Human Security

Sibling of human development - Overview of a perspective in social analysis and policy

Des Gasper

International Institute of Social Studies, The Hague (Erasmus University Rotterdam), gasper@iss.nl

Pre-publication version of Ch. 29 in Cambridge Handbook of the Capability Approach (eds. E. Chiappero-Martinetti, S. Osmani, M. Qizilbash, 2020, pp. 576-600), https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316335741

1. Introduction: 'In Larger Freedom'

While human development thinking has centred on capability, ability to fulfil well-reasoned values, human security analysis looks from the other side, at vulnerability, exposure to risks and misfortune, and ability to prepare for, cope with and recover from threat and harm. It complements a narrower interpretation of human development centred on measuring capability of the individual person; through emphases on (non-)fulfilment of basic needs, change and (in)stability and on their causes and consequences for persons, groups and species. As indicated in the Human Development Report 2010, it is part thus of a broader human development conception, one that considers what is centrally human, what is at risk, and what should be secured—including, besides bodies, requisites for dignity. It complements similarly the human rights concept, which specifies requisites for dignity but not the ontology of interconnections that generate threats, risks and opportunities. Its attention to securing priority values and human rights, and to global interlinkages that can both assist and threaten persons individually and jointly, spans the agenda of the United Nations laid down in the 1940s. Revival from the 1990s of this human security framework has helped to '[re-]unify the peace agenda, the development agenda and the human rights agenda,…later gradually incorporating also the climate change agenda' (Popovski 2014: 95).

Leading this 1990s revival was Mahbub ul Haq, who had launched the Human Development Report Office in 1989-90 for UNDP (Gasper 2011). He aimed to humanize discussion of socio-economic development with the idea that people are both its ends and central means. Working then for several years at the UN in New York during the emergence of the post Cold War world, Haq saw the need to place that human development concept in broader context and to stress the combination of vulnerabilities with deprivations, giving attention to risks and forces of disruption and destruction in the lives of ordinary people, especially the poorest (Haq 1999). In the 1994 Human Development Report he launched human security analysis, aiming to also humanize security discussions and practice and link them to development discussions and action: 'Security must be measured in the lives of the people, not by the weaponry of the state'. The human security concept has helped to open-up thinking

concerning security of what, whom, and against what threats. Just as human development analysis has promoted people-centred thinking in arenas of economic development and finance, human security analysis has promoted it in security discussions that have been dominated by national state, military and aggregate-economic preoccupations. It connects to previous work in that direction, as in emancipatory security studies (Bilgin 2003). Indeed human security thinking has become at least as prominent in security studies, environmental studies and some other fields as in socio-economic development studies.

The human security agenda thus involves not only humanizing discussions of violence and peace. First, 'security' is a prioritising term, rather than an entity in itself; we must not presume that issues of violence and crime are necessarily the main, even the only, 'security' issues. Human security analyses of what are or should be priorities bring a focus on questions of what it is to be human. Second, this thrust has been part of a reassertion of the foundational rationale of the United Nations: highlighting both human dignity and human interconnectedness, including the interconnections of nations and between military and economic security, and how these issues affect and are affected by issues of human dignity. U.S. President F.D. Roosevelt articulated that rationale during World War Two, seeing the war as product of multiple factors. He championed 'freedom from want' and 'freedom from fear' besides classic civic freedoms of speech and of worship, and stressed the interdependence of all these. The rationale of the United Nations was that 'military security without economic improvement was short-term and futile … [Likewise if these] did not produce ways of improving political and cultural understandings among peoples' (Kennedy, 2007: 11-12). As part of reviving the sense of purpose of the UN, Secretary-General Kofi Annan returned in the early 2000s to this language of 'In Larger Freedom' from the 1945 Charter, to underline the interconnectedness of peace and socio-economic and political freedoms (Traub 2006). He declared that disease, destitution and environmental destruction are equally great threats to collective security and peace as terrorism or nuclear proliferation.

While human development thinking became institutionalized in the UN system in the global, regional and national Human Development Reports (HDRs), human security thinking did not become equally strongly instituted, in the HDRs Office or elsewhere. A very small UN Human Security Unit was established in 2004, but tasked with project funding rather than with research and strategic thinking and housed in the Office for Humanitarian Affairs which deals with emergency relief. Given then the concept's complex scope and implications, it became subject to multiple interpretations. Unfortunately it sometimes became perceived as rival and competitor to human development thinking.[1]

[1] The 2014 Human Development Report (UNDP 2014) covered the human security agenda endorsed by the General Assembly in 2012, including social protection and employment but also climate change and disaster preparedness and

The human security concept is a boundary concept that seeks to bridge not just between traditional security studies and human development theory but across various disciplinary and professional divides, by asking in regard to each case what are the impacts on priority human concerns. It thereby makes us reflect on what indeed are priorities in a particular context and how are they impacted—what are, for example, the health impacts of trade, the climate impacts of travel, the conflict impacts of inequality. For this necessary agenda human security language functions as a sort of Esperanto, that sometimes fails to fully satisfy experts of specific organizational worlds and intellectual and practice communities. Further, damage for poorer people caused by the activities of richer people is often not an accepted and funded research theme; such examination can face obstruction by dominant groups and nations. Despite the proud territorialism in some responses—as in parts of conventional security studies and from some human rights theorists—ideas of human security have gained substantial attention and application across many fields, countries and arenas. Following a multi-year process of examination and experimentation within the UN system and beyond, mandated by the World Summit of 2005, the UN General Assembly adopted an agreed understanding of the concept and approach in 2012 (UNGA 2012), recognizing not just its role as a reminder of human priorities and interconnectedness but its practical applicability and relevance (see e.g. Eliasson 2013). The Human Security Unit subsequently moved to the Secretary-General's apex secretariat.

This piece reviews a selection of human security thinking and its relation to work on human development and the capability approach. [2] Section 2 looks at interpretations of the concept. It emphasises four aspects of a human security perspective, using an analysis by Amartya Sen, and relates them to two dimensions suggested by O'Brien and Leichenko. The 'equity dimension' includes the focus on persons and how they live and can live, plus a focus on fulfilment of basic needs and rights. The 'connectivity dimension' considers how people live within a total context constituted by numerous interconnecting systems, plus the threats, risks and opportunities that arise from the intersections and interactions of factors from different parts of this life-environment. In each dimension, human security analysis adds something within (or, alternatively stated, to) human development thinking.

Section 3 examines this relation of a human security perspective to human development and capabilities thinking. It notes the bases of human security thinking in Sen's entitlements analysis that

response, using largely the same themes, tools and key messages (see e.g. pp. 10-12 and Box 1.2). While the Report 'encompasses vulnerability to any type of adverse event that could threaten people's capabilities and choices' it avoided affiliating to the term human security, as supposedly at risk of being too encompassing (p.10). Mysteriously, it avowed to be 'closely aligned with the human security approach, *but* with a focus on vulnerability' (UNDP 2014: 4; emphasis added); and, despite its return to the focus of its 1994 predecessor it claimed to be the first global HDR to '[consider] vulnerability and resilience through a human development lens' (p.vi). As a result, it seems to have secluded itself from some of the literatures most relevant to its themes, for example on indices of human security. Even so, at various points it still talked in terms of 'human security' (e.g. p.24), implicitly as the inverse of vulnerability.

[2] Parts of this paper develop ideas from Gasper and Gómez (2014). I thank Oscar Gómez for permission to rework these, for comments on an earlier draft and for sustained fruitful collaboration.

was created to investigate famine and hunger, and in a richer picture of human life than the pictures in welfare economics or traditional security studies thinking. As compared to welfare economics it emphasises contingency, (in)stability, threats to basic needs, meanings, and uncertainty, as major life-themes. As compared to a traditional security focus on bodies, violence and crime, human security thinking reflects also concerns of livelihood, meaningfulness and identity. It addresses protection and empowerment against threats that people fear and/or reasonably should fear.

The concept is part of a way of framing and doing analysis, which considers how diverse threats interconnect, vary in relative importance over time and place, and need to be periodically viewed in holistic and comparative fashion rather than responded to only in terms of stereotyped familiar formats and responses. Different detailed versions have emerged. Section 4 looks at some, and examines the types of role and thinking that are involved.

Section 5 notes various lines of application since 1994, including work on violent conflict, on crime and 'citizen security', on psychological insecurity, and on environmental change; plus studies that essay comprehensive identification and comparison of all major threats, and studies of selected priority threats, each for a particular time and place. Work of each of these types is extensive, especially on violence and on environmental security.[3] Human security thinking is being used for exploration of dimensions of 'being human' (Archer 2000) in many fields, including: vulnerable embodied living, in regard to health; living in the physical environment, in relation to disasters; and living in the world of nation-states, as in relation to international migration.[4] Section 6 concludes.

2. Human security as concept and conception

Basic features

The Commission on Human Security (CHS), advising the UN in 2003, defined human security as: '[protection of] the vital core of all human lives in ways that enhance human freedoms and human fulfillment. Human security means [protection of] fundamental freedoms.' (CHS 2003). This sort of formulation underlies the 2012 General Assembly agreed understanding. Amartya Sen, co-chair of the Commission, distinguished four features of human security thinking (Sen 2014: 18). Three can be seen as part of the core concept, while the fourth is part of a broader conception, a way of thinking about the world that contains also the other three. The Commission Report and Sen's other work elaborate that way of thinking, as a framework for description and explanation and a partial framework for policy analysis.

[3] For conflict, see e.g., Martin and Owen (2014), Fukuda-Parr and Messineo (2012); for environment, e.g. Redclift and Grasso (2013), Sygna et al. (2013).

[4] For a survey of human security analyses of migration, see Gasper and Sinatti (2016).

The term 'broader' refers here to human security thinking as containing more than just a single concept. It does not refer to past debates about the appropriate scope of that concept of human security, between narrower ('Canadian') and broader ('Japanese' or 'U.N.') versions. The 'Canadian' version covered only violent threats to bodily integrity or sometimes also to property.[5] Over time, Hubert (2004)'s prediction has been vindicated: that given the strength of interconnections of what conventionally were treated as separated spheres—economic development, peace/violence, health/disease, environment—then even if the concept adopted of human security were narrow, analysing and acting on just this narrow part of the interconnected whole still requires attention to the whole: a broad scope (Kaldor and Beebe 2010, Tadjbakhsh 2014).

The first feature in Sen's list is a central focus on what happens to people, individual persons, rather than on the national economy, the military or prioritized infrastructure. In contrast, for example, some contemporary disasters management focuses on 'Critical Infrastructure Protection', or has even given priority to protecting expensive property above the needs of low-income residents, as seen during Hurricane Katrina and its aftermath in New Orleans in 2005 (Cameron 2014).

Second is a stress on basic human priorities, including life and health and dignity. The idea of human security builds on but transforms earlier work on basic human needs, in which Haq was involved (e.g., Streeten et al. 1981). Reviving the language used around the foundation of the UN, a human security approach states this feature as: '(a) The right of people to live in freedom and dignity, free from poverty and despair. All individuals, in particular vulnerable people, are entitled to freedom from fear and freedom from want, with an equal opportunity to enjoy all their rights and fully develop their human potential' (UN General Assembly 2012, resolution 66/290 on human security). Some authors equate freedom to live in dignity to simply the sum of freedom-from-fear and freedom-from-want, but others rightly criticise this as too limited (Cameron 2014); living in dignity involves more, including from the agenda of human rights, the third UN pillar established in the 1940s alongside the commitments to peace and economic improvement. The 2012 General Assembly resolution thus goes beyond only the two freedom-froms.

Third, human security analysis considers the stability or instability of fulfilment of these basic priorities, and the 'downside risks' to which ordinary people are vulnerable. The concern with stability is with regard to vulnerability in circumstances of deprivation, fulfilment of basic human priorities, and not, for example, the stability of returns to billionaire speculators.

The fourth feature is an understanding of individuals' lives through consideration of their total context of living, with attention to the social and physical contexts that constrain and enable people and help determine their vulnerabilities and capabilities. Sen's work on famines and entitlements analysis (e.g., Sen 1981; Gasper 1993, 2008) showed the investigation of a person's total context—

[5] See Gasper (2010, 2014) for analytical comparison of the many proffered definitions.

economic, social and cultural, legal, political, physical, epidemiological, etcetera—to examine what they can and cannot achieve. The approach is exemplified in his books with Jean Drèze on hunger and on socio-economic development in India (e.g., Drèze and Sen 1989, 1990, 2002).

So, human security analysis looks at threats to the fulfilment of basic priorities in the lives of ordinary persons, and at the generation and interconnection of those threats. It responds to criticisms of the notion of 'security' that Marx voiced long ago*:* 'Security is the supreme social concept of [bourgeois] civil society…[because the] whole society exists only in order to guarantee for each of its members the preservation of his person, his rights and his property' (Marx 1963: 25-6). In such a society those with little or no property have had few *de facto* rights. 'Marx rejected liberalism and the rights of man because of the underlying views of man as a sovereign being—when he was not in fact sovereign but subject to overwhelming outside forces—and of society and other men as means toward private ends' (Duncan 1973: 88). In regard to Marx's objections, human security analysis illuminates how individuals are constrained by numerous outside forces and how this can be taken into account; it redirects the prioritizing force of 'security' language towards humanistic values; and it seeks primarily to secure not rights to property and privilege for existing property-holders, but the basic life requirements of everyone, including for dignified and meaningful affiliations with others.

The concern for fulfilment of basic freedoms for everyone underlies the other three features: the observational foci on how ordinary individuals can live and die and on their risks and vulnerabilities, and the concern with comprehensive analysis of the intersecting systems that condition these lives and risks. Policies designed for a 'security' that is seen only as territorial or about economic sovereignty and civil order are insufficient, often irrelevant, and sometimes pernicious for protecting and empowering people in terms of their daily needs. The focus on persons and their fulfilment of basic needs and freedoms redirects security discussions: from the national-state level to human beings as potential victims and agents; beyond physical violence as the only relevant threat; and beyond physical harm as the only relevant damage. The redirection can be done to different extents, according to the breadth of at-risk values and corresponding threats that are included; hence the diversity of proffered detailed definitions of human security. The Commission on Human Security stressed the sufficiently stable achievement of basic needs/rights, while indicating that detailed specification of the priority values to include should necessarily occur partly via reasoned and legitimate process within each relevant political community. This formulation gives both focus and flexibility, a workable combination of universal concerns with situational and local considerations.

The 'equity dimension' of human security analysis: basic needs, human rights, dignity

The focus on people and the priority to basic needs are parts of what O'Brien and Leichenko (2007) called human security analysis's equity dimension (see also Leichenko and O'Brien 2008). Over time, many human security thinkers have connected these two features to a commitment to

human rights. A human rights basis underpins the coverage of all affected persons, in contrast to a 'citizen security' concept that excludes non-citizens and is narrower in the range of values it prioritizes for protection. Human security analysis then explores which values and rights are specifically at risk; and promotes their defence or attainment by considering who are duty-bearers and what are their capacities. Human rights principles also provide a necessary balance to the capability approach. For while that

> expresses an ideal of a community sitting together to decide the priorities that it will seek to assure or promote[, the] sister human rights approach recognises that "communities" can exclude and marginalise. It expresses the priority of some basic entitlements that stem from global and nationally endorsed values that override community habits [for they] ensure all residents and workers can adequately participate in the deliberating community. (Frediani et al., 2014: 7).

Haq emphasised a motivating principle of respect for the human dignity of others (e.g. Haq, 1997). This spirit animates the commitment to human rights, the concern for each person and all persons. The theme of dignity is prominent in contemporary jurisprudence (e.g., Düwell et al. 2014) and policy discourse (e.g., the UN Secretary-General's 2013 Report *A Life of Dignity for All*) as well as in classical and contemporary ethics. It is central too in understanding societal dynamics. The behaviour of each person and society reflects a drive to be treated by others as having intrinsic worth (Goulet 1971). If they are not so treated then they will likely resist. Further, respect and concern for others' dignity strengthens the motivation for tracing connections across organizational, national and disciplinary boundaries, and is thus part of the basis for more adequate understanding.

The 'connectivity dimension' of human security analysis

A human-focus demands a broad analytical perspective, for human lives are constituted by the intersections of numerous factors from across conventionally separated spheres (e.g., polity, economy, society, ecosystems). The intersections involve not merely addition of separate effects but major interactions. Further, one's impacts on others have consequences. Human security analysis's focus on threats and risks in interconnected systems and on the transdisciplinary systems analysis required form what O'Brien and Leichenko call its connectivity dimension. This includes a transdisciplinary approach at the level of larger systems and a holistic perspective on real individuals' lives. The former alone is not enough. For example, a 'hot-spots' approach—that identifies which regions have problematic conditions in each or most of a series of different aspects—is helpful but not sufficient. We must consider the circumstances and reactions of specific affected groups, not just aggregate data for a region (Chan and Southgate 2014). Human security analyses add value through person-centred attention to the intersections of multiple dimensions of life in specific contexts.

The aspects mentioned in the 1994 HDR were these: 'The list of threats to human security is long, but most can be considered under seven main categories: Economic security, Food security, Health security, Environmental security, Personal security, Community security, Political security' (UNDP 1994: 24-25). This was a checklist for threatened (sets of) values and for considering the systems of threats that endanger them, not a list of specific threats or threat vectors. It was not intended to entrench a silo-approach in which the categories are considered in isolation; but it was both conveniently and dangerously close to existing bureaucratic divisions. Much research shows how trends and events in all seven areas interconnect. Implications for explanatory analysis, policy and public action were noted in the 2012 General Assembly resolution: '(b) Human security calls for people-centred, comprehensive, context-specific and prevention-oriented responses that strengthen the protection and empowerment of all people and all communities'. Such implications were traced already in the entitlements-analysis work led by Sen, and have been followed up in many streams of human security research.

Beyond the concept alone

The 2012 General Assembly resolution drew from a widely quoted formulation in the 1994 HDR that human security thinking has four key characteristics: (1) people-centred; this, the first of Sen's four features, covers both its orientation in evaluation and a principle that policy should draw on the interests, understanding and involvement of local people; (2) universal, which means it applies to all people within a country and to and across all countries; (3) interdependent: all the elements—all peoples, all the aspects of security—are interconnected; as in Sen's fourth feature; and (4) prevention-oriented. This formulation partly repeats elements of the core concept but partly builds a picture of ways of thinking for better understanding and better policy. Characteristics (1) and (3) contain implications for doing policy analysis; and number (4) adds a major orientation in policy planning and design. For trying to describe and explain systems, and for trying to then design policy, different more detailed variants of human security thinking exist. We discuss this further in Section 4.

3. Human security and human development: faces of being human

Part or partner?

Human security analysis can be seen as an aspect of human development analysis broadly conceived, referring here to the approach initiated by Haq, Sen and their associates. The same researchers formulated human security analysis as part of that enterprise, using largely the same concepts, and for continuation in particular of the agenda of Sen's entitlements analysis: to investigate threats and risks, how these affect diverse groups, and how people can and do respond.

If we see human development analysis as centrally including attention to basic needs and to threats, disruptions and fluctuations, as it should and typically does, then human security analysis is a wing or dimension within it. If human development analysis looks only at creation and expansion of valuable capabilities, then human security analysis adds attention to risks, vulnerabilities, forces of disruption, destruction and change, and maintaining or restoring basic requirements despite such factors. When human development theory is equated to capability theory, as in the synecdoche that equates development to freedom, then human security theory extends it, for it involves a notion of what is human beyond only freedom and (reasoned) choice. If human development theory is more expansive, as it should be, then human security analysis fits within it.

The first and fourth of the four human security features mentioned by Sen are standard parts of human development theory: individual people's lives are considered, in terms of ideas of functioning, capability and agency, with attention to the contexts in which valued functionings are or can be promoted and sustained or endangered and thwarted. Human security analysis's second feature adds an emphasis on basic functionings and capabilities. It supports necessary public prioritisation within the otherwise open-ended human development panorama of 'what people have reason to value'. Following up basic needs theory as worked on earlier by Haq, Streeten, Stewart and others, it looks—as in some MDG and SDG checklists—at fulfilment of requirements for (eventually) functioning as an autonomous agent, an effective responsible citizen: including, *inter alia*, sufficient education, adequate health, a basic level of income, and social inclusion with a dignified accepted status; and at factors which prevent, undermine or jeopardize their attainment.

A relatively distinctive emphasis is added too, by Sen's third highlighted feature, regarding the ways in which intersecting forces can generate 'downside risks' that undermine fulfilment of the basic needs and/or rights; including possible spirals of disadvantage, physical, mental and emotional damage and disability, and death (see e.g. Stiglitz 2014). Tipping-points exist in many systems, including personal, political and ecological.

The 2010 Human Development Report adopted a 'separate but equal' formulation: 'human development and human security are distinct concepts—the first relating to expanding people's freedoms and the second to ensuring against threats to those freedoms.' (UNDP 2010: 17). Later on the same page it moved to a 'part of the whole' formulation: 'Human security is not an alternative to human development—it is a critical part of it that focuses on creating a minimum set of capabilities and protecting them from pervasive threats.' (UNDP 2010: 17; likewise Alkire 2010). If we stay with the latter formulation, we can say that the human (in)security concept considers both deprivation and vulnerability, not only the latter. Downturns become far more serious in circumstances of deprivation.

The language of capabilities is used not only as a way of describing what people can attain, but with reference too to their capacities and abilities. The Global Environmental Change and Human Security research program defined human security as the capacity of individuals and communities to

respond to threats to their social, human and environmental rights. The Commission on Human Security, the UN Trust Fund for Human Security and the 2012 General Assembly resolution similarly emphasized empowerment, not only protection by others, for reacting to threats and fulfilling basic requirements. Human security analysts in Latvia added a concept of 'securitability'—people's ability to establish, maintain and restore their own security (UNDP 2003)–which was adopted later as a national policy objective.

Human security analysis as a door to explorations of being human

The theme of vulnerability is part of a richer picture of the human than only skills, reason and choice. It was central in for example classical Greek philosophy and drama. Deneulin (2016) criticises the HDR 2014, *Reducing Vulnerabilities and Building Resilience*, for reducing human development analysis to capability theory and individuals' choice sets, and lack of fundamental attention to the natural environment and to institutions and their capabilities. Some of these concerns have become addressed in human security analyses. Goulet (1971) wrote similarly of 'Vulnerability [as] the key to understanding and promoting development'. He argued that we must study how people in each given setting view and feel vulnerability, and how they seek to make sense of the world, their lives and the forces and choices that face them: their 'existence rationality'. Attention to perceptions and emotions of security and insecurity is an important element in recent and ongoing human security research; for emotions are central parts of human personality, thinking and motivation, especially so in regard to felt vulnerability and uncertainty. Nussbaum's writings on human development ethics (e.g. 2001) investigate risks, emotions, happenstance, and the interconnections that increase both vulnerabilities and responsibilities. She articulates the ancient Greek ideas that part of what makes people human and not gods is vulnerability, and that our own vulnerability is a major potential source of or condition for sympathy with the vulnerability of others.

The CHS definition of human security by Sen and Alkire was in the liberal language of freedoms, but its consideration of basic needs, requirements for agency, and the vulnerability of their attainment makes human security analysis a door into exploration of being human: including of psychological needs, situatedness, limits and mortality (cf. James 2014). Admittedly, some writers on human security have discussed only 'security' at length and given insufficient attention to 'human', using merely a contrast between the individual and the state as the object of security. For Haq though, the human security approach concerned not atomistic economic-men but real social beings with needs for dignity (Lama 2010).

People live in and are constituted through communities and relationships, which build and also limit their agency. Definitional of human beings is that we are not self-enclosed individuals; indeed our individuality arises through our particular set of relationships (Hobson 2014b). We live situated at and

as particular intersections of numerous such factors—including, not least, gender (Tripp et al., 2013). Human security analyses examine these life-situations, in the holistic style of anthropology; and study the resultant unfolding trajectories in the ways that historians, novelists and biographers do, observing how people's lives move over time as product of the various forces and of their own thoughts and choices. Scenarios analysis and a narrative approach fit well here (Gasper 2013). Trajectories never stop unfolding, and bring periodic surprises. Individuals and societal, global and environmental systems have limits and reactions; and knock-on effects and feedbacks can magnify original shocks.

Japan's 'triple disaster' of 2011—a mega-earthquake leading to a mega-tsunami leading to a near mega-nuclear crisis at Fukushima—illustrated such knock-on effects. It provides a hint of what climate change too is likely to bring. It occurred in a country at the global technological frontier and with a reputation of being a leader in safety-consciousness and disaster-preparedness. Besides silo-ism in the relations between organizations and disciplines, the pride in national technological prowess contributed to overconfidence, and combined with corrupt capture of supposed regulators by the nuclear industry and its political partners, leading to systematic downplaying of risks to ordinary people in order to boost industry profits (Kingston 2014). Extreme-case scenarios were not envisaged, let alone examined.

'Human' refers too to our species on this globe. A preferred translation in China for 'human security' thus means 'humankind security' (Li and Yu, 2013).[6] Interconnection beyond national boundaries is both a descriptive emphasis and an ethical perspective in work on human development and security. Human security thinking especially draws out the logic that there can be no sustained security or peace or environmental stability in one country or region alone. The doyen of Japanese human security studies, Kinhide Mushakoji, amongst others has often articulated this principle of 'common human security' that applies between all human groups.

[6] Human security discourse's stress on the importance of individual persons runs counter to predominant Chinese perspectives of the priority of the collective, the authority of the state in domestic affairs, and the primacy of state sovereignty in international relations and rejection of any hint that external actors could justifiably intervene in defence of threatened individuals (Breslin 2015; Li and Yu, 2013). The terms 'non-traditional security', 'comprehensive security' and 'people-oriented security' have been adopted more readily for discussing human security issues, as has an interpretation of 'human' which stresses the national collectivity or humankind as a whole (Tow 2013). Nevertheless, many Chinese analysts and policymakers have adopted a 'people first' perspective in security discussions, in terms of objectives-setting and as a basis for understanding (Ren and Li, 2013).

4. A range of roles and degrees of scope

Beyond definitions of core elements, human security analysis is elaborated and operationalized in various ways, for diverse contexts and purposes. The roles extend from simply highlighting the human individual, giving a guiding criterion in looking for and focusing within cause-effect webs and in assembling data in evaluation, to being a policy leitmotif that stresses shared risks, offering a framework in policy design, and stimulating motivation that supports all these tasks and consequent action (Debiel and Werthes 2006; Gasper 2010).

A people-centred, socially and environmentally situated, approach

First, and most central, the concept of human security provides a set of values and criteria, of securing the basic needs and freedoms of ordinary individuals—the 'equity dimension'. Second, also central is the shared 'language'—a set of themes and concerns that reflects an ontology, about persons who are group members living in a socially structured world and a natural environment that are interrelated and that together fundamentally determine persons' life risks and possibilities. These values and ontology influence description and evaluations, for they indicate what deserves to be described and monitored: which outcomes are important to explain and which determinants should not be omitted. In the infinitely ramifying web of causes and effects there is never just one uniquely correct story to be told; but one should discipline one's inevitably selective story (or stories) by use of defensible criteria, including ethical criteria about what should receive attention and how burdens of proof should be distributed (Stretton 1969; Gasper 2008).

Together these first two features give a field of attention. To this are typically added various tools but there is not a highly specific, exact and exclusive set. So, third, some human security thinking but not all consciously offers a distinctive approach to analysing social realities. It is alive to the ramifying web, given the connectivity theme, and to criteria of basic human needs and rights for guiding our attention within the web. O'Brien et al. (2010) and Tschakert (2012) explain how they (re)frame analyses (in their case about climate change) by using a human security perspective.[7] Some variants emphasise listening-oriented fieldwork about daily lives; such fieldwork often presents perspectives different from the expectations and perceptions of conventional 'security providers' (Gomez et al. 2013).

[7] Tschakert suggests 'why a human security lens is helpful…: (1) it expands the individualistic notion of capabilities, self-fulfilment, and the right to self-determination to an inclusive commitment to the well-being of others; …. (3) it includes the responsibility to protect those who are less fortunate…; and (5) it challenges underlying neoliberal thinking that promotes…social fragmentation rather than solidarity, social citizenship, and obligations to and for others.' (2012:150).

Fourth, some thinking goes further and presents a distinctive approach to designing policy options in response to diagnosed problems. Fifth, some goes further still and offers a perspective on governance more generally. In these later levels one finds progressively more variation in views. There is not just one intellectual 'package deal' of human security doctrine. While its values may be often associated with particular types of thinking about the potentials of persons and groups, and about policy and governance and more, they can partner various types of thinking not just one.

Policy analysis and governance

In policy analysis and design, human security values and concepts direct attention to particular outcomes as being important to influence and to particular means as relevant to consider. They direct us to look for example at climate change's impacts on health, not only impacts on impersonal aggregates such as estimated GDP losses; and to look at all persons, globally. They help clarification of whose security is being considered and whose overlooked; for example, that whereas in engineering design in rich countries to be 'conservative' means minimizing chances of disastrous outcomes for users, being 'conservative' in current discussions of climate change impact means ensuring that any chance of rich consumers 'unnecessarily' reducing their emissions is avoided, rather than prioritizing that vulnerable low-income residents of low-income countries are not exposed to disastrous possible damage (Gasper 2015).

Regarding policy means, Zack (2014) draws on the Commission on Human Security's work to specify a 'Human Security Paradigm' that includes not just a diagnosis of vulnerability and a normative ideal of protection of basic freedoms but a commitment to measures of prevention and empowerment to support preparedness and response to help achieve the ideal. Zack's picture of human security oriented policy analysis can be extended, into a list of typical features:-

1. Systematic identification of threats and risks, and appraisal of key uncertainties. One tool is to identify 'hot-spots' where multiple stresses and/or risks intersect. This was used already in the HDR 1994.
2. Preparation of indexes of insecurity, for capturing attention and for risk identification (though they can miss local heterogeneity and miss that 'intersection' means more than mere addition); e.g., Werthes et al. (2011), UNDP (2011), Hastings (2013).
3. Social and spatial disaggregation in research and statistics, and openness to broad sources of information and to multiple perspectives. This includes allowing voice to the poor and marginal (cf. Deneulin 2016).
4. A principle of 'common security', given the importance of feedbacks and resistance to neglect: 'human security…cannot be achieved at the expense of others.' (Elliott 2015).

5. A focus on prevention as better than cure; and, relatedly, causal analyses that look far back towards foundational causes (Lodgaard 2004).
6. Entitlements- and livelihoods- analyses of vulnerability, to indicate avenues for remedial improvement and prevention.
7. Empowerment of people, as a general purpose means that helps resilience and adaptation. No state can deal with all insecurities; community and personal action are essential too.
8. Prioritisations within sectors (e.g. for preventive health expenditures) and between sectors (e.g. for basic sanitation, before hospitals) (Jolly and Basu Ray 2006).
9. A focus on evolving threats and on the ends of human welfare, not on conventional specific 'security' instruments—the military, the police, hospitals, etc.; thus wide-ranging comparison between possible means to achieve a given end.
10. Comparison more generally, to compare security benefits from alternative possible expenditure types (Jolly and Basu Ray 2006); and as for example in work on the health impacts of alternative economic policy choices. Picciotto et al. (2007) provide many illustrations.
11. Looking at relative priorities between sectors can sensibly be done periodically, through an alternation between concentration on identified priority areas and then periodic reconsideration of what should be the priority areas (Gomez et al. 2013; Gomez and Gasper 2013).
12. This philosophy of policy planning does not produce a full or single human security policy approach. Approaches will appropriately vary according to sector and context (Elliott 2015). Chinese scholars, for example, typically argue for a state-led approach to human security as suiting China's political-cultural conditions.

Dreze and Sen said much of this in their 1989 book on policy analysis for situations of extreme deprivation and vulnerability, which provided an intellectual basis for the 2003 Commission on Human Security work that Sen co-chaired.

Subsequent work elaborates the final point listed above. The availability of a favourable societal apparatus—including a social contract governing long-term relationships between agents, notably between the needier and the richer, as well as skills and trust for responding to human security problems—varies greatly, for example (see e.g. Bolton 2014, on Haiti). The nature of psychological insecurity and the felt requirements of security require empirical examination in each situation. Diversity is implied too by a stress on empowerment and agency as central for living in dignity. Craig Murphy warns that to an important extent 'what constitutes dignity is socially constructed' (2015: 10); 'in my own country [the USA], many people – some research suggests most people – actually believe that an effective welfare state and any attempts to limit the growth of inequality threaten the autonomy and equal opportunity that are the *sine qua non* of human dignity.' (2015: 10, 11).

Roles: bridging and flexible focusing

Human security analysis views lives as wholes. 'A human security approach [to disaster recovery, for example,] recognizes the importance of the connection between community, personal and health security, and the social consequences of housing policy' (Maly 2014: 113), plus the need to consider relocation and housing in tandem with access to employment. Interpretation and prioritization of the various dimensions calls for involvement of affected people and/or their representatives. Fukushima (2014) shows the importance further of cultural revival as an element in post-disaster or post-conflict recovery, and its role in restoring confidence and co-operation.

This holistic perspective provides a frame for cross-disciplinary, cross-organization and global bridge-building, rather than an exact framework for detailed intra-disciplinary theory-building. In leading us to attend to the lives of vulnerable people, it can promote concern and motivate action, including cooperation to supply public goods. Its perspective of human co-membership in a global socio-ecological system can support commitment to global public goods, and help general-purpose internationally oriented organisations, such as in the UN system, to make sense of and in their work (Gasper 2010). It has appeal far beyond international organisations though, including through its stresses on global interconnectedness and human situatedness in the natural world.

The approach is often criticised for being too wide in scope, but its proper use combines a broad vision with a flexible focus according to the case. First, argues Bacon (2014), broad definition of human security facilitates broad support for the theme as a banner. Werthes and Debiel called it a political *leitmotif,* whose 'potential…relies on its ambiguity/flexibility' (2006: 15). More than this, second: 'A broad treatment of threats and of potential responses is essential: threats interconnect, the relative importance of threats changes over time, and comparisons are required between different ways of responding to a given threat and of the returns from responding to different threats.' (Gasper and Gomez 2014: 5). One can try in particular contexts and time-frames to concentrate on particular selected threats and types of response, but alternate between periodic broader studies that make comparisons and the subsequent narrower focused studies and action within the selected priority areas.

This flexibility runs counter to processes of institutional socialization and vested interest. A key role of the human security concept is thus to act as a boundary concept that connects across disciplinary and professional areas. DeWit (2014) argues specifically that a key role is in seeking to educate the military, who constitute vast repositories of technical capacities and financial resources that are not going to disappear and that dwarf those of humanitarian and development agencies. Similarly, 'human security can be considered a "bridging concept"' that links priority attention to immediate crises with longer-term attention to the structural causes of people's vulnerability (Kaldor et al. 2007: 281). Glasius (2012), Bacon and Hobson (2014), and Deneulin (2016), amongst others, elaborate similar ideas. Section 5 now illustrates use of this perspective, from several fields.

5. Some lines of work since the 1994 Human Development Report

The 1994 HDR's list for discussing areas of values that could be threatened—Personal, Health, Economic, Food, Political, Environmental, Community—and the corresponding threats does not cover all relevant issues. Further, the categories overlap for the areas were not all identified in terms of the same type of criterion and were somewhat arbitrarily specified.[8] So we will not stick tightly to that list while reviewing subsequent research; work is often cross-cutting and covers other areas too.

The 1994 list has, even so, provided for some users a 'handrail' in complex terrain, especially when essaying surveys of all major threats (see e.g. the 2015 Nigeria HDR). The list has remained popular also because its categories often link to existing Ministry or department portfolios and titles. Unfortunately it can then reproduce a silo approach in which strongly interconnected aspects become treated in isolation; separated policy 'silos' do not communicate much and become ineffective. The list's categories which fitted existing policy portfolios have also often not become loci of in-depth work that uses a human security language and perspective, though much work in such areas, for example on livelihoods, can be enriched by a human security framework. Work on economic security and 'social protection', health security and food security have usually proceeded inside already established languages. A large exception to this pattern concerns environmental change.

Environmental change

A major human security literature has emerged here, for audiences are mainly concerned not about the environment in isolation but about its impacts on how humans live and can live. Further, for environmental change, the interactions between economic (in)security, personal (in)security, food (in)security, environmental (in)security, etc. are often extremely significant, so that the comprehensive perspective and yet human-focus of human security analysis has been attractive. Considerable work appeared for example in the 1999-2010 Global Environmental Change and Human Security component of the UN's International Human Dimensions Programme and through the UN University's Institute for Environment and Human Security. Large bodies of work are summarized in three chapters in the IPCC's 2014 General Assessment, on climate change impacts on health, poverty and other aspects of human (in)security, including conflict and migration. Such studies do not restrict themselves to natural

[8] See Gasper and Gomez (2014) on how the 1994 HDR's seven areas were ad hoc, overlapping, and partly based on existing inter-agency divisions.

environment variables but explore all the categories from the 1994 HDR and their extensive interconnections. Some authors consider this the most evolved field of human security research.[9]

'Personal security', of body and property

The work on 'personal security' contains two streams: one focuses on organized armed conflict involving attempts to capture the state or create a state; a second ('citizen security') stream focuses mainly on crime.[10] *The Routledge Handbook of Human Security* (Martin and Owen 2014) provides a major survey of the first stream, on ongoing, feared, or recent armed conflict. This stream is prominent in, for example, Britain, Canada and the USA; and was also strongly represented in the Commission on Human Security's report (2003) though as part of a broader perspective. It emphasises root causes of conflicts, their human impacts and consequent feeds-forward into possible new conflicts. The 'citizen security' stream is about threats in peacetime to citizens' person or property. It emerged in Spain and Latin America as part of reorienting security policy in former authoritarian states to prioritize citizen welfare. It has been adopted in some international agency work, especially for Latin America and the Caribbean (see e.g. UNDP 2013, World Bank 2011), and has thereby melded with wider work on human security. Much of it focuses at a city/municipality level. It carries a risk of marginalizing non-citizens, though its empirical work has also helped to counteract their frequent demonization as the alleged main sources of crime.[11]

Review of foci areas in the national and regional HDRs that are explicitly on human security suggests that, in terms of the 1994 categories, 'personal security'—of personal property and/or bodily integrity in relation to violence or harassment—has been the most prominent but still clearly a minority choice (Gómez et al. 2013, 2016), even given the tendency for much work that fits a human security framework to not use human security language. The minority status is appropriate given that, for example, typically many more people in the Philippines or Bangladesh have lost their lives because of disasters than because of armed conflict or violent crime (see e.g. Saferworld 2008), and that even in Afghanistan armed conflict has been a lesser cause of rural poverty shocks and displacement than is drought (UNDP 2004).

Also prominent amongst HDRs on human security have been three other types of study. First, many studies focus not on a particular category of threatened values but on a central agent for

[9] See e.g., Matthew et al. (2010), and the Hexagon book series on Human and Environmental Security and Peace published by Springer.

[10] The stream of *'citizen security'* work in Latin America has covered both physical violence and crimes against property (e.g. UNDP 2013). The 2011 World Development Report adopted the term 'citizen security' but tried to impose its own definition in terms only of physical violence (World Bank 2011).

[11] For fuller discussion see Gasper and Gómez (2014).

defending those values (but also for violating them), the State, and on 'state-building' in contexts of conflict management and societal reconstruction (Gómez et al. 2013).

Situational identification of priority security problems

In the second other type of HDRs on human security the focus is on what is identified as requiring priority attention in the particular time and place; for example, in some cases social exclusion and/or psychological insecurity (e.g., UNDP 1998 (and 2012), 2001, 2003, in Chile, Macedonia and Latvia respectively). Diverse traditional and non-traditional threats, such as climate change, financial crisis, pandemics, disasters or terrorism may be considered human security issues by local and international communities because of their urgency and severe actual or potential effects at the particular time and place. (See also the series of regional human security studies summarized in UNESCO 2008.)

The third other cluster consists of 'comprehensive mapping' studies that inform the identification of priorities by comparing all the major possible threats and potentially threatened values in the given time and place (see Gómez et al. 2013, 2016 for surveys). Such studies put traditional personal security issues into appropriate perspective. Good examples include Human Development Reports for Latvia, the Arab Countries, Thailand and Benin (UNDP 2003, 2009a, 2009b, 2011).

Psychological security and the study of perceptions

A major gap in the 1994 HDR list concerned psychological security, which does not match any existing policy portfolio or department title. This theme should instead be combined with every type of sectoral focus; not only in regard to the psychological preludes and sequels to conflict and disasters (on which see Leaning 2014, Bacon and Hobson eds. 2014, Hobson et al. 2014). The centrality of psychological security and insecurity for well-being, ill-being and effective personal agency has become increasingly clear. Of the 1994 categories, 'community security' links somewhat to psychological security but was thinly conceptualised and has not yet become a major area in human development and capability research.

Seeking a deeper conceptualisation, several authors add the category of 'existential security', to complement material security (e.g., Burgess et al. 2007, Cameron 2014, Gasper 2010; cf. Norris and Inglehart 2015). Others talk similarly of 'ontological security' (Hawkins and Maurer, 2011; James 2014; cf. Giddens 1991), meaning security in terms of meaningfulness, the feeling of being at home—even if one's physical house has been destroyed or one is a refugee—and of experiencing sustaining social relations that provide a psychological basis for resilience. Lacking such relatedness, many people become sick in post-disaster situations, for example old people in evacuation centres and relocation housing. Rebuilding of social ties is key to recovery (Sakamoto 2014). 'Material and

existential security are in this sense mutually reliant and co-constituting' (Cameron 2014: 171). People are not plants; we need more than material nutrients.

Studies of perceptions help us in understanding existential insecurity, including in relation to social heterogeneity and situational complexity.[12] They often reveal discrepancies between popular perceptions and official statistics, due to weaknesses in one or the other; and invite exploration both of possible exaggerated fears and unfounded degrees of confidence (see e.g. UNDP 2013 on exaggerated fears in Latin America regarding crime rates, especially for violent crime or as supposedly committed by immigrants). Gaps in risk perceptions exist also between experts from different disciplines, and between different social milieux and cultural traditions. Investigating such gaps is a research priority.

Human security, disasters and health

As many people had died from 'natural' disasters since 1900 as from the two world wars, argued Cohen and Werker already in 2008. The area will grow further as environmental change intensifies. Both 'natural' and human-induced disasters 'represent ruptures in society, both literally and figuratively' (Hobson, 2014a: 33). Crises reveal—for those interested to see—who is vulnerable. Disasters studies have shown that the human scale of a disaster is a product of the intensity of the hazard and the scale of people's vulnerability, which varies between groups and places according to social arrangements (Wisner et al. 2012). The most vulnerable suffer the most and become further disadvantaged: the 'social law of disaster' states that 'disasters increase the relative disadvantage of vulnerable populations' (Zack, 2014: 62). Disasters can also trigger for the affluent the sorts of dangers that the world's poorest face always; for example, people who require medications can lose access, including to their records and hence to systems for replenishment (Otani 2014). Unfortunately, crises do not necessarily bring political visibility for the worst affected; often the poor starve quietly.

Chan and Southgate (2014) note parallels between a human security approach and frameworks in public health. Health too is an integrative theme, and cannot be securely enjoyed by only some groups or locations while others go without (see e.g. Gasper 2013). Thus Hastings' Human Security Index (e.g. Hastings 2013) in effect operationalises WHO's encompassing definition of health.

Chan and Southgate argue that a human security framework encourages a more comprehensive and 'joined-up' approach to health, including deep attention to health needs in disasters, including needs of people with chronic diseases. The fields of public health, disaster management and risk reduction know already that incidence and scale of damage are socially determined; but a human security perspective encourages tracking the interconnections of diverse factors across established boundaries, emphasises empowerment and wide involvement in disaster response and preparation, and

[12] See e.g. Inglehart and Norris (2012), on answers in the World Values Survey (2010-12) regarding security perceptions.

increases attention to local particularities, happenstance, emotions and relationships, perceptions and psychological needs (Bacon and Hobson eds., 2014; Hobson et al. eds. 2014). Its integrative perspective, viewing human lives holistically not sectorally, conduces also to comparison of options across sectors and seeking cross-sector prioritizations.

6. Conclusion

Human security can be called 'secure human development', wrote Murphy (2015). One can speak then of human security analysis as a facet of human development analysis (e.g., Gasper 2008). While conceptually accurate, this picture is not necessarily sociologically and institutionally accurate (Alkire 2010). In practice human security analysis has sometimes become a parallel and intellectually broader version, partly because it is a distillation of the full perspective underlying the United Nations not only that of its development wing. Mahbub ul Haq voiced this perspective throughout the 1990s, his final decade, as a way of reasserting the UN's rationale (Haq 1999; Gasper 2011). The perspective emphasizes a global scale and the species level as well as the individual level. Placing human development analysis in an office attached to UNDP has perhaps inhibited going far with some dimensions of human security, to avoid competing with other agencies and to stay away from the full security agenda that remains the prerogative of national governments, primarily the big powers. Haq defied such constraints but they may have weighed more heavily on his successors.

Haq's turn to the language of human security was not an accident. He found that it combined several themes: the liberating stress on reasoned human freedoms rather than aggregate economic product, from capability theory; the commitment to human dignity, from human rights theory and practice; a necessary focus on priorities, from basic needs theory and economics; the essential dialogue with national security and military groups; and foregrounding the vulnerabilities of ordinary people in an interconnected globe. A human security perspective tries to remind us of our shared humanity as co-members in an insecure world. We share, not least, a fragile environment which we are seriously damaging and can break (ISSC/UNESCO 2013). Human security analysis is essential in preparation for coming shocks and for response, and in trying to get commitment to and action for preventive mitigation.

Whether the language of 'security' and 'insecurity' is itself a safe choice has been intensely debated. To talk only about vulnerability is less politically exposed, some authors consider (as in HDR 2014). 'Security' is a language of priority-claiming, inevitably connected to power politics. But 'human security' language may help to counter the already entrenched priority-claiming by established privileged groups, and to converse with and broaden the thinking of security organizations. Compared to using only 'vulnerability' the concept of 'insecurity' brings out better too the essential subjective dimensions; issues of security, insecurity and threat link to fear, emotions, and partly subjective

perception. A human security perspective is one way to embed a richer picture of the human being than only concerning capability and reasoned choice, and this picture then helps us in rethinking much else.

REFERENCES

Alkire, S., 2010. *Human Development: Definitions, Critiques, and Related Concepts.* Human Development Research Paper 2010/01. New York: UNDP.

Bacon, P., 2014. The politics of human security in Japan. In Bacon and Hobson eds., 22-38.

Bacon, P., and C. Hobson, 2014. Incorporating natural disasters into the human security agenda. In Hobson et al. eds., 1-21.

Bacon, P., C. Hobson (eds.), 2014. *Human security and Japan's triple disaster: responding to the 2011 earthquake, tsunami and Fukushima nuclear crisis*. London: Routledge.

Bilgin, P., 2003. Individual and Societal Dimensions of Security. *International Studies Review*, 5, 203-222.

Bolton, M., 2014. Exit strategy: human security, the social contract and liquid governance in Haiti's post-earthquake reconstruction. In Hobson et al. eds., 140-157.

Bosold, D., and S. Werthes, 2005. Human security in practice: Canadian and Japanese experiences. *Internationale Politik und Gesellschaft*, 1, 84-102.

Breslin, S., 2015. Debating Human Security in China. *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 45(2), 243–265.

Burgess, J.P., et al. (12 other names), 2007. *Promoting Human Security: Ethical, Normative and Educational Frameworks in Western Europe*, Paris: UNESCO.

Cameron, R., 2014. A more 'human' human security. The importance of existential security in resilient communities. In Hobson et al. (eds.), 158-180.

Chan, E.Y.Y., and R.J. Southgate, 2014. Responding to chronic disease needs following disasters. In Hobson et al. (eds.), 74-93.

CHS (Commission on Human Security), 2003. *Human Security Now*. New York: United Nations.

Cohen, C., and E. Werker, 2008. The political economy of 'natural' disasters. *J. of Conflict Resolution,* 52(6), 795-819.

Debiel, T., Werthes, S. (eds.), 2006. *Human Security on Foreign Policy Agendas*, INEF Report 80/2006, Duisburg: University of Duisburg-Essen.

Deneulin, S., 2016. Expanding Freedoms, Changing Structures: The Human Development Report 2014. *Development and Change*, 47(4), 937-951.

DeWit, A., 2014. Towards Human Security: climate change and the military role in humanitarian assistance and disaster response. In Bacon and Hobson (eds.), 180-197.

Drèze, J., and A.K. Sen, 1989. *Hunger and Public Action*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Drèze, J., and A.K. Sen, eds., 1990. *The Political Economy of Hunger* (3 vols.). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Drèze J. and Sen, A.K. 2002. *India: Development and Participation.* Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Duncan, G., 1973. *Marx and Mill.* Cambridge University Press.

Düwell, M., J. Braarvig, R. Brownsword, D. Mieth, eds. 2014. *The Cambridge Handbook of Human Dignity*. Cambridge University Press.

Eliasson, J., 2013. Closing remarks by UN Deputy Secretary-General. High Level Event on Human Security, 8 May 2013, New York. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_6AZ7hcThbA

Elliott, L., 2015. Governing for Human Security. Paper at Workshop on Governing for Human Security, University of Nottingham, May 2015.

Frediani, A.A., A. Boni, D. Gasper. 2014. Approaching Development Projects from a Human Development and Capability Perspective. *J. of Human Development and Capabilities,* 15(1), 1-12.

Fukuda-Parr, S., and C. Messineo, 2012. Human Security: a critical review of the literature. Working Paper 11, CPRD, University of Leuven.

Fukushima, A., 2014. Post-disaster recovery and the cultural dimension of human security. In Bacon and Hobson (eds.), 141-159.

Gasper, D., 1993. Entitlements Analysis. *Development and Change*, 24(4), 679-718.

Gasper, D. 2008. From 'Hume's Law' To Policy Analysis For Human Development. *Review of Political Economy*, 20(2), 233-256.

Gasper, D., 2010. The Idea of Human Security. In K. O'Brien et al. (eds.), 23-46.

Gasper, D., 2011: 'Pioneering The Human Development Revolution' - Analysing The Trajectory Of Mahbub ul Haq. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, 12(3), 433-456.

Gasper, D., 2013. Climate Change and the Language of Human Security. *Ethics, Policy and Environment*, 16(1), 56-78.

Gasper, D., 2014: Human Security: From Definitions to Investigating a Discourse. In M. Martin and T. Owen (eds.), pp. 28-42.

Gasper, D., 2015. 'Precautionary? Principled?'. Ch.2 in *Climate Change and Human Rights,* eds. M. di Paola, D. Kamal; http://www.globalpolicyjournal.com/projects/gp-e-books/climate-change-and-human-rights-2015-paris-conference-and-task-protecting-people, Wiley-Blackwell.

Gasper, D., and O.A. Gómez. 2014. Evolution of thinking and research on human security and personal security 1994-2013. HDRO Occasional Paper, http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/evolution-thinking-and-research-human-and-personal-security-1994-2013, New York: UNDP.

Gasper, D., and Sinatti, G., 2016. Investigating Migration within a Human Security Framework. *Revista Migracion y Desarrollo*, 14(27), 19-63.

Giddens, A., 1991. *Modernity and Self-Identity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Glasius, M.E. 2012. Human security: a shifting and bridging concept that can be operationalised. In *Human rights and conflicts*, eds. I. Boerefijn, L. Henderson, R. Janse, R. Weaver. Intersentia.

Gómez, O.A., D. Gasper, and Y. Mine, 2013. *Good Practices in Addressing Human Security through National Human Development Reports*, HDRO Occasional Paper. New York: UNDP. http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/good_practices.pdf

----, 2016: Moving development and security narratives a step further: Human security in the Human Development Reports. *Journal of Development Studies*, 52(1), 113-129.

Goulet, D., 1971. *The Cruel Choice*. New York: Atheneum.

Haq, M. ul. 1997. Towards a more compassionate society. Plenary Address to the State of the World Forum, San Francisco, 8 November 1997. http://www.un.org.pk/hdc/Speeches.

Haq, M. ul, 1999. *Reflections on Human Development,* enlarged edition, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Hastings, D., 2013, The Human Security Index. *Development,* 56(1): 66–78.

Hawkins, R., and K. Maurer, 2011. "You fix my community, you have fixed my life": the disruption and rebuilding of ontological security in New Orleans. *Disasters,* 35(1), 143-159.

Hobson, C., 2014a. Human security after the shock. In Hobson et al (eds)., 22-36.

Hobson, C., 2014b. Human security and *fortuna*. In Hobson et al (eds)., 181-188.

Hobson, C., P. Bacon, R. Cameron (eds.), 2014. *Human Security and Natural Disasters*. London: Routledge.

Hubert, D., 2004. 'An idea that works in practice'. *Security Dialogue*, 25(3): 351‑352.

Inglehart, R.F., P. Norris, 2012. The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse: Understanding Human Security. *Scandinavian Political Studies,* 35(1), 71-96.

IPCC, 2014. *Fourth Assessment Report*. Geneva: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

ISSC/UNESCO, 2013. *World Social Science Report 2013—Changing Global Environments*. Paris: OECD-UNESCO.

James, P., 2014. Human security as a military security leftover, or as part of the human condition? In: Bacon and Hobson (eds.), 72-88.

Jolly, R., and D. Basu Ray, 2006. *The Human Security Framework and National Human Development Reports.* NHDR Occasional Paper no.5. New York: UNDP.

Kaldor, M., and S. Beebe, 2010. *The Ultimate Weapon Is No Weapon*. New York: PublicAffairs Books.

Kaldor, M., M. Martin, S. Selchow, 2007. Human Security: A New Strategic Narrative for Europe*. International Affairs*, 273-288.

Kennedy, P. 2007. *The Parliament of Man – the United Nations and the Quest for World Government*, Penguin, London.

Kingston, J., 2014. Mismanaging risk and the Fukushima nuclear crisis. In Bacon and Hobson (eds.), 39-58.

Lama, M. 2010. *Human Security in India*. Dhaka: The University Press Ltd.

Leaning, J., 2014. Human Security and War. In M. Martin and T. Owen (eds.), 159-173.

Leichenko, R., and K. O'Brien, 2008. *Environmental Change and Globalization: Double Exposures*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Li, J., and X. Yu, 2013. Human Security: China's Conceptual Approaches and Policymaking Patterns. In Tow et al eds., 15-30.

Lodgaard, S., 2004. Human Security – concept and operationalization. In M. Muller and B. de Gaay Fortman (eds.), *From Warfare to Welfare*. Assen: Royal van Gorcum, 16-38.

Maly, E., 2014. Towards a people-centred housing recovery after the triple disaster. In Bacon and Hobson (eds.), 108-126.

Martin, M., and T. Owen (eds.), 2014. *Routledge Handbook of Human Security*, Abingdon: Routledge.

Marx, K. 1963. *Early Writings*, ed. T. Bottomore; London: Watts.

Matthew, R., J. Barnett, B. McDonald, K. O'Brien, eds., 2010. *Global Environmental Change and Human Security*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Murphy, C., 2015. Dignity, Human Security and Global Governance. *J. of Human Security Studies*. 4(1), 1-12.

Norris, P., and R. Inglehart, 2015. Are high levels of existential security conducive to secularization? Ch.177 in S. Brunn (ed.), *The Changing World Religion Map*, Dordrecht: Springer.

Nussbaum, M., 2001. *The Fragility of Goodness – Luck and Ethics in Greek Tragedy and Philosophy* (Revised edition). Cambridge University Press.

O'Brien, K., and R. Leichenko, 2007 *Human Security, Vulnerability and Sustainable Adaptation.* Occasional Paper 2007/9, New York: Human Development Report Office, UNDP.

O'Brien, K., A.L. St.Clair, B. Kristoffersen (eds.), 2010. *Climate Change, Ethics and Human Security*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Otani, J., 2014. An ageing society and post-disaster community security. In Bacon and Hobson eds., 127-140.

Picciotto, R., F. Olonisakin, and M. Clarke, 2007. *Global Development and Human Security*, New York: Transaction Publishers.

Popovksi, V., 2014. State negligence before and after natural disasters as human rights violations. In Hobson et al. (eds., 2014), 94-110.

Redclift, M., and M. Grasso, eds. 2013. *Elgar Handbook of Climate Change and Human Security*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Ren, X. and Y. Li, 2013. A Return to People: China's approach to human security. In Tow et al. (eds.), 31-42.

Saferworld, 2008. *Human Security in Bangladesh*. London: Saferworld.

Sakamoto, M., 2014. Human security and life recovery: lessons from the 1995 Kobe Earthquake and the 2011 triple disaster. In Bacon and Hobson eds., 89-107.

Sen, A., 1981. *Poverty and Famines.* Oxford: Clarendon.

Sen, A., 2014. Birth of a Discourse. In M. Martin & T. Owen (eds.), 17-27.

Stiglitz, J., 2014. Broadening our Thinking on Vulnerability. In UNDP (2014): 84-5.

Streeten, P., et al., 1981. *First Things First: Meeting Basic Needs in Developing Countries.* Oxford University Press.

Stretton, H., 1969. *The Political Sciences.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Sygna, L., K. O'Brien, J. Wolf, eds., 2013. *A Changing Environment for Human Security*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Tadjbakhsh, S., 2014. In defense of the broad view of human security. In Martin and Owen (eds.), 43-57.

Tow, W., 2013. Introduction. In Tow et al. eds., 1-11.

Tow, W., D. Walton and R. Kersten, eds., 2013. *New Approaches to Human Security in the Asia-Pacific*. Ashgate.

Traub, J., 2006. *The Best Intentions—Kofi Annan and the UN in the Era of American World Power.* London: Bloomsbury.

Tripp, A.M.; M.M. Ferree; & C. Ewig (Eds.), 2013. *Gender, violence, and human security*. New York: New York University Press

Tschakert, P., 2012. From impacts to embodied experiences: tracing political ecology in climate change research. *Geografisk Tidskrift-Danish Journal of Geography*, 112(2), 144-158.

UNDP, 1994. *Human Development Report 1994: New Dimensions of Human Security*. New York: Oxford University Press.

UNDP, 1998. *Chile Human Development Report—Paradoxes of Modernity: Human Security*. Santiago: UNDP.

UNDP, 2001. *Social Exclusion and Human Insecurity in the FYR Macedonia*. Skopje: UNDP.

UNDP, 2003. *Latvia Human Development Report 2002/2003: Human Security*. Riga: UNDP.

UNDP, 2004. *Afghanistan Human Development Report — Security with a Human Face*. Kabul: UNDP.

UNDP, 2009a. *Challenges to Human Security in the Arab Countries*. New York: UNDP.

UNDP, 2009b. *Thailand Human Development Report— Human Security, Today and Tomorrow*. Bangkok: UNDP.

UNDP, 2010. *Human Development Report 2010: The Real Wealth of Nations: Pathways to Human Development.* New York: UNDP.

UNDP, 2011. *Sécurité Humaine et Développement Humain au Bénin*. Cotonou: UNDP.

UNDP, 2012. *Human Development in Chile 2012: Subjective wellbeing: the challenges of rethinking development*. Santiago: UNDP.

UNDP, 2013. *Citizen Security with a Human Face: Evidence and Proposals for Latin America*. New York: UNDP.

UNDP, 2014. *Human Development Report 2014*. *Sustaining Human Progress: Reducing Vulnerabilities and Building Resilience.* New York: UNDP.

UNESCO, 2008. *Human Security – Approaches and Challenges*, Paris: UNESCO.

UNGA, 2012. General Assembly Resolution on human security, A/RES/66/290. www.un.org/humansecurity/content/un-secretary-general-reports-human-security

Werthes, S., T. Debiel, 2006. Human Security on Foreign Policy Agendas. In Debiel and Werthes eds., 7-20.

Werthes, S., Heaven, C., Vollnhals, S., 2011. *Assessing Human Insecurity Worldwide*. INEF-Report 102/2011. University of Duisburg-Essen: INEF.

Wisner, B., J. Gaillard, I. Kelman, eds., 2012. *Routledge Handbook of Hazards and Disaster Risk Reduction*. London: Routledge.

World Bank, 2011. *World Development Report 2011—Conflict, Development and Security.* Washington: World Bank.

Zack, N., 2014. The ethics of disaster and Hurricane Katrina. In Hobson et al. (eds.), 57-73.