations*, 1/28, pp. 1–28.
- Buzan, B., 1983. *People, States and Fear: The National Security Problem in International Relations*. Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press.
- Buzan, B., 1991. *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era*. Harlow: Longman.
- Buzan B., 1997. Rethinking Security after the Cold War. *Cooperation and Conflict*, 32/1, pp. 5–28.
- Buzan, B., 2004. *From international to world society?: English school theory and the social structure of globalisation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Buzan, B., 2015. The English School: a Neglected Approach to International Security Studies. *Security Dialogue*, 46/ 2, pp. 126–143.

- Buzan, B., and L. Hansen, 2009. *The Evolution of International Security Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Buzan, B., Weaver, O., and J. Wilde, 1998. *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. London: Lynne Rienner.
- CASE Collective, 2006. Critical Approaches to Security in Europe. *Security Dialogue*, 37/4, pp. 443–487.
- Cassel, G., 2003. *The Myopic Hand at Work: Colonial Development Policy in Montserrat*. Available at:
<<http://www.uwichill.edu.bb/bnccde/montserrat/conference/papers/cassel.htm>>.
- Chambers, R., 1983. *Rural Development — Putting The Last First*. New York: Wiley.
- Chambers, R., 1997. *Whose Reality Counts? Putting the Last First*. London: Intermediate Technology Books.
- Chandler, D., 2007. The Security–development Nexus and the Rise of 'Anti-foreign Policy'. *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 10/4, pp. 362–386.
- Chandler, D., 2008. *The Human Security Paradox: How Nation States Grew to Love Cosmopolitan Ethics*. Draft paper for international conference, 'Globalization, Difference, and Human Securities', Graduate School of Human Sciences, Osaka University, Japan, 12-14 March 2008. Available at:
<<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.512.7734&rep=rep1&type=pdf>>.
- Chandler, D., 2012. Development as Freedom? From Colonialism to Countering Climate Change. In: Söderbaum, F., and J. Stilhoff Sörensen (eds.), 2012. *The End of the Security-Development Nexus? The Rise of Global Disaster Management*. Uppsala: Dag Hammarsköld Foundation. Available at:

<http://www.academia.edu/6106710/Rethinking_Intervention_and_Interventionism>.

Clapham, A., 2010. The Role of the Individual in International Law. *European Journal of International Law*, 21/1, pp. 25–30.

Collins, A., 2007. *Contemporary Security Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Collier, P. et al., 2003. *Breaking the Conflict Trap. Civil War and Development Policy*. Washington D.C.: Co-publication of the World Bank and Oxford University Press.

Commission on Human Security, 2003. *Human Security Now: Protecting and Empowering People*. New York. Available at:
<<http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/91BAEEDBA50C6907C1256D19006A9353-chs-security-may03.pdf>>.

Comstock, D. E., 1994. A Method for Critical Research. In: Martin, M., and L. C. McIntyre (eds.), 1994. *Readings in the Philosophy of Social Science*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Cooke, B., and U. Kothari (eds.), 2001. *Participation: The New Tyranny?* London: Zed Books.

Cox, R., 1981. Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory. In: Williams, H. L., Wright, M., and T. Evans (eds.), 1993. *A Reader in International Relations and Political Theory*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Creswell, J. W., 2002. *Research design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W., 2007. *Qualitative Inquiry and research design*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

- Debiel, T., and S. Werthes (eds.), 2006. *Human Security on Foreign Policy Agendas. Changes, Concepts and Cases*. INEF REPORT 80/2006. Essen: Institute for Development and Peace. Available at:
<<http://inef.uni-due.de/page/documents/Report80.pdf>>.
- De Larrinaga, M., and M. G. Doucet, 2008. Sovereign Power and the Biopolitics of Human Security. *Security Dialogue*, 39/5, pp. 517–537.
- Dillon, M., 2006. *The Biopolitics of Human Security*. Paper. Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association, San Diego, March 2006.
- Dillon, M., 2007. Governing Terror: the State of Emergency of Biopolitical Emergence. *International Political Sociology*, 1/1, pp. 7–28.
- Disman, M., 2008. *Jak se vyrábí sociologická znalost*. Praha: Karolinum.
- Duffield, M., 2001. *Global Governance and the New Wars*. London: Zed Books.
- Duffield, M., 2007. *Development, Security and Unending Wars: Governing the World of Peoples*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Duffield, M., 2007a. Development, Territories and People: Consolidating the External Sovereign Frontiers. *Alternatives*, 32/2, pp. 225-246.
- Duffield, M., 2010. The Liberal Way of Development and the Development – Security Impasse: Exploring the Global Life-Chance Divide. *Security Dialogue*, 41/1, pp. 53–76.
- Dušková, L., Harmáček, J., Krylová, P., Opršal, Z., Syrovátka, M., and S. Šafaříková, 2011. *Encyklopedie rozvojových studií*. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého.
- Economides, S., and P. Wilson, 2001. *The Economic Factor in International Relations*. London: I. B. Tauris.
- Edwards, M., and D. Hulme (eds.), 1995. *Non-Governmental Organisations. Performance and Accountability: Beyond the Magic Bullet*. London: Earthscan.

- Escobar, A., 1988. Power and Visibility: Development and the Invention and Management of the Third World. *Cultural Anthropology*, 3/4, pp. 428–443.
- Escobar, A., 1995. *Encountering Development. The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Essed, P., 2002. Everyday Racism: A New Approach to the Study of Racism. In: Essed, P., and D. T. Goldberg (eds.), 2008. *Race Critical Theories*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Esteva, G., and M. S. Prakash, 1995. From 'Global Thinking' to 'Local Thinking': Reasons to go Beyond Globalization to Localization. *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft (ÖZP; Austrian Journal of Political Science)*, 2.
- Esteva, G., and M. S. Prakash, 1997. *Hope At The Margins : Beyond Human Rights and Development*. New York : St. Martin's Press.
- Floyd, R., 2007. Human Security and the Copenhagen School's Securitization Approach: Conceptualizing Human Security as a Securitizing Move. *Human Security Journal*, 5, pp. 38–49.
- Foucault, M., 1972. *Archeology of Knowledge*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M., 1978. *The History of Sexuality*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M., 1995. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Random House.
- Freedman, L., 1998. International Security: Changing Targets. *Foreign Policy*, 110, pp. 48–63.
- Friedman, J., 1992. *Empowerment: The Politics of Alternative Development*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Fukuda-Parr, S., and C. Messineo, 2011. *Human Security*. International Affairs Working Paper 2011/4.

- Galtung, J., 1969. Violence, Peace and Peace Research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 6/3, pp. 167–191.
- Galtung, J., 1980. The Basic Needs Approach. In: Lederer, K., Galtung, J., and D. Antal (eds.), 1980. *Human Needs: A Contribution to Current Debate*. Cambridge: Oelgeschlager, Gunn and Hain.
- Gasper, D., 2005. Securing Humanity – Situating Human Security as Concept and Discourse. *Journal of Human Development*, 6/2, pp. 221–245.
- Gasper, D., 2007. *Human Rights, Human Needs, Human Development, Human Security: Relationships between Four International ‘Human’ Discourses*. GARNET Working Paper: No 20/07. Institute of Social Studies, The Hague. Available at: <<http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/garnet/workingpapers/2007.pdf>>.
- Gasper, D., 2008. *The Idea of Human Security*. GARNET Working Paper: No 28/08. Institute for Social Studies, The Hague. Available at: <http://www.garnet-eu.org/fileadmin/documents/working_papers/2808.pdf>.
- Gasper, D., and O. A. Gómez, 2014. *Evolution of Thinking and Research on Human and Personal Security 1994 – 2013*. UNDP Human Development Report Office Occasional Paper. UNDP. Available at: <http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/gomez_hdr14.pdf>.
- Gawerc, M. I., 2006. Peace-building: Theoretical and Concrete Perspectives. *Peace and Change*, 31/4, pp. 435–478.
- Gelot, L., and F. Söderbaum, 2012. Rethinking Intervention and Interventionism. In: Söderbaum, F., and J. Stilhoff Sörensen (eds.), 2012. *The End of the Security-Development Nexus? The Rise of Global Disaster Management. Development Dialogue 58*. Uppsala: Dag Hammarsköld Foundation. Available at: <http://www.academia.edu/6106710/Rethinking_Intervention_and_Interventionism>.

- Gleditsch, N. et al., 2003. *Conflict and Development: Framework for Proposed Research Area*. International Peace Research Institute Oslo and Chr. Michelsen Institute. Available at:
<http://www.prio.no/files/file40683_npg001.pdf>.
- Gray, D. E., 2009. *Doing Research in the Real World*. London: Sage.
- Grayson, K. 2008. Human Security as Power/Knowledge: the Biopolitics of a Definitional Debate. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 21/3, pp. 383-401.
- Grieco, J. M., 1988. Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation. In: Art, R., and R. Jervis (eds.), 2003. *International Politics: Enduring Concepts and Contemporary Issues*. New York: Longman.
- Gudynas, E., 2011. Buen Vivir: Today's tomorrow. *Development*, 54/4, pp. 441-447.
- Harborne, B., 2012. Aid: A Security Perspective. In: Spear, J., and P. D. Williams (eds.), 2012. *Security and Development in Global Politics: A Critical Comparison*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Haque, M. S., 1999. *Restructuring Development Theories and Policies*. Albany: State University of New York.
- Herz, J., 1951. *Political Realism and Political Idealism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hettne, B., 1990. *Development Theory and the Three Worlds*. London: Longman.
- Hettne, B., 1995. *Development Theory and the Three Worlds: Towards an International Political Economy of Development*. New York: Longman.
- Hettne, B., 2010. Development and Security: Origins and Future. *Security Dialogue*, 41/1, pp. 31-52.

- Holsti, K. J., 2004. *Taming the Sovereigns: Institutional Change in International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Homer-Dixon, T., 1994. Environmental Scarcities and Violent Conflict. *International Security*, 19/1, pp. 5–40.
- Howard-Hassmann, R. E., 2012. Human Security Undermining Human Rights? *Human Rights Quarterly*, 34/1, pp. 88–112.
- Howe, B. M., and S. Jang, 2013. Human Security and Development: Divergent Approaches to Burma/Myanmar. *Pacific Focus*, 28/1, pp. 120–143.
- Human Rights for All. *Report of the Secretary-General A/59/2005*. United Nations. Available at:
<http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/59/2005>.
- Human Security Network, not dated. Available at:
<www.humansecuritynetwork.org>.
- Huysmans, H., 2004. Minding exceptions: Politics of Insecurity and Liberal Democracy. *Contemporary Political Theory*, 3/3, pp. 321–341.
- ILO [International Labor Office], 1976. *Employment, Growth and Basic Needs: A One World Problem*. Report written for World Employment Conference, June 1976. ILO: Geneva.
- Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues, 1982. *Common Security: A Programme for Disarmament: The Report of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues*. London: Pan Books.
- International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, 2001. *The Responsibility to Protect: Report*. Ottawa: ICISS. Available at:
<<http://responsibilitytoprotect.org/ICISS%20Report.pdf>>.
- Jabri, V., 2007. *War and the Transformation of Global Politics*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Johnston, L., 2006. Transnational Security Governance. In: Wood, J., and B. Dupont (eds.), 2006. *Democracy, Society and the Governance of Security*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kaldor, M., 1999. *New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Kaldor, M., 2007. *Human Security: Reflections on Globalization and Intervention*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Kent, A., 2012. Intervention or Interaction? Developing Ideas from Cambodia. In: Söderbaum, F., and J. Stilhoff Sørensen (eds.), 2012. *The End of the Security-Development Nexus? The Rise of Global Disaster Management. Development Dialogue 58*. Uppsala: Dag Hammarsköld Foundation. Available at: <http://www.academia.edu/6106710/Rethinking_Intervention_and_Interventionism>.
- Khagram, S., Clark, W. C., and D. Firas Raad, 2003. From the Environment and Human Security to Sustainable Security and Development. *Journal of Human Development*, 4/2, pp. 289–313.
- Khong, Y. F., 2001. Human Security: A Shotgun Approach to Alleviating Human Misery? *Global Governance*, 7/3, pp. 231–236. Available at: <<http://faculty.maxwell.syr.edu/rdenever/PPA-730-27/Khong.pdf>>.
- King, G., and C. J. L. Murray, 2001-2. Rethinking Human Security. *Political Science Quarterly*, 116/4, pp. 585–610.
- Kienscherf, M., 2011. A Programme of Global Pacification: US Counterinsurgency Doctrine and the Biopolitics of Human (In)security. *Security Dialogue*, 42/6, pp. 517–535.
- Knudsen, O. F., 2001. Post-Copenhagen Security Studies: Desecuritizing Securitization. *Security Dialogue*, 32/3, pp. 355–368.

- Kohler, G., Gasper, D., Jolly, R., and M. Simane, 2011. *Human Security – a Framework for Deepening the MDGs*. Conference Paper. Millennium Goals and Beyond: Reflections on International Development Policy Agenda after 2015. Bonn, November 2011.
- Krause, K., and M. C. Williams (eds.), 1997. *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*. London: Routledge.
- Latouche, S., 1993. *In the Wake of the Affluent Society: An Exploration of Post-Development*. London: Zed Books.
- Liotta, P. H., and T. Owen, 2006. Why Human Security? *The Whitehead Journal of Diplomacy and International Relations*, Winter/Spring 2006, pp. 40–41.
- Longshore Smith, M., and C. Sewart, 2009. The Relational Ontology of Amartya Sen's Capability Approach: Incorporating Social and Individual Causes. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, 10/2, pp. 213–235.
- Loomba, A., 2005. *Colonialism, Postcolonialism*. London: Routledge.
- Luckham, R., 2009. *Democracy and Security: A Shotgun Marriage?* GCST Working Paper, no. 8, September 2009. Global Consortium on Security Transformation.
- MacFarlane, N., and Y. F. Khong, 2006. *Human Security and the United Nations. A Critical History*. Bloomington: University of Indiana Press.
- Majumdar, R., 2008. *Writing Postcolonial History*. London: Arnold.
- Makino, K., 2006. Human Security and Aid from the Perspective of an Aid Practitioner. In: *Foundation for Advanced Studies on International Development*, 2006. In Search of New Approaches to Japanese Development Assistance. Tokyo: FASID.

- Marhja, N., 2013. Some Humans Are More Human than Others: Troubling the 'Human' in Human Security from a Critical Feminist Perspective. *Security Dialogue*, 44/1, pp. 19–35.
- Marshall, 1947. *The Marshall Proposal of Assistance to Europe*. Monetary and Economic Department, 10th July 1947. Available at: <<http://www.trumanlibrary.org>>.
- Maslow, A. H., 1962. *Toward a Psychology of Being*. Princeton: Van Nostrand Co.
- Mathews, S., 2004. Post-development theory and the question of alternatives – the view from Africa. *Third World Quarterly*, 25/2, pp. 373–384.
- Max-Neef, M. A., 1991. *Human-scale Development*. New York: Appex Press.
- McCarthy, T., 2009. *Race, Empire, and the Idea of Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCormack, T., 2011. The Limits of Emancipation in the Human Security Framework. In: In: Chandler D., and N. Hynek (eds.), 2011. *Critical Perspectives on Human Security*. London: Routledge.
- Meadows, D. H., Meadows, D. L., Randers, J., and W. W. Behrens III, 1972. *Limits to Growth*. New York: New American Library.
- Mgbeoji, I., 2006. The Civilised Self and the Barbaric Other: Imperial Delusions of Other and the Challenges of Human Security. *Third World Quarterly*, 27/5, pp. 855–869.
- Merriam, S. H., 2009. *Qualitative Research. A Guide to Design and Implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Morgenthau, H., 1948. *Politics among Nations*. New York: Knoply.
- Murphy, S. D., 1996. *Humanitarian Intervention: The United Nations in an Evolving World Order*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Naidoo, S., 2001. *A Theoretical Conceptualization of Human Security*. Paper presented at “Peace, Human Security and Conflict Prevention in Africa”, UNESCO-ISS Expert Meeting, South Africa, 23-24 July. Institute for Security Studies (ISS) Pretoria, South Africa. Available at: <<https://www.issafrica.org/pubs/books/unesco/naidoo.pdf>>.
- Nandy, A., 1989. Shamans, Savages and the Wilderness: On the Audibility of the Dissent and the Future of Civilizations. *Alternatives*, 14, pp. 263–77.
- Newman, E., 2010. Critical Human Security Studies. *Review of International Studies*, 36/01, pp. 77–94.
- OECD-DAC [The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development-Development Assistance Committee], 1997. *Conflict, Peace and Development Cooperation on the Threshold of the 21st Century*. Policy Statement. Paris: OECD. Available at: <http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/Pcaaa817.pdf>.
- Overseas Development Institute, 1978. *Briefing Paper No 5*, December 1978. London.
- Owen, T., 2004. Human Security – Conflict, Critique and Consensus: Colloquium Remarks and a Proposal for a Threshold-Based Definition. *Security Dialogue*, 35/3, pp. 373–387.
- Packdaman, N., 1994. The Story of Development Thinking. In: Sacks-Jeanet, C., Sagasti, F., and J. J. Salomon, 1994. *The Uncertain Quest: Science, Technology and Development*. Tokyo: United Nations University.
- Paris, R., 2001. Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air? *International Security*, 26/2, pp. 87–102.
- Peet, R., and E. Hartwick, 2009. *Theories of Development. Contentions, Arguments, Alternatives*. London: The Guilford Press.
- Peet, R., and E. Hartwick, 2015. *Theories of Development. Contentions. Arguments. Alternatives*. New York: Guildford Press.

- Pieterse, N. J., 2001. *Development Theory: deconstructions/reconstructions*. London: Sage Publications.
- Peoples, C., and N. Vaughan-Williams, 2010. *Critical Security Studies: An Introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Peterson, J. H., 2013. Creating Space for Emancipatory Human Security: Liberal Obstructions and the Potential of Agonism. *International Studies Quarterly*, 57/2, pp. 318–328.
- Power, M., 2003. *Rethinking Development Geographies*. New York: Routledge.
- Prakash, M. S., 1995a. Ecological Literacy for Moral Virtue: Orr on [Moral] Education for Postmodern Sustainability. *Journal of Moral Education*, 24/1, pp. 3–18.
- Prakash, M. S., 1995b. *Ecological Care and Justice*. Philosophy of Education 1995 - A Publication of the Philosophy of Education Society, pp. 444–445.
- Preston, P. W., 1996. *Development Theory. An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Pronk, J. P., 2001. Aid as Catalyst? *Development and Change*, 32, pp. 611–629.
- Prosper, B., 2006. Canada and Human Security: From Axworthy Doctrine to Middle Power Internationalism. *American Review of Canadian Studies*, Summer, 2006.
- Rahnema, M., 1997. *The Post-Development Reader*. London: Atlantic Highlands.
- Roosevelt, F. D., 1941. *The Four Freedoms speech by Franklin D. Roosevelt*. January 6, 1941. State of the Union Speech. Available at the Institute for Study of Civic Values at: <<http://www.libertynet.org>>.
- Rostow, W. W., 1960. *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rothschild, E., 1995. What is Security? *Daedalus*, 124/3, pp. 53–98.

- Ruttenberg, T., 2013. Wellbeing Economics and Buen Vivir: Development Alternatives for Inclusive Human Security. *PRAXIS The Fletcher Journal of Human Security*, 28, pp. 68–93.
- Saíd, E., 1979. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Saíd, E., 2006. Orientalism. In: Ashcroft, Bill et al. (eds.), 2006. *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Saíd, E. W., 2008. Imaginative Geography and Its Representations: Orientalizing the Oriental. In: Essed, P., and D. T. Goldberg (eds.), 2008. *Race Critical Theories*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sachs, W. (ed.), 2002. *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge and Power*. London: Zed Books.
- Seers, D., 1979. *The Meanings of Development: Four Critical Studies*. London: Fran Cass.
- Seers, D., 1983. *The Political Economy of Nationalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Selvadurai, S., Choy, E. M., Maros, M., and K. Abdullah, 2013. Shifting Discourses in Social Sciences: Nexus of Knowledge and Power. *Asian Social Science*. 9/7.
- Schirch, L., 2012. *From Protection of Civilians to Human Security: Comparing and Contrasting Principles, Distinctions, and Institutionalization*. 3P Human Security. Available at:
<<http://3phumansecurity.org/site/images/stories/PolicyBriefs/hsrt.pdf>>.
- Schnabel, A., 2012. The Security-Development Discourse and the Role of SSR as a Development Instrument. In: Schnabel, A., and V. Farr, 2012. *Back to the Roots: Security Sector Reform and Development*. Geneva: Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces.

- Shani, G., 2014. Human Security at Twenty: Civilizing Process or Civilizing Mission? *E-international relations*. Available at: <<http://www.e-ir.info/2014/06/19/human-security-at-twenty-civilizing-process-or-civilizing-mission/>>.
- Shani, G., Sato, M., and M. Pasha (eds.), 2007. *Protecting Human Security in a post- 9/11 World*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sjoberg, L., 2010. *Gender and International Security*. London: Routledge.
- Sjoberg, L., 2013. *Gendering Global Conflict: Toward a Feminist Theory of War*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Smith, A., 1776. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of Wealth of Nations*. London: Strahan and Cadell. Available at: <<http://www.econlib.org/library/smith/smwn.html>>.
- Smith, S., 2000. The Increasing Insecurity of Security Studies: Conceptualizing Security in the Last Twenty Years. In: Croft, S., and T. Terriff (eds.), 2000. *Critical Reflections on Security and Change*. London: Frank Cass.
- Snyder, G., 2002. Mersheimer's World Offensive Realism and the Struggle for Security. *International Security*, 27/1, pp. 149–173.
- Spivak, G., 1996. *A Spivak Reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Stewart, F., 2004. Development and Security. *Conflict, Security and Development*, 4/3, pp. 261–288.
- Stern, M., and J. Ojendal, 2010. Mapping the Development-Security Nexus: Conflict, Complexity, Cacophony, Convergence? *Security Dialogue*, 41/1, 5–30.
- Streeten, P., and S. J. Burki, 1978. Basic Needs: Some Issues. *World Development*, 6/3, pp. 411–421.
- Streeten, P., 1983. Development Dichotomies. *World Development*, 11/10, pp. 875–889.

- Summer A., and M. Tribe, 2008. *International Development Studies: Theories and Methods in Research and Practice*. London: Sage.
- Tadjbakhsh, S., and A. M. Chenoy, 2007. *Human Security – Concepts and Implications*. New York: Routledge.
- Thomas, C., 1987. *In Search of Security: The Third World in International Relations*. Brighton: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Thomas, C., 2001. Global Governance, Development and Human Security: Exploring the Links. *Third World Quarterly*, 22/2, pp. 159–175.
- Thomas, C., 2003. Third World Security. In: Art, R. J., and R. Jervis, 2003. *International Politics: Enduring Concepts and Contemporary Issues*. New York: Longman.
- Tickner, J. A., 1988 (reprinted in 2011). A Critique of Morgenthau's Principles of Political Realism. In: Art, R., and R. Jervis (eds.), 2011. *International Politics: Enduring concepts and Contemporary Issues*. Boston: Longman.
- Tickner, J. A., 1992. *Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Tickner, J. A., 2001. *Gendering World Politics: Issues and Approaches in The Post-Cold War Era*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Todorov, T., 2009. Race and Racism. In: Back, L., and J. Solomos (eds.), 2009. *Theories of Race and Racism. A Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Truman, H., 1947. *Recommendation for Assistance to Greece and Turkey*. Address of the President of the United States delivered before a joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives on March 12, 1947. Available at: <<http://www.ourdocuments.gov>>.
- Tuchman Mathews, J., 1989. Redefining Security. *Foreign Affairs*, 68/2, pp. 162–177.

- Ul Haq, M., 1995. *Reflections on Human Development*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ullman, R. H., 1983. Redefining Security. *International Security*, 8/1, pp. 129–153.
- Ulusoy, H., 2003. Revisiting Security Communities After the Cold War: The Constructivist Perspective. *Perceptions*, 8, pp. 161–196.
- UNDP [United Nations Development Program], 1994. *Human Development Report: New Dimensions of Human Security*. New York: UNDP. Available at: <http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/reports/255/hdr_1994_en_complete_nostats.pdf>.
- United Nations General Assembly, 2005a. *2005 World Summit Outcome*. Resolution A/RES/60/1. United Nations. Available at: <<http://www.ifrc.org/docs/idrl/I520EN.pdf>>.
- United Nations General Assembly, 2005b. *In Larger Freedom: Towards Development, Security and Human Rights for All*. Report of the Secretary General A/59/2005. United Nations. Available at: <http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/59/2005>.
- United Nations General Assembly, 2012. *Follow-up to Paragraph 143 on Human Security of the 2005 World Summit Outcome*. Resolution A/RES/66/290. United Nations. Available at: <http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=%20A/RES/66/290>.
- United Nations Secretary-General, 1992. *An Agenda for Peace: Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking and Peace-keeping*: Report of the Secretary-General pursuant to the statement adopted by the Summit Meeting of the Security Council on 31 January 1992.
- United Nations Security Council, 2006. *Resolution 1647, S/RES/1647*.

- United Nations, 2004. *A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility*. Report of the Secretary-General's High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change. United Nations. Available at:
<http://www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/pdf/historical/hlp_more_secure_world.pdf>.
- United Nations University, not dated. *Pioneers in Development*. Available at:
<<http://www.archive.unu.edu/unupress/unupbooks/un09ul/un09ue0a.htm>>.
- US [United States] Congress, 1947. *The Marshall Plan*. Congressional Record, 30th June 1947. Available at:
<<http://usinfo.state.gov/usa/infousa/facts/democrac/57.htm>>.
- Waltz, K., 1979. The Anarchic Structure of World Politics. In: Art, R., and R. Jervis (eds.), 2003. *International Politics: Enduring Concepts and Contemporary Issues*. New York: Longman.
- Wyn-Jones, R., 1999. *Security, Strategy and Critical Theory*. Boulder, Co.: Lynne Rienner.
- WB [World Bank], 2002. *The Role and Effectiveness of Development Assistance. Lessons from World Bank Experience*. Research Paper from Development Economics Vice Presidency of the World Bank. Washington: World Bank.
- Weaver, O., 1995. Securitization and De-securitization. In: Lipschutz, R., 1995. *On Security*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Whaites, A., 2002. *Development Dilemmas – NGO Challenges and Ambiguities*. Monrovia: World Vision International.
- Wheeler, D., 2011. Freedom from Want, and Freedom from Fear. *Journal of Human Security*, 7/1, pp. 37–52.

Whitehouse, Ch., 1996. *Human Rights and Basic Needs in Development. Are They Universal? Are They Universalisable?* Occasional Paper 06/96. Center for Development Studies. University of Bath.

Willis, K., 2005. *Theories and Practices of Development*. London: Routledge.

Appendix

(adapted from *The Global Development Research Center, www.gdrc.org*)

Definitions of Human Security

United Nations Definitions

Kofi Annan:

“In the wake of these conflicts, a new understanding of the concept of security is evolving. Once synonymous with the defence of territory from external attack, the requirements of security today have come to embrace the protection of communities and individuals from internal violence. The need for a more human-centred approach to security is reinforced by the continuing dangers that weapons of mass destruction, most notably nuclear weapons, pose to humanity: their very name reveals their scope and their intended objective, if they were ever used.”¹

“We must also broaden our view of what is meant by peace and security. Peace means much more than the absence of war. Human security can no longer be understood in purely military terms. Rather, it must encompass economic development, social justice, environmental protection, democratization, disarmament, and respect for human rights and the rule of law.”²

“The demands we face also reflect a growing consensus that collective security can no longer be narrowly defined as the absence of armed conflict, be it between or within States. Gross abuses of human rights, the large-scale displacement of civilian populations, international terrorism, the AIDS pandemic, drug and arms trafficking and environmental disasters present a direct threat to human security, forcing us to adopt a much more coordinated approach to a range of issues.”³

“Human security, in its broadest sense, embraces far more than the absence of violent conflict. It encompasses human rights, good governance, access to education and health care and ensuring that each individual has opportunities and choices to fulfill his or her potential. Every step in this direction is also a step towards reducing poverty, achieving economic growth and preventing conflict. Freedom from want, freedom from fear, and the freedom of future generations to inherit a healthy natural environment -- these are the interrelated building blocks of human – and therefore national – security.”⁴

¹ United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan. Millenium Report, Chapter 3, p.43-44.

<<http://www.un.org/millennium/sg/report/full.htm>> 08/22/01

² Kofi Annan. “Towards a Culture of Peace.” <<http://www.unesco.org/opi2/lettres/TextAnglais/AnnanE.html>> 08/22/01

³ Kofi Annan. *Report of the Secretary-General on the Work of the Organization*. General Assembly Official Records Fifty-fifth session Supplement No.1 (A/55/1). New York: United Nations, 2000, p.4.

<<http://www.un.org/documents/sg/report00/a551e.pdf>> 08/27/01

⁴ Kofi Annan. “Secretary-General Salutes International Workshop on Human Security in Mongolia.” Two-Day Session in Ulaanbaatar, May 8-10, 2000. Press Release SG/SM/7382.

<<http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2000/20000508.sgs7382.doc.html>> 08/27/01

Sadako Ogata, (former) United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees:

“Several key elements make up *human security*. A first essential element is the possibility for all citizens to live in peace and security within their own borders. This implies the capacity of states and citizens to prevent and resolve conflicts through peaceful and non-violent means and, after the conflict is over, the ability to effectively carry out reconciliation efforts. A second element is that people should enjoy without discrimination all rights and obligations - including human, political, social, economic and cultural rights - that belonging to a State implies. A third element is social inclusion - or having equal access to the political, social and economic policy making processes, as well as to draw equal benefits from them. A fourth element is that of the establishment of rule of law and the independence of the justice system. Each individual in a society should have the same rights and obligations and be subject to the same set of rules. These basic elements which are predicated on the equality of all before the law, effectively remove any risk of arbitrariness which so often manifests itself in discrimination, abuse or oppression.”⁵

“Threats to human security are varied – political and military, but also social, economic and environmental. A wide array of factors contribute to making people feel insecure, from the laying of landmines and the proliferation of small arms, to transnational threats such as drugs trafficking, to the spread of HIV. Once again, therefore, let me speak of human insecurity from my perspective. Refugees flee conflicts. One of the main factors of human insecurity is precisely the lack of effective political and security mechanisms to address conflicts.”⁶

Ramesh Thakur, Vice Rector, Peace and Security, United Nations University:

“Human security refers to the quality of life of the people of a society or polity. Anything which degrades their quality of life – demographic pressures, diminished access to or stock or resources, and so on – is a security threat. Conversely, anything which can upgrade their quality of life – economic growth, improved access to resources, social and political empowerment, and so on – is an enhancement of human security.”⁷

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP):

⁵ "Inclusion or Exclusion: Social Development Challenges For Asia and Europe." Statement of Mrs. Sadako Ogata United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees at the Asian Development Bank Seminar, 27 April 1998. <<http://www.unhcr.ch/refworld/unhcr/hcspeech/27ap1998.htm>> 08/22/01

⁶ "Human Security: a Refugee Perspective." Keynote Speech by Mrs Sadako Ogata, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, at the Ministerial Meeting on Human Security Issues of the "Lysoen Process" Group of Governments. Bergen, Norway, 19 May 1999. < <http://www.unhcr.ch/refworld/unhcr/hcspeech/990519.htm>> 08/22/01

⁷ Ramesh Thakur. "From National to Human Security." *Asia-Pacific Security: The Economics-Politics Nexus*. Eds. Stuart Harris, and Andrew Mack. Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1997, p. 53-54.

“Human security can be said to have two main aspects. It means, first, safety from such chronic threats as hunger, disease and repression. And second, it means protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the patterns of daily life – whether in homes, in jobs or in communities. Such threats can exist at all levels of national income and development.”⁸

“The list of threats to human security is long, but most can be considered under several main categories:

- ∞ Economic security
- ∞ Food security
- ∞ Health security
- ∞ Environmental security
- ∞ Personal security
- ∞ Community security
- ∞ Political security”⁹

United Nations Deputy Secretary-General Louise Frechette:

“What do we mean by human security? We mean, in its most simple expression, all those things that men and women anywhere in the world cherish most: enough food for the family; adequate shelter; good health; schooling for the children; protection from violence whether inflicted by man or by nature; and a State which does not oppress its citizens but rules with their consent.”¹⁰

Hans Van Ginkel (Rector, United Nations University) and Edward Newman:

“In policy terms, human security is an integrated, sustainable, comprehensive security from fear, conflict, ignorance, poverty, social and cultural deprivation, and hunger, resting upon positive and negative freedoms.”¹¹

⁸ United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). *Human Development Report 1994*. New York: Oxford University Press, 23. <<http://www.undp.org/hdro/1994/94.htm>> 08/02/01

⁹ Ibid. p. 24-25.

¹⁰ Statement by the United Nations Deputy Secretary-General Louise Frechette to a high-level panel discussion on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the Vienna International Centre (VIC), October 9, 1999. <<http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/1999/19991012.dsgsm70.doc.html>> 08/02/01

¹¹ Hans Van Ginkel, and Edward Newman. “In Quest of “Human Security.” *Japan Review of International Affairs* 14.1 (2000): 79.

Government Definitions

Government of Canada:

“For Canada, human security means freedom from pervasive threats to people’s rights, safety or lives.”...“Canada has identified five foreign policy priorities for advancing human security:

1. Protection of civilians, concerned with building international will and strengthening norms and capacity to reduce the human costs of armed conflict.
2. Peace support operations, concerned with building UN capacities and addressing the demanding and increasingly complex requirements for deployment of skilled personnel, including Canadians, to these missions.
3. Conflict prevention, with strengthening the capacity of the international community to prevent or resolve conflict, and building local indigenous capacity to manage conflict without violence.
4. Governance and accountability, concerned with fostering improved accountability of public and private sector institutions in terms of established norms of democracy and human rights.
5. Public safety, concerned with building international expertise, capacities and instruments to counter the growing threats posed by the rise of transnational organized crime.”¹²

Human Security Network:

“A humane world where people can live in security and dignity, free from poverty and despair, is still a dream for many and should be enjoyed by all. In such a world, every individual would be guaranteed freedom from fear and freedom from want, with an equal opportunity to fully develop their human potential. Building human security is essential to achieving this goal. In essence, human security means freedom from pervasive threats to people’s rights, their safety or even their lives.”¹³

Government of Japan:

1. “Human security may be defined as the preservation and protection of the life and dignity of individual human beings. Japan holds the view, as do many other countries, that human security can be ensured only when the individual is confident of a life free of fear and free of want.”¹⁴

¹² Foreign ministry website. <<http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/foreignp/humansecurity/menu-e.asp>> 08/22/01

¹³ Human Security Network homepage. <<http://www.humansecuritynetwork.org/menu-e.asp>> 08/22/01

¹⁴ Yukio Takasu. “Toward Effective Cross-Sectorial Partnership to Ensure Human Security in a Globalized World.” Statement by Mr. Yukio Takasu, Director-General of Multilateral Cooperation Department, at the Third Intellectual Dialogue on Building Asia’s Tomorrow. Bangkok, June 19, 2000. <http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/human_secu/speech0006.html> 08/22/01

2. “Japan emphasizes "Human Security" from the perspective of strengthening efforts to cope with threats to human lives, livelihoods and dignity as poverty, environmental degradation, illicit drugs, transnational organized crime, infectious diseases such as HIV/AIDS, the outflow of refugees and anti-personnel land mines, and has taken various initiatives in this context. To ensure "Human freedom and potential," a range of issues needs to be addressed from the perspective of "Human Security" focused on the individual, requiring cooperation among the various actors in the international community, including governments, international organizations and civil society.”¹⁵

¹⁵ Government of Japan, Ministry of Foreign Affairs. *Diplomatic Bluebook 1999*, Chapter 2, Section 3.
<<http://www.mofa.go.jp>> 08/22/01

Definitions from Academic Papers

Kanti Bajpai:

“Human security relates to the protection of the individual’s personal safety and freedom from direct and indirect threats of violence. The promotion of human development and good governance, and, when necessary, the collective use of sanctions and force are central to managing human security. States, international organizations, non-governmental organizations, and other groups in civil society in combination are vital to the prospects of human security.”¹⁶

Lincoln Chen:

“The term human security...focuses the concept of security on human survival, well-being and freedom.” “...we conceptualize human security as the objective – the ultimate ends – of all security concerns. In this schema, other forms of security, such as military security, are not ultimate goals. Rather, these other forms of security are simply means for achieving the ultimate objectives of human security.”¹⁷

David T. Graham and Nana K. Poku:

“Rather than viewing security as being concerned with ‘individuals qua citizens’ (that is, toward their states), our approach view security as being concerned with ‘individuals qua persons’ (Krause and Williams 1997). Implicit then, in this conjunction of issues with ideas of human security and liberation is the notion of the ethical and moral. As an approach that focuses upon the importance of the insecurities facing people rather than governments or institutional agencies, human security is concerned with transcending the dominant paradigmatic orthodoxy that views critical concerns of migration – recognitions (i.e. citizenship), basic needs (i.e. sustenance, protection (i.e. refugee status), or human rights (i.e. legal standing) – as problems of interstate politics and consequently beyond the realm of the ethical and moral.”¹⁸

Anne Hammerstad:

“According to both ‘critical’ and ‘human’ security approaches, security is about attaining the social, political, environmental and economic conditions conducive to a life in freedom and dignity for the individual.”¹⁹

Gary King and Christopher Murray:

¹⁶ Kanti Bajpai. *The Idea of a Human Security Audit*. Joan B. Kroc Institute Report, No. 19. Fall 2000, p. 1-4.

<http://www.nd.edu/~krocinst/ocpapers/op_19_1.PDF> 08/22/01

¹⁷ Lincoln Chen. “Human Security: Concepts and Approaches.” *Common Security in Asia New Concepts of Human Security*. Eds. Tatsuro Matsumae and Lincoln C. Chen. Tokyo: Tokai University Press, 1995, p.139.

¹⁸ David T. Graham, and Nana K. Poku. *Migration, Globalisation and Human Security*. London: Routledge, 2000, p.17.

¹⁹ Anne Hammerstad. “Whose Security? UNHCR, Refugee Protection and State Security After the Cold War.” *Security Dialogue* 31.4 (2000): 395.

“...the number of years of future life spend outside a state of “generalized poverty.”²⁰

“...our suggestion for a parsimonious set of domains for measuring human security would be income, health, education and political freedom and democracy.”²¹

Jennifer Leaning, M.D., S.M.H., and Sam Arie:

“Human security is an underlying condition for sustainable human development. It results from the social, psychological, economic, and political aspects of human life that in times of acute crisis or chronic deprivation protect the survival of individuals, support individual and group capacities to attain minimally adequate standards of living, and promote constructive group attachment and continuity through time. Its key measurable components can be summarized as: a sustainable sense of home; constructive social and family networks; and an acceptance of the past and a positive grasp of the future. It is suggested that these components can be best measured by trends in their inverse indicators (social dislocation, dynamic inequality, and discount rate) according to metrics and units that will require further specification.”²²

Global Environmental Change and Human Security Project

Steven Lonergan, Kent Gustavson, and Brian Carter:

“As our perspective changes, it is important to adapt our policy framework to meet this change. One alternative is to focus on *human security*, recognizing the inter linkages of environment and society, and acknowledging that our perceptions of our environment and the way we interact with our environment are historically, socially, and politically constructed. In this context, human security is achieved when and where individuals and communities:

- ∞ have the options necessary to end, mitigate, or adapt to threats to their human, environmental, and social rights;
- ∞ have the capacity and freedom to exercise these options; and
- ∞ actively participate in attaining these options.”
- ∞ ...“Human security embodies the notion that problems must always be addressed from a broader perspective that encompasses both *poverty* and issues of *equity* (social, economic, environmental, or institutional) as it is these issues that often lead to insecurity and conflict.”²³

Global Environmental Change and Human Security Project Website:

²⁰ Gary King and Christopher Murray. “Rethinking Human Security.” *Political Science Quarterly*. (Winter 2002): In Press. Manuscript, p. 2. <<http://gking.harvard.edu/files/hs.pdf>> 08/22/01

²¹ Ibid. Manuscript, p. 13.

²² Jennifer Leaning, M.D., S.M.H., and Sam Arie. Human Security in Crisis and Transition: A Background Document of Definition and Application. Working Draft, Prepared for US AID / Tulane CERTI. September 2000, p.37.

²³ Steven Lonergan, Kent Gustavson, and Brian Carter. “The index of Human Insecurity.” AVISO Bulletin Issue No. 6 (January 2000). <<http://www.gechs.org/aviso/AvisoEnglish/six/six.shtml>> 08/24/01

“Human security is not only concerned with threats to the physical security of individuals, it encompasses economic, health, and environmental concerns as well.”²⁴

George MacLean:

“In broad terms, human security shifts our focus from traditional territorial security to that of the person. Human security recognizes that an individual’s personal protection and preservation comes not just from the safeguarding of the state as a political unit, but also from access to individual welfare and quality of life. But human security does not merely “envelope” matters of individual benefit (such as education, health care, protection from crime, and the like); this is because these matters could be thought of as part of the objectives of sovereign states. Rather, human security also denotes protection from the *unstructured violence* that often accompanies many aspects of non-territorial security, such as violence emanating from environmental scarcity, or mass migration. Therefore, just as traditional notions of territorial security involve the structured violence manifest in state warfare, human security also attends to the issue of unstructured violence.² Human security, in short, involves the security of the individual in their personal surroundings, their community, and in their environment.”²⁵

Astri Suhrke:

“Whether the threat is economic or physical violence, immediate protective measures are necessary if longer-term investments to improve conditions can be relevant at all. It follows that the core of human insecurity can be seen as extreme vulnerability. The central task of a policy inspired by human security concerns would therefore be to protect those who are most vulnerable. ...The philosophers do not tell us precisely who the vulnerable are, but it is self-evident that those exposed to immediate physical threats to life or deprivation of life-sustaining resources are extremely vulnerable. ...Other persons can be placed in equally life-threatening positions for reasons of deep poverty or natural disasters. This gives us three categories of extremely vulnerable persons:

- ∞ victims of war and internal conflict;
- ∞ those who live close to the subsistence level and thus are structurally positioned at the edge of socio-economic disaster; and
- ∞ victims of natural disasters.

In this schema, the condition of abject poverty or powerlessness is not qualitatively different from vulnerability to physical violence during conflict. Indeed, it recalls the concept of ‘structural violence’ developed in the 1970s by Johan Galtung.”²⁶

Caroline Thomas:

1. “Human security describes a condition of existence in which basic material needs are met, and in which human dignity, including meaningful participation in the life of the

²⁴ < <http://www.knaw.nl/hdp/global.htm> >

²⁵ George MacLean. *The Changing Concept of Human Security: Coordinating National and Multilateral Responses*. <<http://www.unac.org/canada/security/maclean.html>> 08/22/01

²⁶ Astri Suhrke. “Human Security and the Interests of States.” *Security Dialogue*. 30.3 (1999): 265-276.

community, can be realized. Such human security is indivisible; it cannot be pursued by or for one group at the expense of another.”²⁷

2. “[W]hile material sufficiency lies at the core of human security, in addition the concept encompasses non-material dimensions to form a qualitative whole.”

“The quantitative aspect refers to material sufficiency.” “[t]he pursuit of human security must have at its core the satisfaction of basic material needs of all humankind. At the most basic level, food, shelter, education and health care are essential for the survival of human beings.

The qualitative aspect of human security is about the achievement of human dignity which incorporates personal autonomy, control over one’s live and unhindered participation in the life of the community. Emancipation from oppressive power structures, be they global, national or local in origin and scope, is necessary for human security. Human security is oriented towards an active and substantive notion of democracy, one that ensures the opportunity of all for participation in the decisions that affect their lives. Therefore it is engaged directly with discussions of democracy at all levels, from the local to the global.”²⁸

²⁷ Caroline Thomas, and Peter Wilkin, eds. *Globalization, Human Security, and the African Experience*. Boulder/London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc, 1999, p.3.

²⁸ Caroline Thomas. *Global Governance, Development and Human Security*. London: Pluto Press, 2000, p. 6-7.