

THE RECONSTRUCTION OF HUMAN SECURITY  
THROUGH THE FRAMEWORK OF SECURITY-AS-EMANCIPATION

A Master's Thesis

by

ULUÇ KARAKAŞ

Department of

International Relations

İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University

Ankara

July 2014



*To my beloved family*

THE RECONSTRUCTION OF HUMAN SECURITY  
THROUGH THE FRAMEWORK OF SECURITY-AS-EMANCIPATION

Graduate School of Economics and Social Sciences  
of  
İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University

by

ULUÇ KARAKAŞ

In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of  
MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE DEPARTMENT OF  
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS  
İHSAN DOĞRAMACI BİLKENT UNIVERSITY  
ANKARA

July 2014

I certify that I have read this thesis and found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations.

-----

Assist. Prof. Dr. Ali Bilgiç

Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations.

-----

Assist. Prof. Dr. Can E. Mutlu

Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations.

-----

Prof. Dr. Alev Çınar

Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Graduate School of Economics and Social Science

-----

Prof. Dr. Erdal Erel

Director

## **ABSTRACT**

### **THE RECONSTRUCTION OF HUMAN SECURITY THROUGH THE FRAMEWORK OF SECURITY-AS-EMANCIPATION**

Karakaş, Uluç

M.A., Department of International Relations

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Ali Bilgiç

July 2014

This thesis provides a critical examination of Human Security through the framework of security-as-emancipation. Given the novelty and prominence of Human Security after the Cold War, it is argued that Human Security has yet to realize the promise of being human-centric toward individual agency and change. Accordingly, the subject matter of the thesis is to critically re-engage with the unfulfilled promise of Human Security. In this context, through comparing different perspectives offered by critical security studies, the thesis argues that the framework of security-as-emancipation paves the way for rethinking the promise of Human Security toward the reconstruction of Human Security by way of (1)

problematizing contradictions within Human Security and (2) transforming Human Security into an emancipatory Human Security perspective. The problematization part lays bare the contradictory co-existence of both state-centrism and market-centrism within HS. Both state-centrism and market-centrism necessitates re-conceiving the role of the state as well the role of the market. In accordance with the contradictory aspects, the reconstruction of Human Security puts forward a novel stance on both political community in terms of the role of the state and political economy in terms of the role of the market. In conjunction with this, the thesis asserts that an emancipatory Human Security perspective could realize the promise of being human-centric toward individual agency and just change.

**Key words:** Human Security, security, emancipation, problematization, state-centrism, market-centrism, transformation, agency, change.

## ÖZET

### ÖZGÜRLEŞME OLARAK GÜVENLİK ÇERÇEVESİ YOLUYLA İNSAN GÜVENLİĞİNİN YENİDEN İNŞASI

Karakaş, Uluç

Yüksek Lisans, Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ali Bilgiç

July 2014

Bu tez, özgürleşme olarak güvenlik çerçevesi yoluyla İnsan Güvenliği'nin eleştirel bir incelemesini sağlamaktadır. Soğuk Savaş'tan sonra İnsan Güvenliği'nin yeniliği ve öne çıkışı göz önünde tutularak, İnsan Güvenliği'nin bireyin failliğine ve değişime yönelik insan-merkezli olma taahhütünü henüz gerçekleştirmediği tartışılmaktadır. Dolayısıyla, tezin konusu İnsan Güvenliği'nin yerine getirelemeyen taahhütünü eleştirel bir şekilde yeniden ele almaktır. Bu bağlamda tez, eleştirel güvenlik çalışmaları tarafından önerilen farklı perspektifleri karşılaştırarak, özgürleşme olarak güvenlik çerçevesinin (1) İnsan Güvenliği'nin bünyesindeki çelişkileri sorunsallaştırması ve (2) İnsan Güvenliği'ni özgürlükçü bir İnsan Güvenliği perspektifine dönüştürmesi



aracılığıyla İnsan Güvenliği'nin yeniden inşasına yönelik İnsan Güvenliği'nin taahhütünü yeniden düşünmenin önünü açtığı tartışmaktadır. Sorunsallaştırma bölümü, hem devlet-merkezliliğin hem de piyasa-merkezliliğin İnsan Güvenliği içindeki çelişkili bir arada bulunuşunu ortaya çıkarmaktadır. Hem devlet-merkezlilik hem de piyasa-merkezlilik, devletin ve piyasanın rolünü yeniden tasavvur etmeyi gerektirmektedir. Çelişkili hususlara uygun olarak, İnsan Güvenliği'nin yeniden inşası, hem devletin rolü açısından siyasal topluluk hem de piyasanın rolü açısından siyasal iktisat üzerine özgün bir bakış açısı ileri sürmektedir. Bununla bağlantılı olarak, tez özgürlükçü bir İnsan Güvenliği perspektifinin bireyin failliğine ve adil değişime yönelik insan-merkezli olma taahhütünü gerçekleştirebildiğini iddia etmektedir.

**Anahtar kelimeler:** İnsan Güvenliği, güvenlik, özgürleşme, sorunsallaştırma, devlet-merkezlilik, piyasa-merkezlilik, dönüşüm, faillik, değişim.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

As a student without any footprint of the intellectual evolution, I began to my university years through understanding what I misunderstood or I did not understand by asking endless questions. Accordingly, I defined a sort of academic education as a process of throwing stones into the fathomless well in my mind. Whenever I came close to hearing sounds from the fathomless well, there was a professor who artfully helped me reconfigure my thinking and ask what-questions, how-questions, and why-questions in a systematic manner in order to conduct a proper research process in front of my imaginary fathomless well. In this sense, professors of the departments of International Relations, and Political Science and Public Administration at Ankara University, and particularly, Prof. Dr. Aykut Çelebi, a professor who voluntarily established a three-year reading group covering social and political theory through films, literature, and academic social and political texts, triggered the process of realizing my academic aims. I owe them a debt of gratitude due to their endeavors.

Bearing in mind my fathomless well, I took a step further by enrolling at a M.A. program in the department of International Relations at Bilkent University. Again, I was throwing stones into the well through asking many questions to the

professors at the department in order to embody an academic journey. Yet, I was attempting to professionalize and discipline my thinking toward a likely M.A. project.

At this stage, Assist. Prof. Dr. Nil Şatana, a professor with full of research enthusiasm and encouragement toward conducting research with various methods, helped me grasp the significance of integrating a research process with methods. I would like to thank to her.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Pınar Bilgin, a professor teaching a student how to think academically step by step through her timely interventions to your questions and projects, paved the way for my current M.A. project through her classes and subsequent mentorship. I would like to thank her for her precious support.

Assist. Prof. Dr. Can Mutlu, a professor with his conscientious attitude toward students in order to both encourage and discipline them, taught me how to conceive of alternative worlds of theories, methodologies and methods as well as peoples and lives in his graduate class on research methods and in his daily life through a friendly manner. By putting an emphasis on how to intertwine industriousness without missing my daily live, he actually demonstrated that academy without a daily life was a theory without practice. Thus, they had to feed each other. Accordingly, his endless support toward conducting and finishing my M.A. project provided me with further academic plans as well. With all my heart, I owe him a debt of gratitude.

Assist. Prof. Dr. Ali Bilgiç, a professor with his exemplary industrious stance and his didactic style as a supervisor, managed the process of conducting M.A. project through shedding light on how to write a decent thesis in a

professional as well as student-friendly way. First of all, he always provided me with timely feedback on my chapters. His door was always open to questions and novel ideas. His intellectual guidance helped me to rethink temporary predicaments of the thesis and overcome them. Thus, writing process regularly continued in consultation with him. What's more, he always encouraged for a future doctoral project. Secondly, I as a research assistant of him learned how to be multitasked. Overall, even if I cannot thank him enough, I am grateful to him for his exemplary support and guidance.

I also would like to thank to Alperen Özkan, Başar Baysal, Benjamin Reimold, Buğra Sarı, Burak Toygar Haliştoprak, Burçak Dölek, Büşra Süpürgeci, Emir Yazıcı, Eralp Semerci, Fatih Erol, Fatma Yaycı, Gözde Turan, Haig Shismanian, Muhammed Koçak, Neslihan Dikmen, Nigarhan Gürpınar, Sercan Canbolat due to their contributions to lively academic setting of our department as well as their friendship. What's More, İsmail Erkam Sula, a person with diverse interests and loyalty to what he studies, researches and investigates, supported and critiqued in a reconstructive manner through his provoking questions as well as stylistic assistance during the process of thesis writing. I would like to thank to him. Mine Nur Küçük, a person with an ambitious and charitable life, helped me rethink and refine my assumptions during the process of thesis writing and provided me with extra sources. The overlap between our research interests also led to the development of academic communication through exchange of ideas. I would like to thank to her. Sezgi Karacan, a person with extraordinary research interests, helped me revise some part of the thesis in terms of content and style. During the process of thesis writing, she also assisted me in motivating myself when I sometimes lost my concentration. I would like to thank to her.

Lastly, I would like to thank to İbrahim Tuna Özel, Eren Özcan, Ahmet Gencehan Babiş, Begüm İman, Aysun Ünal, Cansu Şaziye Soysal, Gonca Köksal, Fatih Kaan Gökdemir, Çağatay Ünlü due to their invaluable friendship since my undergraduate years.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT .....	iii
ÖZET .....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	xi
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 Problematique and the Research Question .....	1
1.2 The Significance of Answering to the Research Question and Structure.....	5
CHAPTER II: HUMAN SECURITY AND CRITICAL SECURITY STUDIES ..	8
2.1 Introduction.....	8
2.2 Human Security as a Policy Framework .....	9
2.3 Politics of Human Security and Seeking a Reconstructive Dialogue.....	14
2.3.1 Securitization Theory (ST) and Human Security.....	16
2.3.2 Sociological Approaches to Security and Human Security .....	20
2.3.3 Emancipatory Security Theory (EST) and Human Security.....	28
2.4 Conclusion .....	33

CHAPTER III: THE PROBLEMATIZATION OF THE EXISTING HUMAN SECURITY PERSPECTIVES .....	35
3.1 Introduction.....	35
3.2 Gender and Human Security.....	36
3.3 National / Supranational Interest, Foreign Policy and Human Security.....	43
3.4 Development and Human Security .....	49
3.5 Conclusion .....	53
CHAPTER IV: THE TRANSFORMATION OF HUMAN SECURITY INTO AN EMANCIPATORY HUMAN SECURITY PERSPECTIVE.....	55
4.1 Introduction.....	55
4.2 An Opening for an Emancipatory Human Security Perspective .....	56
4.3 The Implication of a Human Rights Culture for Human Security.....	60
4.4 The Construction of Non- Gendered Emancipatory Dialogic Communities for Human Security.....	62
4.5 Development and Human Security .....	70
4.6 Conclusion .....	74
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION .....	76
Select BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	83

## **CHAPTER I:**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **1.1 Problematique and the Research Question**

Any academic study on Human Security (HS) starts out its inquiry by questioning what HS is, how HS can be operationalized, and how HS contributes to the study of insecurities surrounding individuals (Hampson, 2013; Owen, 2012). Bearing in mind these crucial questions, HS is a novel security perspective proposed by the UN in order to come up with new solutions to the insecurities of individuals as opposed to the state-centric solutions of traditional security studies (UNDP, 1994; CHS, 2003; DFAIT, 1999; 2002).

As I further elaborate on the scope of HS in the chapter II, HS (1) prioritizes security of the individual and (2) offers an alternative human-centric perspective to overcome insecurities of individuals, groups, communities (UNDP, 1994). By drawing on this original document of HS (UNDP, 1994), scholars debate whether HS can delimit its scope by narrowly focusing on “the physical protection of the individual” (Axworthy, 2001) or broadly “satisfying socio-economic needs” and



“empowerment” of individuals by going beyond survival of individuals (CHS, 2003). In this regard, the narrow-vs-broad understanding of HS has constituted the subject matter of HS. Yet, some scholars attempt to transcend this dichotomous evolution of HS by proposing an alternative or rethinking HS from critical perspectives.

In terms of offering an alternative to the narrow-vs-broad understanding of HS, Owen (2004) criticizes the narrow perspective due to its limited focus on physical security as well as the broad perspective due to its limitless scope. In this sense, HS can lose its way if threats to HS are not classified. Accordingly, Owen (2004) puts forward a “threshold-based” definition of HS in order to classify threats to HS. The definition of the threshold draws on “sovereignty as responsibility” to make state accountable to their citizens in terms of their security (ICISS, 2001). Yet, the predicament of the threshold definition comes to the fore because this sort of definition does not engage with the question of how individuals empower themselves if they are passive bearers of security. Furthermore, it is still top-down in the sense that human security can be read as complementary to national security concerns of states as well as the existing international institutions.

Similar to HS’s emergent predicament stemming from a “threshold” solution (2004), critical perspectives critique HS due to (1) its employment by states for their national interests, (2) its contradictory existence within the UN system and (3) its uncritical stance despite the fact that HS advocates to be a human-centric security perspective. In conjunction with this, the problematic aspects of HS lead to the development of a critical literature on HS. Chandler and Hynek (2011) investigate the way in which HS can be a progressive security

perspective in terms of overcoming insecurities of individuals. They reach a conclusion that HS does not challenge the existing power structures and inequalities. What's more, HS can be read as a "political technology" for the extension of liberal rule all over the world in order to control and shape individuals, populations and communities (Doucet and de Larrinaga, 2011). In this regard, HS further deepens insecurities of individuals as opposed to overcoming them. Christie (2010) asserts that HS turns out to be "a new orthodoxy" in terms of maintaining and reproducing the existing power structures and inequalities. In a similar vein, Pasha (2013a) argues that HS conveys a particular way of being an individual as well as a state derived from "a liberal telos." By drawing attention to this very liberal understanding of the self, constitutive of individuals and states in an atomistic, competitive and possessive manner, HS cannot take different cultures and contexts into consideration. Pasha (2013) conceptualizes a deconstructive alternative to HS by taking "difference" into consideration. He entitles his critical orientation as "critical human security studies" to lay bare predicaments of HS in detail.

From the other point of view, the language of security can endanger lives of individuals, their human rights and mobility because the language of security constrains their way of life, their employment of human rights and mobility. In this sense, overcoming insecurities of individuals cannot be realized by securitizing issues within the scope of HS such as oppression and human rights violations (Buzan, 2004; Floyd, 2007). Hence, overcoming insecurities of individual can be realized through distancing particular security logic from the lives of individuals.

Given the profound insights they provided for the critical examination of HS, these critiques of HS draw on a particular understanding of security which has negative implications. Accordingly, their critiques of HS become mostly exclusionary in the sense that they do not provide us with tools of rethinking of HS and pay attention to the promise of being human-centric in a reconstructive manner. Their security frameworks, and correspondingly, their politics of security respectively represent two of the critical approaches of security with which I am going to engage in detail in chapter II (Huysmans, 2006; Bigo, 2013; Waeber, 1995; 1998).

In this context, the exclusionary orientation of many critical scholars of security studies has led me to contemplate upon the re-examination of HS because I have been puzzled by the absence of reconstructive dialogue between HS and critical theories of security except some studies (Thomas, 1999; 2000; 2001; Newman 2010; 2014). This sort of dialogue and reconstructive critique can be performed through the reconstructive purpose of Emancipatory Security Theory (EST) or, in other words, the framework of security-as-emancipation<sup>1</sup>. EST conducts critical security research by (1) problematizing contradictions inherent in a chosen particular perspective or case and (2) transforming this chosen particular perspective or case through offering a reconstructive alternative (Booth, 2005; 2007; Bilgin, 2013; Bilgic, 2013). EST's two-fold security analysis comes about through the method of immanent critique. The method of immanent critique help (1) problematize contradictions within a chosen perspective and case and (2) transform this chosen perspective or case by offering an alternative from within. In terms of HS, the method of immanent critique lays bare and problematizes

---

<sup>1</sup> I am going to use EST and the framework of security-as-emancipation interchangeably.

contradictions of HS and transforms HS into a new HS perspective. Chapter III and IV respectively engage with the tasks of problematization and transformation of HS.

In this sense, EST can pave the way for fulfilling the promise of being human-centric through articulating individual agency and change because HS does not realize its promise of being human-centric in terms of individual agency and change which are common deficiencies of the narrow-vs-broad understanding and the threshold solution (Owen, 2004). In line with this, this thesis asks the following research question: How can Human Security (HS) be re-conceptualized within the framework of security-as-emancipation?

## **1.2 The Significance of Answering to the Research Question and Structure**

Answering to the research question is going to show how HS can be critiqued in a reconstructive sense because this thesis contributes to the evolving literature of HS. Yet, the literature on HS either takes up (1) the existing form of HS as given or (2) critiquing it in a deconstructive manner. The former applies HS to cases, whereas the latter deconstructs the weaknesses of HS. Despite of this sort of the evolution of the literature on HS, this thesis aims to rethink HS from a reconstructive critical perspective.

In this regard, Chapter II begins with the detailed account of the broad-vs-understanding of HS and its inherent predicament in terms of individual agency

and change. Then, the chapter continues to analyze HS through respectively interrogating different frameworks of critical security theories and their associated politics of security. Each section of critical security theories comes to an end by arguing their stances on HS. The reason why I choose EST draws on EST's purpose to conceptualize alternative forms of security, political community and political economy. Accordingly, HS can rethink the role of state and the role of the market (economy) in order to open the way for the critical reconstruction of HS.

Before proposing an alternative HS perspective, Chapter III determines two particular contradictions within HS: (1) state-centrism and (2) market-centrism. It provides a detailed account of why state-centrism draws on the lack of a gender perspective which lay bare gendered relations from a bottom-up manner as well as the employment of HS under the rubric of realist national interest orientation. In this sense, Chapter III attempts to reveal whether HS lacks a gender perspective and how the employment of HS in different foreign policies reflects a further extension of protector/protected binary in favour of national interests. State-centrism signifies the importance of rethinking the role of the state. Together with the contradiction of state-centrism, market-centrism tries to show whether the prevailed neo-liberal model of development is appropriate for HS because this type of development prioritizes markets rather than states. In addition to rethinking the role of the state, reconceiving the role of markets is necessary to open the way for a reconstructed HS perspective.

Bearing in mind these contradictions, Chapter IV offers a reconstructed HS perspective which is emancipatory in order to transcend state-centrism and market-centrism. The transformation of HS into an emancipatory HS perspective

takes place through locating HS within the development of a human rights culture because emancipatory forms of security and political community are central pillars of the development of a human rights culture. What's more, it is argued that the neo-liberal model of development can be modified by satisfying material needs together with taking different contexts and cultures into consideration as well. In this sense, an emancipatory HS perspective can provide individual agency and change and fulfill the promise of being human-centric.

## **CHAPTER II:**

### **HUMAN SECURITY AND CRITICAL SECURITY STUDIES**

#### **2.1 Introduction**

This chapter aims to discuss Human Security (HS) from the perspectives offered by critical security studies. In this sense, the structure of the chapter involves two major sections. First section explains the rise of HS and how HS has evolved so far. Second section pays attention to the analyses of HS by different critical security theories. The main purpose of the section is to establish a reconstructive dialogue between distinctive takes on politics of security and HS. The chapter is concluded by shedding light on the significance of asserting an emancipatory perspective on HS. Accordingly, Chapter III and IV respectively advance an emancipatory HS perspective asserted in this chapter.

## 2.2 Human Security as a Policy Framework<sup>2</sup>

Human security (HS) was introduced to policy-making environments and practitioners by the UN (UNDP 1994). Then, the use of the term “human security” came into prominence with reference to the document of the UNDP in policy settings as well as following academic debates (Paris, 2001; Burgess and Owen, 2004; Shani, 2007a; Taylor, 2010; Hampson, 2013; Hudson, Kreidenweis and Carpenter, 2013). However, the definition of HS, which was put forward by the UN, produced controversies in academia as well as policy-making settings.

Controversies on HS which problematize it as a concept and policy tool are still thriving. Therefore, it is necessary to engage with the UN’s definition of HS first. The 1994 *United Nations Development Report* proposes a new understanding on security with reference to putting individuals first rather than states (UNDP, 1994). Within this context, the question of what human security is or how human security differs from state security forms the basic definition of human security as:

(...) 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 who was not silenced. Human security is not a concern with weapons – it is a concern with human life and dignity (UNPD, 1994, 22).

By drawing on this definition, the UNDP (1994, 22-23) reads HS through articulation of its central features such as “universality, interdependency of components, ensuring early prevention, people-centered.” What the UNDP means

---

<sup>2</sup> I use “human security as a policy framework” and “the existing human security perspective” interchangeably.



by universality is relevancy of human security in everywhere (UNDP, 1994: 23). By emphasizing interdependency of components, the UNDP argues that one's human insecurity affects security of others regardless of states or regions (UNDP, 1994: 23). By ensuring early prevention, the UNDP means dealing with any insecurity in the early phase, which is less costly as well (UNDP, 1994: 23). By being people-centered, the UNDP makes human security central to understanding insecurities of individuals in order to analyze to what extent individuals are free and capable of "exercising their freedoms, choices and opportunities" (UNDP, 1994: 23). Furthermore, the UNDP (1994, 23) draws out "a more systematic definition of human security" in its report:

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, in communities. Such threats can exist at all levels of national income and development.

With regard to the UNDP's definition, human security is intertwined with such threats explained above and development at both national and global level. Even if human security is universal and affecting individuals regardless of national boundaries, the UNDP's definition of HS functions under the state-centric pluralist view of international politics (Newman, 2014).

After UNDP's definition of HS, there are two distinctive initiatives on how to conceptualize human security and employ it as a policy framework. The first one is Canada's conceptualization of HS (Axworthy, 1997; 2001; DFAIT, 1999; 2002) and the second one is the understanding of the 2003 *Human Security Now* (CHS, 2003). Argument on human security will proceed through analyzing the CHS (2003), even if Canada's conceptualization of HS chronologically comes

first because the CHS (2003) follows the theme of human security put forward by the UNDP. The theme of UNDP's definition of HS is security-development nexus. Security-development nexus focuses on the interdependency of security of the individual and human development.

By building on this nexus, this theme also form “the broad definition of human security as freedom from fear as well as freedom from want” (Shani 2007a). Within this context, the UNDP's stance on human security paves the way for the CHS's (2003) understanding of human security. In addition to UNDP (1994), the CHS (2003) further advances the argument on security-development relationship through linking “protection with empowerment.” HS, argues the CHS (2003, 2-19), “is people-centric – not state-centric”, “complements state security”, “includes much broader spectrum of actors and institutions”, “complements human development”, and “reinforces human rights.” In other words, the CHS (2003, 2) draws out HS by linking security, development and rights with each other in order to put forward a definition of human security through integrating protection with empowerment at the same framework:

Human security is a response to new opportunities for propelling development, for dealing with conflict, for blunting the many threats to human security. But it is also a response to proliferation of menace in the 21<sup>st</sup> century – a response to the threats of development reversed, to the threats of violence inflicted. With so many dangers transmitted so rapidly in today's interlinked world, policies and institutions must respond in new ways to protect individuals and communities and to empower them to thrive. This response cannot be effective if it comes fragmented – from those dealing with rights, those with security, those with humanitarian concerns and those with development.

In this sense, the CHS (2003) further sheds light on human security through refining and developing the broad definition of HS derived from the theme of

security-development nexus. However, the broad definition of human security is criticized by Axworthy, Canada's then-foreign minister (1996-2000) and Canada's then-representative of the United Nations Security Council (1998-2000).

Axworthy is both a scholar and a practitioner on human security<sup>3</sup>; nevertheless, the primary focus of Axworthy is to build a new foreign policy for Canada with reference to human security as a policy framework. Thus, official documents on human security (DFAIT, 1999; 2002) reveals how Canada paves the way for a new definition of HS by employing human-centric security in order to construct its foreign policy.

Canada takes up analyzing human security through the UNDP's (1994) broad definition. However, according to Axworthy (2001), the broad definition of the UNDP is not compatible with the purpose of foreign policy-making because it is too broad to operationalize in foreign policy. In doing so, Canada delimits the UNDP's broad definition, which involves both "freedom from want" and "freedom from fear" agendas. Axworthy opens up a new definition of human security derived from freedom from fear (DFAIT, 1999; 2002). The theme of freedom from fear is "protection from physical violence." Thus, Canada leaves development issues out in its freedom from fear agenda.

In this regard, Canada officially criticizes security understanding based on "defending sovereignty and the rights of states" since this kind of security language falls short of analyzing global insecurities surrounding individuals (DFAIT, 2002, 1). Axworthy (2001) interrogates old security language derived from states and their sovereignties due to its insufficient standards in today's

---

<sup>3</sup> He is still in the academia and serves as the president of University of Winnipeg in Canada, <http://www.uwinnipeg.ca/index/admin-president>.

world in which insecurities of individuals necessitate a new security understanding. A new security language needs a new focus which is protection of civilians in conflicts and post-conflict settings:

Canada began using the language of human security when it became obvious that in the aftermath of the Cold War a new foreign policy paradigm was needed. Just from reading the newspaper or watching the evening news, it was apparent that in the new era the primary victims of conflict, if not the primary targets, were most often civilians. Clearly, the protection of individuals would have to be a major focus of our foreign policy (DFAIT, 2002, 1).

The theme of narrow definition of HS turns out to be ‘protection from physical violence’ as opposed to the theme of broad definition of HS as “security-development nexus.” Within the context of these themes, literature on HS is still thriving; however, it could be worthwhile to draw out main lines of contributions. Academic debates on human security focus on: (1) how to classify different approaches to HS (Newman, 2000; Hampson and et al, 2002; 2013; Burgess and Owen, 2004; Taylor, 2012); (2) to what extent existing definitions and frameworks could be operationalized in foreign policies, international organizations and non-governmental organizations (DFAIT, 1999; 2001; Gwozdecky and Sinclair, 2001; Golberg and Hubert, 2001; Small, 2001); (3) critical analyses of perspectives on HS (Tow and Nicholas, 2002; Bellamy and McDonald, 2002; Hudson, 2005; Ewan, 2007; Shani, Sato and Pasha, 2007; Detraz, 2012; Hudson, 2012; Pasha, 2014). It is argued that the narrow-vs-broad understanding of HS shares a common deficiency because neither the broad definition nor the narrow definition can lead to the development of individual agency and result in a transformative change. In conjunction with this, they do not realize the promise of human security, that is, the promise of being human-centric.

This chapter follows the third cluster of critical analyses of perspectives on HS because HS, as both a concept and a policy tool, has not proposed such a transformative shift in international security structures and insecurities of individuals toward enabling individual agency and just change. HS could be read as one of status-quo oriented problem-solving theories or insider theories (Cox 1981; Booth 2012)<sup>4</sup>. By drawing on this point, critical analyses of HS' perspectives help bring "the political back in" with reference to the theme of "politics of security" in critical security studies in order to open the way for politics of human security (Williams and Krause 1997a; 1997b; Booth 1997; Booth 2005a; Booth 2007; Fierke 2007; Bilgin 2013; Bilgic 2013; Nunes 2012).

### **2.3 Politics of Human Security and Seeking a Reconstructive Dialogue**

Prior to a politics of human security, it is vital to lay bare what politics of security means in critical security studies. Critical security studies, as an overarching label, investigates taken-for-granted realities of security by denaturalizing objectivist accounts of traditional security studies and signifying social construction of security (Booth 2005; Peoples and Vaughan Williams 2010; McDonald 2012; Williams 2013; Shepherd 2013). By doing so, critical security studies does not separate politics and security from each other. Rather, it paves the way for politics of security. How you think about politics of security is dependent upon your

---

<sup>4</sup> See why Booth reformulates problem-solving-vs-critical theory distinction as insider-vs-outsider theorizing (Brincat, Lima and Nunes, 2012: 112).

political understanding on security. However, there are distinctive stances on politics of security derived from different schools in critical security studies such as Securitization Theory (ST), sociological approaches to security, and Emancipatory Security Theory (EST) (Waever, 1995; 2004; Waever and Buzan, 1997; 2006; Buzan et al., 1998; Booth, 2005a; 2007; C.A.S.E. Collective, 2006; Fierke, 2012; Bilgic 2013; 2014; Bilgin 2013; McDonald, 2012; McDonald and Browning, 2013; Nunes, 2013).

Distinctive theoretical takes on politics of security derives from theorizing security as either exclusionary and negative or derivative of political theories and emancipatory. To illustrate, how you conceptualize politics of security could be performed (1) through taking security as exclusionary and negative, which results in securitization or exclusionary security practices in the case of ST or sociological approaches to security (Waever, 1995; Buzan, et al.: 1998; Bigo, 2002; 2008; 2013; Balzacq, 2011; Balzacq et. al, 2010; Huysmans, 2000; 2006) or (2) through taking security as derivative of political theories and emancipatory, which emphasizes plurality of politics of security and advances alternatives towards reconstruction in the case of EST (Booth, 1991; 1997; 2005; 2007; Bilgin et. al 1998; Bilgin, 2005; 2013; McDonald 2012; Bilgic 2013; Nunes 2013; Basu and Nunes 2013) . Now, the chapter will be proceeding by respectively interrogating diversified stances on politics of security. Accordingly, how their conceptions of politics of security affect their politics of human security will be laid out.

### **2.3.1 Securitization Theory (ST) and Human Security**

ST is a critical approach to security which reconceptualizes security as a discursive construct in order to develop a novel understanding on security and a new framework to analyze security problems (Wæver, 1995; Buzan et al., 1998; McDonald, 2008; 2013). ST develops its own understanding of security through criticizing both (1) traditional security understanding due to its objectivist framework and its positive stance on security and (2) alternative security understandings derived from “individualizing security” and its positive stance on security (Wæver 1995, 54-57).

In this context, Wæver (1995, 46-47) starts out his inquiry on security by questioning “traditional progressive” objectivist understanding of security through emphasizing the role of language in social construction of security rather taking security “prior to language or out there to be explored.” Then, Wæver (1995, 53) also criticizes initiatives that propose a security framework based on insecurities of individuals because survival and sovereignty of state comes first. By way of criticizing positive stances of traditional security understanding and individualization effort of alternative understandings, Wæver (1995, 56) develops “a conservative approach to security” which takes security as negative and less desirable. The meaning of security becomes negative and a security problem could come about through the use of language by state elites. Within this context, securitizing move is a negative move which is directed by state elites. For Wæver (1995, 55), the question of what security is could be answered in a straightforward manner:

With the help of language theory, we can regard “security” as speech act. In this usage, security is not of interest as a sign that refers to something more real; the utterance *itself* is the act. By saying it, something is done (as in betting, giving a promise, naming a ship). By uttering “security,” a state-representative moves a particular development into a specific area, and thereby claims a special right to use whatever means are necessary to block it.

By drawing on this special right to articulate what security issue is through speech act and extraordinary measures to deal with a security problem, securitizing move becomes a special type of action which transcends normal political procedures or “suspends normal political processes.” In line with this, Buzan and Waever (1997, 241) argues that security means an “extreme form of politicization” in which a different political mentality functions. In other words, the realm of security could be read where emergency politics take places rather than normal politics:

“Security” is the move that takes politics beyond the established rules of the game and frames the issue either as a special kind of politics or as above politics. Securitization can thus be seen as a more extreme version of politicization (Buzan et al 1998, 23).

According to its own terms of ST, any security issue cannot be solved through normal politics because ST conceptualizes security negatively through integrating security with emergency politics as opposed to normal politics. ST is, therefore, committed to “deseuritization” in order to bring issues back to normal politics. ST, by drawing on deseuritization/securitization divide, reinforces the idea of reading security in a negative and exclusionary way by way of focusing on “the political effects of security – in other words, ‘what security does’” (Bilgic, 2013: 7; Nunes, 2013: 348). According to McDonald (2013, 75), “it could also be suggested that the Copenhagen School’s expressed preference for deseuritization – the removal of issues from the realm of security – is a product of a narrow view



of the logic of security (what security does politically).” By equating politics of security with the political implications of security policies, ST narrows down the politics of security. In other words, ST’s its own framework for security analysis could not proffer researchers pluralistic politics of security.

Given the exclusionary and negative outlook of politics of security in ST, weaknesses of ST could be displayed in the issues of limited social construction of security in ST (McDonald, 2008), reading security issues through “Westphalian straitjacket and the problem of Eurocentrism” (Wilkinson, 2007), state-centrism (Wyn Jones, 1999; Bilgin 2013), timeless logic of normative preference toward desecuritization (Bilgin, 2007), gender (Hansen 2000), human security (Buzan, 2004; Floyd 2007). Gender and HS are particularly significant to reveal the incompatibility of ST with human security. Analyses of gender and HS signify the limited interrogation of human security by ST.

In this sense, by taking its own terms of ST into consideration, gender poses a crucial question to ST as well (McDonald 2013, 75). Hansen (2000, 287) critically analyzes the framework of ST through “the case of honour killings in Pakistan.” Speech act epistemology of ST, argues Hansen (2000, 291-299), presupposes voice of securitizing actors; however, gender as a collective identity and a referent object could not be suitable with ST when women in Pakistan decides to protect themselves from honour killings through silencing themselves. Therefore, women in Pakistan choose not to phrase their insecurities rather than locating themselves in societal security sector of ST. Given the analysis of Hansen (2000), insecurities of the unheard, the voiceless, and the oppressed could not be overcome through ST because they are not “dominant voices” in order to articulate security problems (McDonald, 2013: 75). By extending gender issues

and insecurities of women to human security, the question of to what extent ST is suitable with human security could gain significance.

By drawing on ST, Buzan (2004) is suspicious of HS. Buzan (2004: 370) starts out his inquiry on HS through analyzing the problematic of referent object within the framework of HS. If the referent object of HS is collectivities, Buzan (2004: 370) argues that societal security sector of ST could deal with security problems of collectivities. If the referent object of HS is individuals, HS involves human rights agenda and clashes with commitment to desecuritization (Buzan, 2004: 370-371). Buzan (2004) analyzes HS through the standards of ST rather than analyzing its own standards of HS first. His analysis employs the framework of ST in order to lay bare weaknesses of HS. In this sense, this sort of analysis does not draw attention to the way HS attempts to put forward a different understanding on security.

Contrary to Buzan's analysis of security, Floyd (2007) tries to shed light on both ST and HS in a comparative manner. According to Floyd (2007), HS is a critical approach to security due to its opposition to state-centric mainstream security understanding. It has an added value in terms of normative utility to question insecurities surrounding individuals. Yet, there is no analytical utility of HS because it does not offer a framework for a security analysis because anyone cannot perform a security analysis by employing HS:

Indeed apart from the idea that security should be about individuals, human security entirely lacks a framework of analysis; this is truly the crux of the criticism of human security's analytical ability. It can be argued (somewhat harshly perhaps) that because of this, from a human security perspective alone, it impossible to perform any kind of security analysis (Floyd, 2007: 42).

In this sense, HS does not develop a framework for security analysis. Even if Floyd (2007) reaches this sort of conclusion by analyzing HS through the lens of ST, Floyd signifies one of the weaknesses of HS, that is, deficiency of framework for security analysis. In addition to this, Floyd (2007) does not propose replacement of HS with ST. Yet, the analytical utility of ST, which is its own framework for security analysis, could not help HS to develop its own security analysis framework. In this sense, the dialogue between HS and ST falls short due to the negative politicization of security by ST. Like ST, sociological approaches to security critique HS in order to lay bare inadequacies of HS.

### **2.3.2 Sociological Approaches to Security and Human Security**

ST's stance on security as emergency politics has been interrogated due to (1) its speech act theory and (2) states' elites' special right to declare an issue as a security problem. Because this framework is not sufficient to shed light on sociological processes of securitization of issues, some scholars have developed sociological approaches to security in order to analyze how political construction of danger and threat images occur and exclusionary security practices emerge (c.a.s.e. Collective, 2006; Balzacq et al, 2010; Bigo, 2013). These sociological approaches to security draw on post-structural security studies and International Political Sociology (IPS) (c.a.s.e. collective, 2006; Bigo, 2013; Krause and Williams, 1997; Salter and Mutlu, 2013). Accordingly, sociological approaches to

security enhance ST's discursive outlook by pointing to sociological processes of security practices. A novel type securitization theory emerges through critique of ST's discursive approach and focusing on sociological processes of security practices. In line with this, sociological approaches to security "talks about securitization primarily in terms of practices, context, and power relations that characterize the construction of threat images" (Balzacq, 2011: 1). To this aim, sociological approaches to security justify its sociological stance as such:

Security is the name given to certain practices that might otherwise be called violence, coercion, fear, insecurity, freedom, mobility, or opportunity. The boundaries of these practices, which are subsumed into the catchall term 'security', vary according to the disciplinary bodies of knowledge, as well as historical and political reasons. Therefore, like Lewis Carroll's hunting of the snark<sup>5</sup>, the quintessential meaning of security has no end(s) (Bigo, 2013: 124).

Bigo makes an attempt to pay attention to relentless pursuit for an exact meaning of security by exemplifying this pursuit through the continuous struggle between interpreters on the exact meaning of Lewis Carroll's poem. Hence, Bigo (2013: 125) criticizes the meaningless of the quest for an exact meaning of security. In this sense, the true subject matter of security is "what security does" rather than "what security is" (124). Therefore, "security is thus conceived as a process of (in)securitization which is centrally driven by competition among multiple actors to police the line between security and insecurity" (Bigo, 2013: 120).

To assert that security is a process of (in)securitization is to claim interdependency of security and insecurity. In this process of (in)securitization, Bigo's sociological approach to security (2002) questions the fields of professional managers of security and their struggle to acquire legitimacy by claiming some peoples, groups and issues as risky or dangerous to society:

---

<sup>5</sup> <http://publicdomainreview.org/2011/02/22/lewis-carroll-and-the-hunting-of-the-snark/>.

The professionals in charge of the management of risk and fear especially transfer the legitimacy they gain from struggles against terrorists, criminals, spies, and counterfeiters toward other targets, most notably transnational political activists, people crossing borders, or people born in the country but with foreign parents (Bigo, 2002: 63).

Through articulating dangerous groups to society, security professionals in the field attempt to justify the necessity of “exceptional measures beyond the normal demands of everyday politics” (Bigo, 2002: 63-64). They put forward some issues such as migration, crime, political activism as security problems in order to maintain their existence and interests (Bigo, 2002: 64). In addition to maintenance of the professional security field, security professionals compete with each other to obtain “budgets and missions” and “new technologies” for surveillance (Bigo, 2002: 64).

What’s more, political construction of some issues as security problems does not solely comes about through a struggle between security professionals. Within the political field of politicians, politicians positions themselves to help shape securitization of some issues through claims to represent national sovereign body and through locating some issues such as migration, crime, terrorism under the rubric of national security problem. Thus, there exists interdependency between political professionals and security professionals:

The dialectical relationship between political professionals and the professional managers of unease implies that the institutions working on unease not only respond to threat but also determine what is and what is not a threat or a risk. They do that as “professionals.” Their agents are invested with the office of defining and prioritizing threats. They classify events according to their categories (Bigo, 2002: 74).

By drawing on this dialectical relationship between political professionals and security professionals, securitization of an issue maintains national identity through an (in)securitization process which draws a boundary between security

and insecurity, normal citizens and potential risky groups. In addition this, securitization of an issue help govern citizens by disciplining individuals or controlling populations through fear, threat or danger (Peoples and Vaughan-Williams, 2010: 66-67; Burke, 2013: 81-84). Thus, security functions as an enabling exclusionary mechanism or a political technology to separate citizens from non-citizens or so-called normal citizens from abnormal citizens through justifying exclusionary security practices. Thus, security becomes equal to exclusionary practices through interplay between political professionals and security professionals. Consequently, practicing security in an exclusionary and negative manner derives from a sort of politics of security which delimits security to the fields of politicians and security professionals by focusing on what security does politically for the sake of on-going construction of political communities through threat constructions (Bigo, 2013: 125; Bilgic, 2013: 7). In this context, sociological approaches to security actually point to the functioning of political communities through (in)securitization process. For instance, exclusionary security practices could be observed through looking at the relationship between discourses on potential threats to political communities. By drawing on the relationship between existential threats and on-going construction of political communities, Huysmans (2000: 751-53) analyzes the migration policy of the European Union by questioning “the restrictive migration policy” and “politicizing of migration as a danger.” Huysmans (2000: 757) argues that the articulation of the immigrant as potential danger through politicization of migration as a security issue paves the way for securitization of migration as an existential threat to political community, which identifies boundaries and identity of a target political community:

Security policy is a specific policy of mediating belonging. It conserves or transforms political integration and criteria of membership through the identification of existential threats. In security practices the political and social identification of a community and its way of life develop in response to an existential threat. The community defines what it considers to be the good life through the reification of figures of societal danger such as the criminal, the mentally abnormal, and the invading enemy.

With respect to the constitutive relationship between security and political community, security policies help protect and shape boundaries of political communities by securitizing issues which separates its own good from bad, insider from outsider, normal from abnormal, and citizen from non-citizen. Therefore, security becomes a boundary drawing activity which creates binary oppositions in order to constrain the scope of liberty and mobility in a particular political community (Bigo, 2013: 125). Correspondingly, security points to exclusionary security practices which is directly related to existing governmental structures and political processes.

In this sense, If the strength of sociological approaches to security results from laying bare (1) power relations between professionals on security, (2) interdependency of security and insecurity through (in)securitization process and (3) the interrogation of boundary drawing between security and insecurity for the sake of on-going construction of political communities through threat constructions, limited understanding of politics of security is its weakness. What this means is related to falling the trap of “state-centrism” and “security professionalism” (Wyn Jones, 1999; Bilgic, 2013: 6-7; Bilgin, 2013: 98). Bilgic (2013, 6) points to state-centrism: “Sometimes using the language of existential threat and danger, sometimes using the discourse of ‘risk’, sometimes employing policies that target the bodies of human beings, the institutions of state

continuously appears as the arena where the game of security is played.” Regarding the security professionalism, talking to talk of security is not open to individuals or groups other than security professionals (Bilgic, 2013: 7). In this sense, politics of security is limited only to a chosen or recognized group by the state.

Bearing in mind limits of sociological approaches to security, sociological approaches to security critique HS which takes up HS as an exclusionary mechanism. Even if HS attempts to go beyond established boundaries and binary oppositions, this perspective serve as a container to shape and control individuals and populations all around the world. Therefore, HS could be utilized to support “hegemonic power”, “the imposition of neo-liberal practices” or “global capitalism, militarism and neoliberal governance” (Nynek and Chandler, 2011; Turner, Cooper and Pugh, 2011). From a different vantage point, HS could be read through analyzing “global liberal rule” in which “subjugation of bodies and control of populations” takes place (Foucault, 1990: 140 cited in Alt, 2011; Doucet and de Larrinaga, 2011). With regard to this, if suppression of individuals and management of populations aim to discipline individuals and make populations utilizable, HS imposes a certain kind of being an individual and results in ignorance of different cultural contexts (Shani, 2011). In terms of interdependency of security and insecurity, HS can be read as one of boundary drawing activities which controls, manages and shapes individuals.

Any claim on human security becomes an exclusionary practice because it represents a particular understanding of world and its associated security practices. This very understanding of the world derives from the modern subject of International Relations as well as Security Studies, that is, the modern



sovereign state (Walker, 1997; Burke, 2007). Thus, this political world-view draws on a certain conception of the individual and the state: “the modern state expresses the modern aspiration to be able to resolve all contradictions between universality and particularity through the body of the modern subject: the autonomous individual and the sovereign territorial state” (Krause and Williams, 1997b: 77). In conjunction with this, sociological approaches to security investigate how HS is actually a novel way of imposing a particular type of being an individual and a state.

In this context, Pasha (2013a) argues that HS shares the same commitment to the autonomous individual and the modern sovereign state. Accordingly, HS conveys a particular understanding of “the political” constitutive of states and individuals. Thus, HS has to deal with the understanding of politics derived from the constitution of modern sovereign state in order to question state-centrism as well as the imposition of the autonomous individual (Krause and Williams 1997b; Walker, 1997; Booth, 2005a; Bilgin 2013). In other words, if HS does not challenge state-centrism and the imposition of autonomous individual, it could not be an alternative to state-centric national security concerns, and one-dimensional outlook on being a human. Perspectives on human security become exclusionary security practices on behalf of the oppressor over the oppressed (Chandler, 2011: 123). However, by referring to same theoretical stance and its associated analysis of security practices, there is also a gradual rise of “the post-liberal framing of human security” in order to be reactive against “the exigencies of an unknown and constantly threatening world” (Chandler, 2013: 50). Nevertheless, these studies do not explicitly lay bare sites of resistance and the possibilities of protecting differences.

This point actually results from the fact that these studies conceive of security as negative and exclusionary in general. In conjunction with this, their politics of human security is dependent upon the negative and exclusionary implications of HS. However, these types of analyses on HS do not always have to be negative and exclusionary. By sharing commitment to resistance and difference, Richmond (2011) and Hudson (2006) attempts to combine opportunities offered by HS with cultural contexts. Richmond (2011: 52) argues that human security “offer the possibility of a fascinating exchange between its emancipatory<sup>6</sup> goals and local patterns of politics, society, community, interests, in customary, religious, economic and political terms.” Resistance could be shown through articulating “a post-liberal form of human security” which is culturally sensitive and hybrid (Richmond, 2011: 53). Although Richmond (2011) does not offer a reconstruction in the way Emancipatory Security Theory does, the analysis involves a kind of progress which is in favor of local contexts and peoples. With regard to progress in favor of local contexts and peoples, Hudson (2006: 163) integrates post-modern feminist stance with emancipatory security understanding in order to pave the way for “a critical human security approach.” In doing so, Hudson’s critical approach to human security endeavors to propose a framework for human security analysis which pays attention to insecurities of women, the role of the state providing security to its citizens and global human security problems. In this sense, Hudson (2006) integrates local contexts with global governance so as to come up with solutions to insecurities of individuals. This sort of analysis comes close to a framework for security analysis offered by Emancipatory Security Theory (EST). Contrary to the negative understanding of

---

<sup>6</sup> The use of the term does not refer to the usage in Emancipatory Security Theory.

security in ST and sociological approaches to security, EST can pave the way for the reconstruction of HS through both problematizing and transforming it.

### **2.3.3 Emancipatory Security Theory (EST) and Human Security**

EST is a specific school of critical security studies which offers a security analysis by taking security as a derivative concept (Booth, 1997; 2005a; 2007; Bilgic, 2013; Bilgin, 2005; 2013; Basu and Nunes, 2013). Booth (2007: 150) formulates security as a derivative concept: “In short, different attitudes and behavior associated with security are traceable to different political theories. It is a simple idea with enormous implications.” Accordingly, Booth (2007: 150) further broadens his definition of security as a derivative concept:

How one conceives security is constructed out of the assumptions (however explicitly or inexplicitly articulated) that make up one’s theory of world politics (its units, structures, processes, and so on). Security policy, from this perspective, is an epiphenomenon of political theory.

In this regard, understanding security as a derivative concept fundamentally changes security thinking and doing because it lays bare one’s own political theory behind security frameworks and policies. By drawing on this, a particular understanding of security cannot masquerade as natural because EST politicizes each security thinking and doing through revealing political ideas shaping distinctive security understandings and policies. In conjunction with the idea of security as a derivative concept, EST pursues the idea of emancipation derived from the combination of Frankfurt School social theory and Gramscian political

thought in order to propose its conceptualization of security as emancipation (Horkheimer, 1982; Cox, 1981; Wyn Jones, 1999; Booth, 1991; 2007; Bilgic, 2013; Bilgin, 2013; Basu and Nunes, 2013). Booth (1991: 319) originally conceptualizes security as emancipation as such:

Emancipation is the freeing of people (as individuals and groups) from those physical and human constraints which stop them carrying out what they would freely choose to do. War and the threat of war is one of those constraints, together with poverty, poor education, political oppression and so on. Security and emancipation are two sides of the same coin. Emancipation, not power and order, produces true security. Emancipation, theoretically, is security.

With reference to this original conceptualization of emancipation, Booth (2007: 114) ultimately reformulates security as emancipation:

In my early (now distant) attempts to bring these two concepts together, I described them as ‘two side of the same coin’, and come to think of that coin as ‘the invention of humanity’. In other words, security would only extend through world society when emancipatory politics made progress in eradicating structural and contingent oppressions. Through this process, people would explore what humanity might become, in terms of peaceful and positive relations, increasingly free of life-determining insecurity: the self-realisation of people(s) would evolve not against others, but with them.

From early conceptualization of the relationship between security and emancipation as “two sides of the same coin” to the latest conceptualization of the same coin as “the invention of humanity,” Booth (2007: 114) systematically constructs EST by making security as emancipation framework derivative of emancipatory politics. Through emancipatory politics, EST signifies certain characteristics. First, emancipation problematizes unfair-oppressive structures / ideas and paves the way for “struggles” and “new structures conducive to human freedoms” (Bilgic, 2013: 8; Bilgin, 2013: 104). Individuals surrounded by insecurities are the referent-object of emancipation (Bilgic, 2013: 8; Bilgin, 2013: 104). Third, emancipation does not aim to free individuals from their very

insecurities at the expense of other individuals and groups (Bilgic, 2013: 8). Forth, emancipation is not a destination to reach a teleological point. Rather, emancipation is a never-ending process which is consistent with inventing humanity and cultural sensitivity at the same time (Bilgin, 2013: 105; Booth, 2005c: 183; Booth, 2007: 111; Alker, 2005: 207-208).

With regard to these characteristics, emancipatory impulse of EST also helps uncover politics of “meanings attached to different conceptualization of conceptualizations of security” (Bilgic, 2013: 8; Booth, 2013: xv). Uncovering politics behind security thinking and doing opens room for “the pluralism of politics of security” toward “multiplicity of security ideas and practices of myriad actors” (Bilgic, 2013: 9). In doing so, distinctive logics of security could be discovered in order not to delimit security logics to exclusionary thinking and doing. Rather, EST, through its emancipatory politics, develops a positive and plural politics of security for the sake of individuals and groups in their specific cultural contexts.

To this end, Booth (2005e: 268) explicitly integrates EST with endless critical analysis of ontology, epistemology and praxis of security:

Critical security theory is both a theoretical commitment and a political orientation. As a theoretical commitment it embraces a set of ideas engaging in a critical and permanent exploration of the ontology, epistemology, and praxis of security, community, emancipation in world politics. As a political orientation it is informed by the aim of enhancing security through emancipatory politics and networks of community at all levels, including the potential community of communities – common humanity.

Ontology of EST depends upon the question of “what is real?” With respect to this question, EST aims to question “what is the oppression” and “which referent is to be secured?” (Brincat, Lima and Nunes, 2012: 76-77). Through asking two interrelated questions, EST problematizes “existing values and structures” in order

to explore whether they are oppressive and correspondingly have to be transformed (Bilgic, 2013: 9). Exploration of oppressive ideas / values and structures is performed to overcome insecurities of individuals because EST admits that individuals are the ultimate referent objects of security (Booth, 2005e: 268; Bilgic, 2013: 9).

Epistemology of EST depends upon the question of “how can we know” (Booth, 2005e: 269 Booth, 2012: 77; Bilgic, 2013: 9). EST aims to lay bare rival knowledge claims on security and their relationship with interests (Ashley, 1981; Bilgic, 2013: 9). Because EST aims to free individuals from their very insecurities, EST asks whether existing traditional knowledge claims reproduces “existing structures that hinder individual emancipation” (Bilgic, 2013: 9). In this sense, EST argues that if traditional knowledge claims help maintain and reproduce existing structures in favor of interest of the oppressors, a novel sort of knowledge is necessary to be voice for the voiceless, the unheard, and the oppressed. In this sense, EST offers “new conceptual tools” (Bilgic, 2013: 9).

Praxis of EST depends upon the relationship between theory and practice by asking the question of “how might we act?” (Booth, 2005e: 9-10; Brincat, Lima and Nunes, 2012: 77). For EST, there exists immanent possibilities in “existing relations and structures” toward emancipation (Bilgic, 2013: 10). Accordingly, plural politics of security could be discovered within the existing structures in order to pave the way for transformation of those structures.

Within this framework of theory and praxis, EST employs immanent critique as its method. The method of immanent critique forms a solid ground for EST which prevents EST falling the trap of proposing a sort of utopia. Rather, EST, through the method of immanent critique, offers an alternative from within a

particular relations and structures (Wyn Jones, 2005: 220). Bilgic (2013: 128) argue the centrality of immanent critique to emancipatory politics of EST: “Through the immanent critique, the realm of security can be freed from the dominance of destruction, oppression, control and ‘unfreedomization’, and transformed towards the realm of freedom.” By drawing on the method of immanent critique, EST analyzes insecurities through (1) problematization and (2) transformation. In conjunction with problematization and transformation, EST analyzes insecurities as follows:

First, it problematizes the existing security relations and structures from which these relations are derived in order to reveal the contradictions and problems in them. Second, it aims to transform the realm of security towards individual emancipation through revealing the potential embedded within the existing relations and structures (Bilgic, 2013: 11).

By drawing on EST, there are few academic initiatives to analyze HS (Newman, 2010; Ewan, 2007). Yet, these attempts are not detailed engagements with HS through the method of immanent critique. Emancipatory theoretical and political commitment toward praxis through the method of immanent critique could systematically reconstruct HS. The reason why HS needs a reconstruction results from the incapability of HS toward actualizing its promise of overcoming insecurities of individuals and achieving transformation and just change. Furthermore, EST provides conceptual tools to reimagine security, political community and economy (Booth, 2005c). In line with this, by opening the way for alternative forms of security, political community and restructuring of economy, HS can critique the state-centrism as well as market-centrism in terms of development. In this sense, EST can analyze HS so as to pave the way for an emancipatory HS perspective.

By being consistent with the theoretical commitment and the political orientation of EST, HS could be problematized through uncovering political assumptions of actors. Political assumptions of actors behind HS determine its limits. The lack of a gender perspective poses first fundamental question to HS (Caprioli, 2004; Bilgin, 2004). Priority of national / supranational interests of states poses another fundamental question to HS because it still evokes realist political assumptions (Suhrke,1999; Booth, 2007: 321-327). Lastly, the relationship between security and development has to be questioned because state-centric developmentalism or market-centric developmentalism prevails over human security (Thomas, 2001; Tooze, 2005). These issues form the problematization part of the immanent critique of HS. The transformation part of the immanent critique of HS draws on the relationship between emancipatory political communities and human security (Linklater, 1998; 2005; Tooze, 2005; Thomas 2001). Emancipatory dialogic communities can help reconstruct the role of the states, the role of markets and relations between individuals or different groups because it paves the way for emancipatory communities and structures conducive to emancipatory human security.

## **2.4 Conclusion**

Problems of HS are immanent potentialities toward an emancipatory HS perspective. Immanent critique of HS will take place in detail through



problematization and transformation parts. A detailed analysis of problems within HS is an inevitable step before its reconstruction. In the third chapter, the problematization part will take place through briefly explained problems within HS.

# **CHAPTER III:**

## **THE PROBLEMATIZATION OF THE EXISTING HUMAN SECURITY PERSPECTIVES**

### **3.1 Introduction**

This chapter problematizes diverse employments of the existing Human Security (HS) perspectives in order to pave the way for its reconstruction<sup>7</sup>. To this end, the chapter points to three fundamental problematic issues within the existing HS perspectives. Each section deals with one of these issues. First section investigates how HS lacks a gender perspective. Then, second section problematizes the effect of national/supranational interest within HS. Lastly, third section interrogates the relationship between development and HS. Overall, the chapter tries to systematically construct the problematization part of HS with reference to Emancipatory Security Theory (EST).

---

<sup>7</sup> In conjunction with this, the chapter investigates numerous perspectives in order to lay bare the lack of individual agency, transformation and just change because this point is the common denominator of various perspectives on HS.

### **3.2 Gender and Human Security**

One of the pillars of the problematization part of HS is to interrogate the contradictory aspect of gendered relations in the existing HS perspectives (UNDP, 1994; CHS, 2003; DFAIT, 1999; 2001). Regardless of analyzing gendered relations which maintain and reinforce state-centrism, HS cannot transform itself into a truly emancipatory perspective.

The problematization of gender within HS could help shed light on gender relations, and correspondingly, open room for “non-gendered security” (Tickner, 1992; 1997; Booth, 2007). In this sense, the problematization of gender in HS is necessary in order to question gendered relations derivative of patriarchy because gendered relations resulting from patriarchy could be found in the very existing framework of state-centric ontology of traditional security studies (Shepherd, 2010: 25). Accordingly, this state-centric ontology of traditional security understanding prevents HS from realizing what it promises in practice. This promise is to become human-centric by way of overcoming multiple insecurities surrounding individuals. In this sense, Hoogensen and Stuvoy (2006: 219) argue for the significance of the integration of gender into human security:

When integrating a gender perspective into the concept of human security rather than applying human security to gender, the concept distances itself from the exclusive grip of a state-determined concept and becomes security relevant to people – or, rather, human security. Thus, security is not merely the absence of war or conflict: the absence of war is crucial to human security, but human beings require much more to be secure. However, human security cannot be interpreted such that a state enterprise must create and sustain (all) processes of security.

By intertwining the critical attitude of Hoogensen and Stuvoy (2006) with EST’s grasping of security as a derivative concept, the problematization of gender in the

HS can be elaborated through analyzing gendered relations stemming from the state-centric ontology of traditional security understanding. In conjunction with this, HS cannot be a human-centered security perspective if gendered relations and its embedded existence in the state-centric ontology do not set apart from the HS.

To this end, it is vital to engage with diverse stances on the relationship between gender and HS. It can help uncover political values underpinning distinctive feminist perspectives on human security. By doing so, the politics of human security comes to fore through questioning to what extent different takes on the politics of human security reflect gendered relations. Thus, the mapping of distinctive feminisms on human security is beneficial to the overall purpose of the chapter, which is to problematize HS by revealing immanent contradictions resulting from the aspects of gender, national interest and development. Accordingly, gendered relations within HS can be laid bare in detail.

To begin with, Bilgin (2004) pays attention to the conflation of gender with women in her reply to Caprioli's (2004) empiricist (liberal) feminist take on human security, which is not able to account for patriarchal philosophy and politics (Caprioli, 2004; Bilgin, 2004). Bilgin's (2004) critique is useful to understand the distinction between (liberal) empiricist feminism and EST's "stand-point feminist" analysis of gender by taking security as a derivative concept (Tickner, 1992; Withworth, 2013). From another point of view, Hudson (2005) tries to integrate post-modernism's<sup>8</sup> deconstructive stance with critical theory's transformative stance by analyzing human insecurity in general and women's particular insecurities in the context of Africa. Hudson (2005: 157)

---

<sup>8</sup> I use post-modernism and post-structuralism interchangeably.

argues that “the term ‘human’ is presented as though it was gender-neutral, but very often is an expression of the masculine.” In line with the deconstructive purpose of post-modernism, this sort of analysis can actually help uncover gendered relations in the conceptualization of human security because gendered identity of the term “human” results from the prevailing patriarchy and gendered relations.

Bearing in mind these points, the literature on the relationship between gender and HS is underdeveloped in terms of EST’s standpoint feminism. Yet, by utilizing Bilgin’s (2004) response to Caprioli and Booth’s (2007) emphasis on the effect of patriarchy in particular and by drawing on the works of Bilgin (2004), Booth (2007), Basu (2011), Withworth (2013) and Bilgic (2014) as well as Tickner (1992; 1997; 2005) in general, a gendered politics of human security can be laid bare. To illustrate, Withworth (2013) denaturalizes masculinity and shows how masculinity is social construction. In a similar vein, Basu (2011: 98) pays attention to “the relevancy of gender in studying security as emancipation.” In line with this, Basu (2011: 105) problematizes “patriarchal forces” constituting a society which supports masculinity and exclude women’s experience. Similar to Bilgin’s (2004) argument, Basu (2011) signifies patriarchal philosophy which generates “practices” which result in insecurities women as well as men. What’s more, Bilgic (2013) paves the way for rethinking and doing security other than “state-centrism” and “security professionalism through the case of “the Yugoslav anti-feminist movement.” All of these studies can help rethink the role of gendered relations conditioning HS from the lens of the victimhood of women in accordance with their associated insecurities at the bottom.

As briefly discussed above, revealing the gendered politics of human security begins with showing how a particular problematic part of HS is derivative of the patriarchal state-centric security understanding. In this sense, the questions of “what is patriarchy?” and “for whom can patriarchy structure the way we think and do security?” pave the way for the critical examination of the existing HS perspective and consistent with the EST’s framework for security analysis. According to Reardon (2010: 12-13), patriarchy constructs gendered roles for women and men, and gendered insecurities resulting from the supposedly superiority of masculinity over femininity. In a similar vein, Reardon and Gibson (2007: 51-52) further argues the patriarchal “gender roles” through the victimhood of women in war as well as their normal lives:

Their human security is constantly at risk, whether during wartime or as a consequence of socially tolerated male violence, a situation further exacerbated by their new-found military roles and in training for armed conflict. The sexual harassment and exploitation that prevail in civilian life are in many instances even worse in the military.

What’s more, Reardon (2010: 13) argues that the reification process of the idea of masculine superiority, derived from gendered relations of patriarchy, pervades societies and states:

The present militarized system of state security is but a reification of the core political paradigm that has existed in most societies throughout most of history. Patriarchy is likely to have preceded the state that is an abstraction for the power of governance, a depersonalization of power that allows those who hold and exercise it , to rationalize and obscure the harm they cause to those over whom they have power (Reardon, 2010: 13).

Booth (2007: 22-27) also emphasizes the centrality of “patriarchy” together with “proselytizing religion, capitalism, statism/nationalism, race, consumerist democracy” in analyzing, problematizing and transforming the current context of the world order and the world insecurity. In this sense, the patriarchal structuring

of states, societies and the international system results in gendered relations and reifies them into oppressive structures and norms.

In the context of security, any security understanding embedded in gendered relations derivative of patriarchy constructs individuals, societies and states. If gendered understanding on human security is not challenged, it helps reinforce state-centrism and statism in security thinking-doing, and correspondingly, disempower individuals (Bilgin, 2004: 500). In conjunction with this, uncovering gendered political theory in HS points to a particular weakness because HS does not “de-legitimize state” and “de-value sovereignty” and is viewed as complementary to state security (Bellamy and McDonald, 2002: 375–376). In this sense, gendered politics shows that HS does not independent of state-security and the state-centric structuration of the international system:

The present discourse on human security, while broadening the components and definitions of security as it is pursued in the international system, has yet to face the core of the problem of human security. Within this emerging discourse there has been no significant acknowledgement that human security never can be achieved within the present highly militarized, war prone, patriarchal nation state system (Reardon, 2010, 7).

In line with this, Gibson and Reardon (2007: 63) further argue the incompatibility of human security with state security through examining how state security and traditional security understanding form causes of insecurities of individuals:

The concept of human security if fully incorporating gender perspectives offers a positive alternative to the devastating failure of twenty-first-century state security. Traditional state military security has meant perpetuation of the status quo of inequality and violent conflict. It has demanded sacrifices from large numbers of ordinary, working people even to this day in Afghanistan and Iraq and the nations that have sent forces to fight these wars. Traditional military security is a flawed system, capable as much of terrorizing as the terror it seeks to combat.

By incorporating a gender perspective into HS, HS can become “bottom-up” and integrates itself to daily practices of individuals and their insecurities (Hoogensen and Stuvoy, 2006). Otherwise, HS works under the guidance of state security and traditional security understanding. In conjunction with this, HS cannot challenge state-centric security understanding and can only be a complementary to state security (CHS, 2003). The analysis of gendered relations derivative of patriarchy reveals this paradox of HS. According to Gibson and Reardon (2007: 51), “the achievement of human security cannot be possible if we are not more gender-sensitive.” Thus, HS does not actually offer an alternative to the top-down state-centric and gender-biased traditional security studies. Accordingly, it basically becomes a form of problem-solving or insider theories (Brincat, Lima and Nunes, 2012) even if HS promises to analyze world politics with reference to individuals and call for distinctive policy alternatives.

In this sense, even if HS is a novel alternative to the traditional security grasping, it functions under the existing parameters of the international system, which conditions UNDP’s (1994) and CHS’s (2003) initiatives on HS as well as Canada’s (1999; 2001) formulation of HS. Thus, HS does not lead to the development of individual agency and result in transformation and just change. Regarding the consideration of insecurities of women in particular, Reardon (2010: 14) argues that

varying in severity of the inequalities and oppressions it imposes from culture to culture and political regime to political regime, notwithstanding what appears to be considerable progress in what the United Nations refers to as ‘the advancement of women’, the core characteristics of patriarchy are the mainstay of most societies.

The focus on women in the UN’s discourse does not necessarily mean that the UN takes patriarchy into consideration. “The term ‘patriarchy’ is still largely excluded



from the UN's discourses on gender equality, as was the term 'feminist' for many years, even during the two International Women's Decades" (Reardon, 2010: 34). However, the UN's official documents do not claim to provide an epistemological framework for the existing HS perspective. Yet, UNESCO, as an institution within the UN system, provides numerous academic perspectives on HS (Goucha and Crowley, 2008). In this sense, the UN is not entirely outside of the academic discussions on HS as well as the existing parameters of the international system, involving the contradictory aspect of gendered relations and affecting HS within the UN (Christie, 2010: 180). Accordingly, HS cannot be "complementary" to national security as CHS (2003) claims. Gibson and Reardon (2007: 52) argue that "traditional concepts of national security emerge from the patriarchal underpinnings of the realist paradigm of the inter-state system, the state representing the father figure – the ultimate public authority." By revealing the pitfall of state's father figure resulting from "the notion of 'sovereign man'," Nuruzzaman (2006: 296) argues that

the human security paradigm, in the name of policy recommendations attempts to reform the existing system and, like the realist security paradigm, supports the prevailing social order and hence the socially powerful. The commitment to the status quo draws the realist and human security paradigms much closer to each other.

Thus, from the beginning, perspectives on HS have to interrogate state-centric ontology of realism, and correspondingly, "the father figure of the state" resulting from gendered relations conditioning HS. Otherwise, HS cannot construct a perspective on its own right because it can strengthen state-centrism and the prioritization of national security over human security rather than thinking and doing security with reference to insecurities of individuals. However, this very problematic issue within HS could lead to the development of a non-gendered HS

perspective. This issue is going to be one of further tasks of advancing an emancipatory HS perspective in the next chapter as well. Now, this chapter will be proceeding through scrutinizing another problematic aspect within HS.

### **3.3 National / Supranational Interest, Foreign Policy and Human Security**

Similar to the lack of a gender perspective within HS which is not able to account insecurities resulting from gendered relations, national interest orientation of countries and the EU maintains and reinforces state-centrism within their HS perspectives. In this sense, national interests of countries such as Canada, Norway and Japan forms another particular fundamental contradiction. Furthermore, the EU, a supranational body, tries to enhance a novel stance on human security in order to utilize it in its foreign policy. However, the EU's human security understanding is problematic and conveys contradictory statements in its particular reports because the EU represents a sort of supranational interest. The interrogation of this very contradiction can shed light on how these particular countries and the EU as a supranational body employs the language of human security in their foreign policies.

To begin with, Canada, Norway and Japan are leading countries that incorporates human security into their foreign policies. Canada and Norway implements their HS perspectives as “freedom from fear” in their foreign policies (Axworthy, 1999; 2001; DFAIT, 2002; Suhrke, 1999: 265–276). Contrary to Canada and Norway, Japan pursues the broad definition of HS as “freedom from

want” propelled by the UNDP (MOFA, 2000; 2001; 2002; 2009). In addition to the initiatives of Canada, Norway and Japan, The EU, as a supranational body, attempts to reframe the language of human security. Accordingly, the EU tries to incorporate a HS perspective into its foreign policy in order to represent a novel alternative to the existing implementations of HS (Albrecht et al., 2004; Albrecht et al., 2007; Solana, 2014). However, by respectively interrogating each of these countries’ foreign policies in accordance with their conceptions of human security, the problematic aspect of national/supranational interest can be laid bare.

Canada employs HS as freedom from fear referring to protection from physical violence. Axworthy (2001: 4) explains the reason behind Canada’s limited conceptualization of HS in terms of policy-making and applicability by criticizing the UNDP’s original formulation:

The UNDP Human Development Report was a useful point of departure. It was a comprehensive review of the seven dimensions that constitute security: economic, food, health, environment, personal, community, and political. But what made it so encompassing also made it awkward as a policy framework.

Indeed, Axworthy’s move toward narrowing down the conceptualization of HS reflects national interests behind this move (Shaw, MacLean and Black, 2006: 18). Accordingly, the world-view and its associated political theory assisting Canada’s conceptualization of HS is a kind of (neo) realist – (neo) liberal synthesis (Suhrke, 1999: 265–266; McRae, 2001: 14; Franceschet, 2006: 32–34). Grayson (2004, 47) argues that Canada’s human security policy expresses Canada’s national interest:

In essence, the principles of human security have been mapped over a realist understanding of the world and of Canada's place within it. Middlepower and functionalist principles have framed the Canadian human security agenda and brought with them a privileging of the (Canadian) state, and its interests, over those of individual. At best, the Canadian human security agenda offers the potential to manage particular global problems, when energies and resources should be devoted to their elimination.

In line with this, Canada's human security policy is suitable with "the promotion of economic and trade liberalization along neo-liberal lines at national, regional, and global level" (Black, 2006: 61). Thus, Canada's narrow human security agenda paradoxically helps reproduce inequalities affecting individuals and results in their particular insecurities (Black, 2006, 61).

By constructing a narrow human security agenda on the world-view and its associated political theory stemming from (neo) realist – (neo) liberal synthesis, Canada attempts to implement its human security agenda consistent with its "good international citizen role" under the existing parameters of the international system (Shurke, 1999). Prominent initiatives of Canada are "the Ottawa Process" on the prohibition of landmines, the establishment of "the Human Security Network" and support on the establishment of "International Criminal Court" (Gwozdecky and Sinclair, 2001: 28–40; Small, 2001: 231–235; Robinson, 2001: 170–177). However, Canada distanced itself from human security after the term of Axworthy (1996–2000) in the office.

Norway is another country which followed the narrow HS conceptualization of Canada. Together with Canada, Norway is another initiator of the Human Security Network. Suhrke (1999: 266) argues that Norway shares the world-view and its associated political theory behind the narrow human security agenda of Canada with reference to the Oslo–Ottawa axis resulting from peace-keeping issues:

The group saw itself as a friendly intermediary that could help developing countries negotiate their terms of dependence on the Bretton Woods institutions, the United States and the multinational corporations, and make the burden less onerous. In Ottawa, this ideological position underpins efforts to create a space and international role for Canada as a ‘middle power’, above all in distinction to the United States. In Oslo, a similar line of thinking is reflected in the understanding that, for a very small country like Norway, international ‘power’ lies above all in the promotion of powerful ideas.

Japan departs from Canada’s narrow conceptualization of HS and Norway’s appropriation of it because Japanese perspective on HS derives from the broad definition of the UNDP (Atanassova-Cornelis, 2005: 58–74; Sato, 2007: 83–96; Hynek, 2012a: 119–137; Nynek, 2012b: 62–76). Japan actively engages with human security and pursues the CHS’s (2003) approach to HS (MOFA, 2009).

Japan has been the initiator and preeminent contributor to “the Trust Fund for Human Security” under the UN and has accommodated its human security agenda with the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) (MOFA, 2009). However, Japan articulates human security as complementary to the state as the CHS’s (2003) report proposes. Thus, state security renders human security secondary to itself and considers human security as development assistance to developing countries (Sato, 2007: 90–96; Hynek, 2012a, 132). Japan’s human security conception and agenda, therefore, reinforces traditional state-centric account of security. Thus, HS in Japanese foreign policy actually does not thoroughly offer an alternative to state-centric security thinking and doing and its associated political theory resulting from gender-biased, national security and national interest oriented realism.

In this sense, Canada, Norway and Japan are leading examples for the incorporation of human security into foreign policy. Their employments of human security in their foreign policies, however, does not fulfill the promise of HS, that

is, the promise of being human-centric toward overcoming multiple insecurities of individuals. Thus, human security turns out to be complementary to state security. Utilizing human security in terms of state security and national interest is contradictory and inconsistent. In conjunction with this, Booth (2007: 171–172) argues that this kind of move toward human security is actually speaking strategy:

(...) governments talk the talk of broadening ('human security', for example), one should not expect any fundamental changes in their outlook. The test of any change from a traditional understanding of the 'national interest' is the seriousness with which a government is willing to promote world security ideas in their daily actions, and their willingness to bear associated costs. Without this, the discourse of broadening is merely tactical: statist feel-good rhetoric.

Unlike Canada, Norway and Japan, the European Union's appropriation of human security is rather novel and proffers a supranational perspective on HS. Martin and Owen (2010) emphasize the EU's supranational perspective on HS as 'the second generation of human security' and compare it with the first generation led by the UNDP (1994). The EU constructs its human security agenda through the 2004 Barcelona report entitled *A Human Security Doctrine for Europe* and the 2007 Madrid report entitled *A European Way of Security*. These two reports lead to the incorporation of human security into the supranational foreign policy of the EU.

In line with this, Matlary (2008: 141) explains the suitability of HS with the EU through the advantage of being a supranational body because the EU does not have to deal with national security concerns which belong to states. However, this is not the issue for the EU because the EU has a supranational interest which resembles to the outlook of national interest-national security. For instance, it can be claimed that the EU employs human security and locates human insecurity

outside of the EU. Burgess and Tadjbakhsh (2010: 465) analyze this issue by way of revealing the lack of emphasis on human security within the EU:

Threats are seen as emanating from the “other”. Instead of studying the question of human security and insecurity in Europe, it ascribes its proposed human security doctrine to the field of European external relations. It proposes a “self-interested” moral duty to intervene “intelligently” in other parts of the world, using civil-military special forces.

The EU’s human security agenda is based on the distinction between developed and developing world as well as between secure side of the world and the insecure side of the world. These issues can be questioned in the 2004 Barcelona and 2007 Madrid Reports (Albrecht et al, 2004; 2007). The EU, therefore, has the boundaries of the supranational body even if these boundaries are not tangible like boundaries of states. Thus, the EU’s incorporation of human security into its foreign policy turns out to be the same as Canada, Norway, and Japan. In this sense, The EU’s HS understanding suffers from its supranational interest stemming from (neo) realist-(neo) liberal synthesis because it conveys a contradiction which results in insecurities of individuals.

Together with the lack of a gender perspective within HS, which reinforces and reproduces state-centric ontology of traditional security studies, the national/supranational interest orientation of Canada, Norway, Japan and the EU falls under the rubric of state-centrism as well (Bilgin, 2013; Bilgic, 2013; 2014). In this sense, examples of state-centrism within HS convey contradictory aspects while trying to overcome multiple insecurities of individuals. Similar to the contradictory aspect of state-centrism within HS, another problematic aspect can be examined through shedding light on the relationship between development and human security.

### **3.4 Development and Human Security**

Interrogation of gender and national/supranational interest reveal two of the contradictions points in the existing HS perspective: (1) the lack of a gender perspective which prevents HS from fulfilling its promise of being human-centric and (2) the concern toward national/supranational interest reveals how countries such as Canada, Japan and Norway and the EU, as a supranational body, conceptualizes HS in contradiction to the promise of HS, that is, the promise of being human-centric. Accordingly, another contradictory aspect results from the issue of development.

By drawing on the relationship between security and development, Peoples and Vaughan-Williams (2010: 120) argue “the broader notion of a ‘security-development nexus’ wherein human development and the management of security threats are seen to be inextricably linked.” In doing so, Peoples and Vaughan-Williams (2010) problematizes the security-development nexus in order to shed light on what this nexus entails. In this sense, the broad conceptualization of HS proposed by the UNDP (1994) and CHS (2003) depends upon security/development nexus. In conjunction with this, the issue of development within HS, referring to the broad conceptualization in particular, points to the insecurities of individuals other than resulting from direct physical violence (UNDP, 1994; CHS, 2003; DFAIT, 1999; 2001).

The achievement of human security through security/development nexus is determined according to seven categories: “economic security, food security, health security, environmental security, personal security, community security, political security” (UNDP, 1994: 24–25). By drawing on the UNDP’s (1994)



formulation, the CHS (2003: 8) attempts to pay attention to development through changing the direction from measuring national GDP or national GNP to human security/development nexus. Indicators such as national GDP and national GNP do not truly signify the improvement in daily lives of individuals. Both UNDP (1994) and CHS (2003) emphasize development/security nexus in terms of human security. What's more, the UN has been keen on reducing poverty all over the world since the 1995 *World Summit for Social Development* and the proclamation of the 2000 *Millennium Development Goals* (MDGs) (DPI/1933, 1997; Annan, 2000). The CHS (2003) has embraced the MDGs in its formulation of human security. However, even if both the UNDP (1994) and CHS (2003) suggest that human security and development is interdependent, the relationship between human security and development could be considered as problematic and contradictory.

The first problematic aspect draws on the question of whether human security is broader than development, and vice versa. Tadjbakhsh and Chenoy (2006: 109) assert that this issue lays out "the chicken or egg dilemma" within HS. By taking its own terms of HS into consideration, Tadjbakhsh and Chenoy (2007: 105) suggest that both human security and development is intertwined with each other in a mutually constitutive way: "human security, therefore, becomes both the prerequisite of human development, as well as a guarantee for its sustainability and continuation." Yet, this debate does not reveal how the interdependency of human security and development can lead to the development of individual agency and result in transformation and just change. Thus, the argument on the precedence of human security over development, and vice versa could be taken further through posing a distinctive question central to HS.

Accordingly, the second problematic aspect comes to the fore by asking whether development within HS is truly a human-centric development. The rise of human-centric development is closely interlinked with “the evolution of development thinking” (Tadjbakhsh and Chenoy, 2007: 101-105). The drawback of state-centric “development economics” during the 1950s and the 1960s paves the way for “the Basic Needs approach” in the 1970s in order to focus on individuals (Tadjbakhsh and Chenoy, 103). However, “the Basic Needs approach” in the 1970s displays a particular problematic issue as well. This problematic issue derives from the North’s decision-making over the South. Bearing in mind the experiences of state-centric development and the North’s decision-making on development thinking and doing, UNDP (1994), CHS (2003) and Mahbub Ul Haq (1995) tries to advance human-centric approach to development compatible with human security. Yet, given the novelty of their approaches, state-centrism in HS renders human-centric development unlikely. In line with this, human-centric development is confronted with neo-liberal economics and neo-liberal model of development during 1980s and 1990s. According to Thomas (2001: 160), human insecurity is explicitly linked with “the application of the particular neoliberal model of development promoted in the 1980s and 1990s by global governance institutions.” However, even if the neo-liberal model of development focuses on individuals, its major concern is markets (Fierke, 2007: 150). Thus, it is necessary to tackle with the question of the compatibility of the neo-liberal model of development with HS in detail. Thomas (2000: 4) examines this issue through interrogating neo-liberal economics, which changes the direction from state-centric development to market-centric development:

Regarding future prospects for human security, there is a very simple but hugely important question as to whether the mechanisms in place to tackle poverty and to promote wider development are adequate to this task. In 1995, the UN set a target of a 50 per cent reduction in the number of people existing in absolute poverty by 2015. This outcome is to be delivered by any distributive mechanism, but rather the application of the particular neoliberal model of development promoted in the 1980s and the 1990s by global governance institutions. This model places its faith in the market rather than the state, and focuses on export-led growth based on free capital mobility.

By interrogating the compatibility of HS with neo-liberal economics, Thomas (2000, 22, 39–52; 2001) reaches a conclusion that neoliberal model of development is detrimental to human security all over the world. Accordingly, Spear and Williams (2013: 12–13) argues that neoliberal economics makes the market the referent-object of security. Thus, the neoliberal model of development helps flourish markets rather than individuals. While criticizing the state-centric development as detrimental to individuals, neoliberal model of development result in insecurities toward individuals by way of locating economy at the center of security.

Within this context, the UNDP (1994) and the CHS (2003) initiate to enhance lives of individuals. However, their conceptualization of HS based on security/development nexus cannot promise development for individuals due to the neo-liberal model of development prevailed in world economy and politics (Thomas and Williams, 2013: 300-305). Thus, an alternative development model derivative of a different political economy is necessary to pay attention to daily lives of individuals and their insecurities in order not to privilege states and markets. States and markets are means toward human security, not the ends for themselves.

### **3.5 Conclusion**

This chapter problematized the existing HS perspectives. The first section critiqued HS by laying bare the gendered relations of patriarchy. By doing so, it showed how the state-centric ontology of traditional security understanding confronts HS due to the lack of a gender perspective in HS. Thus, from the very beginning of the rise of HS as a novel perspective, state-centrism prevents HS from actualizing the promise of being human-centric. However, one of the sections of the next chapter will be paving the way for a non-gendered perspective on HS as one of the parts of the transformation part.

Second section examined the effect of national/supranational interest within HS. By problematizing the contradictory co-existence of the concern toward national/supranational interest with HS, the promise of being human-centric could not come to the fore due to national/supranational interest oriented foreign policies. Nevertheless, second section also signified the existing potential of the state if the role of the state is reconstructed within HS. In conjunction with this, one of the sections of the next chapter will lay out the reconstructed role of the state for a new perspective on HS.

Third section laid bare the problematic relationship between development and human security. Given the prioritization of the market in the neo-liberal development model, HS cannot be compatible with human-centric development. Yet, the contradictory prioritization of the market also formed the potential for a reconstructed role of the market. Accordingly, one of the sections of the next chapter will be discussing the changing role of the market for a novel perspective on HS. Within this context, the next chapter will be the transformation of HS into

a reconstructed perspective on HS through articulating a non-gendered view and a new role for states and markets.

## **CHAPTER IV:**

### **THE TRANSFORMATION OF HUMAN SECURITY INTO AN EMANCIPATORY HUMAN SECURITY PERSPECTIVE**

#### **4.1 Introduction**

This chapter investigates the way in which HS can be transformed into an emancipatory one. To this purpose, the chapter claims that the immanent contradictions of HS also constitutes the immanent potentialities toward an alternative HS perspective which is emancipatory and open to individual agency, transformation and just change. In this sense, the chapter involves four major sections. First section articulates the incompleteness of HS and paves the way for an emancipatory HS perspective in accordance with the instances of existing literature and EST's framework. Second section indicates the importance of the development of a human rights culture for EST and its relevancy for an emancipatory reconstruction of HS. Third section proposes the reconstruction of political communities in a bottom-up manner and discusses the cosmopolitan employment of HS by states. Fourth section puts forward an alternative model of

development which is human-centric. The chapter concludes by drawing attention to an emancipatory HS perspective in terms of its eligibility to fulfill the promise of being human-centric toward individual agency, transformation and just change.

## **4.2 An Opening for an Emancipatory Human Security Perspective**

HS is incomplete because of two points: (1) state-centrism and (2) market-centrism. State-centrism prevails due to the lack of a gender perspective in HS and the employment of HS for national/supranational interest orientation of countries and the EU. Market-centrism results from the neo-liberal model of development, which prioritizes markets rather than human-centric development. Bearing these problematic and contradictory points in mind, HS can reconstruct itself in accordance with the promise of being human-centric. In this sense, HS necessitates rethinking the role of the state as well as the role of the market. Emancipatory Security Theory's emphasis on the relation between security, community and economy toward the advancement of a human rights culture appear likely to transform HS into an emancipatory HS perspective due to EST's emphasis on "change" and "individual agency" as opposed to state-centrism and market-centrism (Booth, 2005; Linklater, 1998; 2005; Tooze, 2005).

To this end, EST has a potential to recover the promise of being human-centric within HS through articulating an emancipatory perspective for HS. Given few scholarly initiatives to understand and restructure HS in accordance with

EST, these initiatives do not systematically reconstruct HS. To illustrate, Shani and Pasha (2007) tries to pave the way for “a critical human security perspective” in conjunction with EST. However, their reading of EST affects their critical approach to HS because they think that EST’s focus on individuals is pre-political and transhistorical (Shani and Pasha, 2007: 198-199). Nevertheless, scholars of EST emphasize “individual in the making” (Bilgic, 2013b; Basu and Nunes, 2013). Thus, Shani and Pasha’s (2007) attempt to establish a dialogue between HS and EST do not promise “a critical human security perspective” in the way EST can put forward.

From different point of view, Richmond (2007) critiques “liberal peace” perspective imposed on HS because of its top-down institutionalization and tendency to international intervention. Instead of “liberal peace” perspective on HS, Richmond (2007: 461) argues the possibility of a bottom-up approach to HS:

The second approach derives from the critical impulse in IR, and offers a focus on emancipation as the aim of human security. This bottom-up approach means that individuals are empowered to negotiate and develop a form of human security that is fitted to their needs – political, economic, and social, but also provides them with the necessary tools to do so.

Accordingly, Richmond (2007: 461) puts forward the primacy of “local interests and particularities” together with the “universal project” of HS. Even if Richmond (2007) does not draw on EST’s conceptual language and its operationalization, his analysis can be considered as a form of immanent critique of HS. First, Richmond (2007) signifies the weakness of “liberal peace” perspective on HS conducive to top-down institutionalization and international intervention. Second, by going beyond this contradictory dimension, Richmond (2007) offers a reconstructed version of HS for peace-building purposes. This sort of analysis on HS provides



analytical points in terms of an emancipatory way of thinking and doing on HS for the reconstruction purpose of this chapter.

In terms of establishing a particular dialogue between HS and EST, Newman (2010) questions whether HS and EST can contribute to each other. By drawing on EST, Newman (2010) conducts his research through comparing the promise of HS with EST in order to open the way to “critical human security studies.” In this sense, Newman’s (2010) attempt is an introductory reconstructive dialogue between HS against the reluctance of critical approaches to security to engage with HS. Accordingly, Newman (2010) critiques this particular reluctance and his research paves the way for a future direction toward reconstruction. In doing so, HS can overcome its “central paradox”: “it apparently calls for a critique of the structures and norms that produce human insecurity, yet the ontological starting point of most human security scholarship and its policy orientation reinforce these structures and norms” (Newman, 2010: 88). Regarding the ontological departure of HS, Newman (2010: 89) further argues that “human security generally adopts a policy oriented approach which attempts to improve human welfare within the political, legal and practical parameters of the ‘real world’.” By pointing to the central paradox of HS and its functioning under the existing parameters of the international system, Newman (2010) opens the way for the likelihood of a reconstructive dialogue between HS and EST. Compared to Richmond’s (2007) analysis of an emancipatory form of HS through peace-building, Newman’s (2010) study directly draw on the likely reconstruction of HS with reference to EST.

In conjunction with this, the scholarly initiative of Newman (2010) can be further advanced by systematically drawing on EST’s framework (Booth, 2005;

2007; Bilgin, 2005; 2013; Bilgiç, 2013a; 2014). In doing so, the likelihood of the transformation of HS into an emancipatory HS perspective comes to the fore. In this regard, Booth (2005d: 181) argues how the analysis of a security issue can be conducted through analyzing security stemming from emancipatory politics as follows:

Emancipation is the theory and practice of inventing humanity, with a view to freeing people, as individuals and collectivities, from contingent and structural oppressions. It is a discourse of human self-creation and the politics of trying to bring it about. Security and community are guiding principles, and at this stage of history the growth of a universal human rights culture is central to emancipatory politics. The concept of emancipation shapes strategies and tactics of resistance, offers a theory of progress for society, and gives a politics of hope for common humanity.

In this regard, the development of a universal human rights culture forms the main axis of EST because it helps to rethink and reconstruct security and community as well as economy in accordance with emancipation (Booth, 2005d; Linklater, 1998: 2005; Tooze, 2005; Tickner, 1992). According to Booth (2005c: 109), “emancipatory communities, in recognizing the right of individuals to express themselves through multiple identifiers of difference, will, above all, celebrate human equality.” Furthermore, Booth (2005c: 110) argues the necessity of a particular type of political economy which do not prevent individuals from articulating themselves in a non-restrictive way. In other words, “material emancipatory changes are realized through the means recovering voice, while changing material structures better enables movement towards an open deliberative context” (McDonald, 2012: 46). Thus, EST’s framework proposes the development of a human rights culture in order to pave the way for emancipatory global politics constructing communities, structures and political economies toward overcoming multiple insecurities of individuals and recovering their

agencies and the likelihood of change (Booth, 2005d; Linklater, 1998; 2005; Tooze, 2005).

### **4.3 The Implication of a Human Rights Culture for Human Security**

With regard to the development of a human rights culture (Booth, 1999a; 1999b; 1999c; Booth, 2005d; Booth, 2007: 378-392), Booth's (1999c: 33) emphasis on the development of a human rights culture is not one of ahistorical perspectives on human rights. Rather, by drawing on "the key move" to "anthropologise and historicise human rights," Booth (1999c) criticizes "ahistorical presentism," "cultural essentialism," and "the scientific objectivity."

By elucidating "ahistorical presentism," Booth (1999c: 35-36) argues that presentism help maintain particular "power structures," "traditional values," communitarian "political realism" hostile to human rights. Open-endedness of social potential of the human can overcome "ahistorical presentism." Booth (1999c: 32) frames this assertion through proposing "sociality theory." By critiquing "cultural essentialism," Booth (1999c: 36-38) asserts that cultural essentialism means "the reduction of social and political explanations to culture" and turning cultures into "exclusivist identity-referents." Accordingly, cultural essentialism protects the interests of traditional elites through concealing their political motives and interests with reference to cultural authenticity. In line with this, Booth offers emancipation as solution to cultural essentialism in order to

pave the way for the development of a human rights culture.<sup>9</sup> By shedding light on “the scientific objectivity,” Booth (1999c: 46-48) examines positivist fact-value distinction and the concern on objectivity in order to lay bare how this sort of scientific practice help reproduce the status-quo oriented world-view of realism(s). Hence, the development of a human rights culture cannot flourish under the guidance of “scientific objectivity” because “what purports to be value-free/objective/apolitical/positivist analysis can merely be a cloak for status quo thinking (and therefore value)” (Booth, 1999c: 47).

Within this context, the rise and development of a human rights culture can be integrated to HS, and correspondingly, its promise of being human-centric (Booth, 2005d). Accordingly, distinctive reconstruction of security and community serves as “guiding principles” toward it (Booth, 2005d; 181). In terms of thinking the reconstruction of HS, EST’s commitment to the development of a human rights culture together with the emphasis on security and community can be a guiding move. What’s more, an appropriate form of development stemming from a human-centric stance is also necessary because “security, community and economics are inseparable” (Booth, 2005c; Thomas, 1999; Tooze, 2005). That is to say, in terms of discussing the particular construction of political community as well as political economy, EST can intertwine the emancipatory construction of political communities through dialogue with the reduction of material inequalities in order to transform HS into an emancipatory security perspective (Booth, 2005c: 110; McDonald, 2012: 46). Now, the next section of the chapter will be proceeding by offering likely alternative construction of political communities for

---

<sup>9</sup> This claim actually tries to lay bare particular political programmes behind cultural essentialism. In this sense, Booth (1999) does not oppose to “difference,” traditions and cultures. Rather, he problematizes the political abuse of cultures through articulating cultural authenticity.

the realization of the promise of being human-centric. In this sense, an alternative political community can help overcome multiple insecurities of individual toward enabling individual agency and resulting in transformation and just change.

#### **4.4 The Construction of Non- Gendered Emancipatory Dialogic Communities for Human Security**

Drawing on Booth's (2007: 112) formulation of emancipation as "the philosophy, theory, and politics of inventing humanity," HS can transform itself into an emancipatory HS perspective that can realize the promise of being human-centric toward overcoming multiple insecurities of individuals. In this sense, the development of a human rights culture is central to emancipatory politics of human security.

In conjunction with this, the transformation of HS into an emancipatory HS perspective can take place by locating human security at the intersection of security, community, political economy because emancipatory politics of human security can take place through analyzing the role of the state as well as the role of the market (Booth, 2005c). In this regard, an emancipatory HS perspective draws on the redefined notions of community and economy to go beyond state-centrism and market-centrism in human security. This brings us to the question of what kind of political community and political economy can help recover the immanent potential of HS, and correspondingly, transform it into an emancipatory HS

perspective. At this point, the chapter will be proceeding through respectively examining the reconstruction of political community in the following part of this section and the likely restructuring of economy in the next section.

Drawing on the conceptual language of EST, the transformation of HS security into an emancipatory security perspective can take place through articulating HS stemming from non-gendered emancipatory political communities based on dialogic structures as opposed to the unequal hierarchical structures of “bounded communities” constructed upon exclusionary practices (Linklater, 1998: 15-45, 84-85, 90-92, 100-108). According to Linklater (2005: 116), “however one chooses to define security, there can be no doubt that it has to be underpinned by the appropriate form of political community.” In addition to this, Linklater (2005: 120-121) further argues that individuals can overcome their insecurities through “domination-free” communication based on “dialogue.”

By intertwining emancipation with dialogue, “essentialist accounts of political community” that is not accountable to the excluded can be replaced with “dialogic arrangements” that do not function at the expense of others or favor the privileged over others (Linklater, 2005: 120-121). By doing so, the likelihood of the emancipatory construction of political communities can take place. In line with this, regarding the emancipatory construction of political communities, Booth (2005c: 109) argues that

communities in general are social organizations whose separateness expresses human variety, but an emancipatory community will recognize that people have multiple identities, that a person’s identity cannot be defined by one attribution, and that people must be allowed to live simultaneously in a variety of communities. Emancipatory communities, in recognizing the right of individuals to express themselves through multiple identifiers of difference, will, above all, celebrate human equality.

In this regard, emancipatory politics of human security is likely to start out its inquiry by offering a non-gendered stance on security for emancipatory reconstruction of political communities from the very beginning. Because a non-gendered stance of emancipatory political communities for human security can overcome particular binary oppositions, an emancipatory HS perspective can construct itself in a “bottom-up” manner (Hoogensen and Stuvoy, 2006). According to Tickner (1992: 19), “distinctions between domestic and foreign, inside and outside, order and anarchy, and center and periphery have served as important assumptions in theory construction and as organizing principles for the way we view the world.” HS help maintain these binaries because of the state-centrism, which reproduces these binary distinctions. However, the prevailed state-centrism within HS, which maintains these binary oppositions, can be transcended (Newman, 2014; Williams, 2004). Accordingly, an emancipatory HS perspective is likely to offer individual agency and just change at the bottom.

In this sense, a non-gendered stance on HS can begin with the experiences of women and men resulting from a gendered hierarchical structures and their particular places vis-à-vis states and the international system. To illustrate, Gibson and Reardon (2007: 51) exemplify the prevailed “gender roles” in wars and normal lives with reference to “socially tolerated male violence” resulting from gendered hierarchies pervading societies and states. What’s more, Reardon (2010) analyzes the international system as a war system stemming from patriarchal gender relations. Bearing these instances in mind, a non-gendered stance on HS takes insecurities of individuals and communities into consideration at first hand. In this sense, a non-gendered perspective aim to enable individual agency and just

change by way of making individuals their own security providers without unequal gender hierarchies. Thus, a non-gendered stance on HS embarks on this process through going beyond insecurities at the bottom. According to Tickner (2001: 61-62), a feminist perspective on HS<sup>10</sup> engages with security issues “at the bottom” by way of focusing on “the individual or community” at first hand rather than “the state or the international system.” Furthermore, Tickner (2001: 62) claims that a feminist perspective on HS opens the way for a non-gendered stance on HS by way of problematizing “social hierarchies” at the bottom and developing “an emancipatory type of security.” Hence, the “bottom-up” approach to HS through a non-gendered perspective paves the way for change from individuals to the international as Detraz (2012: 149) claims through taking gender identity into consideration:

Gender identity offers a bottom-up foundational logic for understanding human security that gets around narrowing our forces to the individual in such a way that we lose sight of sources of vulnerabilities and power relationships. Gender identity, then, may be a way to make human security a more useful discourse for encouraging change in the international community.

Bearing in mind a non-gendered stance on HS toward an emancipatory HS perspective, “empowerment” strategies of the CHS (2003) by drawing on the UNDP (1994), “systems of disempowerment” can be laid bare and fundamental questions comes to the fore. In a similar vein, the issues of individual agency and change through human security can be realized by intertwining a non-gendered stance with HS. By drawing on this insight, HS can overcome its fundamental paradox:

---

<sup>10</sup> When Tickner (2001) refers to human security, her conception of human security does not stem from the documents of the UNDP (1994) or the CHS (2003). Rather, Tickner (2001) frames human security in accordance with critical theory conducive to emancipation.



The UN's human security initiatives do not fundamentally question existing structures and institutions of power, gender, and distribution in relation to economic and political organization. The UN, while in some ways promoting the individual as the referent object of security even when this is in tension with the state, is more likely to see a strong state as a necessary requirement for individual security, even though many member states of the UN have dubious human rights records (Newman, 2014: 231).

Thus, beginning with a non-gendered stance on HS, the effect of state-centric discourses on HS starts to change and open the way for individual agency and change in the way HS operationalized. Thus, to transform HS into an emancipatory HS perspective is to reconstruct the promise of HS, that is, the promise of being human-centric toward overcoming multiple insecurities of individuals in conjunction with the emphasis on openness toward individual agency and change. Beginning with a non-gendered stance on HS in order to reconstruct emancipatory political communities toward realizing individual agency and change, the state-centric dimension of the UN system can be questioned in terms of an emancipatory HS perspective.

In this regard, while proposing HS as a new way of analyzing and solving insecurities of individuals, the UN system also make its own system questionable. Newman (2014: 231) asserts that “as an organization based on upon sovereign states, the UN reflects a pluralist view of international politics, and this has implications for its approach to human security.” Hence, the UN's system stemming from a pluralist worldview is actually in tension with the promise of HS proposed by the UN (Newman, 2014: 232). Even if the UN's human security conception offers a new focus on security thinking and doing by claiming to make individuals the referent object of security, “the pluralist politics of the UN”

undermines the promise of HS because of the concern on the protection of “state sovereignty in a quite conventional Westphalian way” (Newman, 2014: 232).

Together with “the pluralist politics of the UN” (Newman, 2014), state-centric understanding of international politics, and correspondingly, foreign policies of states downplay the promise of HS. In this sense, Burgess (2008: 61) argues that HS accepts “the principles of realism” that involves “the state,” “the opposition between morality and politics,” “power” as well as national security and national interest. Burgess (2008: 58) argues that

In order to make sense of human security, its relation to more conventional or traditional-bound notions of security must be clarified. What is the essence of “security” in human security? Is there one at all? And, inversely, what of the human can be derived from the notion of security?

In conjunction with these crucial questions, Burgess (2008: 58) scrutinizes the problematic aspects of HS. His interrogation of HS signifies the before discussed state-centrism within HS. Accordingly, by employing HS in their foreign policies, governments do not change their priorities (Booth, 2007: 321-327). They do not favor the promise of being human-centric in the sense that HS claims. Rather, they pursue their national interests. Thus, they reproduce the prevailed state-centrism, and correspondingly, cause insecurities. Furthermore, they do not question systemic insecurities as well (Booth, 2007: 326; Thomas, 1999).

In conjunction with this, given the pluralist view of international politics and security prevailed within the UN system as well as the realist view of international politics and security appeared in foreign policies of countries, the promise of HS toward overcoming multiple insecurities of individuals can go beyond these configurations of international politics (Suhrke, 1999; Williams,

2004; Newman, 2014). By interrogating the centrality of state within HS, the transformation of HS into a truly emancipatory HS perspective can be realized through articulating newer roles for states in conjunction with cosmopolitan purposes (Booth, 2007: 144-148; Held, 1995). Because the transformation of traditional national security / national interest oriented states into cosmopolitan states have profound implications for the achievement of the promise of HS, and correspondingly, global governance and world politics.

In this sense, an emancipatory HS perspective can pave the way for rethinking existing foreign policies of countries and current structures of international organizations toward construction of emancipatory political communities (Thomas, 2000). Accordingly, an emancipatory HS perspective can help grow a human rights culture in the world. By doing so, both the meanings of becoming a human and realizing security can be opened to individual agency and change. Hence, by drawing attention to individual agency and change, an emancipatory HS perspective is like to offer an alternative to HS, which is comfortable with existing parameters of the international system.

Booth (2007: 142) argues that “the history of Westphalian ‘nation-state’ building” is inclined to homogenize different individuals, groups and communities under the rubric of nation-state. Thus, the project of nation-state building fails to represent the excluded, the oppressed and the voiceless. In this regard, the promise of being human-centric cannot be fulfilled unless the “bounded community” understanding of realism(s) that reinforces state-centrism within the existing HS perspective is transformed (Linklater, 1998; 2005). Furthermore, as analyzed in chapter III, the national interest orientation of states and the EU cannot be rethought and transformed into a more cosmopolitan outlook unless the

realist outlook of states changes. In conjunction with this, Booth (2007: 142) offers alternative construction of political community as opposed to the project of nation-state building:

If enlightened world order values are to be operationalized, political community must be transformative, open, and reflexive; in other words, better able to reconcile the *I* and the *we* at all levels. This means a pattern of multilevel global governance made up networks of emancipatory communities above and below the state, with the latter metamorphosing into Beck's *cosmopolitan states* which – in contrast to 'national states', which see any blurring of the border between the domestic / foreign realms as a threat to their existence – 'emphasize the necessity of solidarity with foreigners both inside and outside the national borders'. Cosmopolitan states, unlike the Westphalian model, would be sensitive to their limits.

Accordingly, EST's commitment to development of a human rights culture can open the way for a novel type of political community that restructures the role of the state within HS toward enabling change and individual agency. Thus, the promise of being human-centric can be truly recovered.

In this sense, Booth (2007: 268) argues that "community is the site of security." By transforming HS into an emancipatory security perspective, HS interrogates "the bounded community" and can help to construct emancipatory communities for human security (Linklater, 1998). To this end, a non-gendered stance on HS forms one of the fundamental pillars of an emancipatory HS perspective. Another reconstructive stance results from the interrogation of "the central paradox of the UN system" with reference to sovereign states and human security at the same time. The last reconstructive stance can be derived from the role of states in foreign-policy making because states such as Canada, Norway, Japan and the EU employs HS in conjunction with their interests (Suhrke, 1999; Burgess and Tadjbakhsh, 2010; Matlary, 2011). Contrary to this point, a

reconstructed role for states forms one of the fundamental pillars of an emancipatory HS perspective as well. All of these reconstructive analyses can be further strengthened by discussing an alternative to the market-centric neo-liberal model of development. Now, the chapter will be proceeding by analyzing this aspect.

#### **4.5 Development and Human Security**

EST can provide HS with the tools of examining the prevailed market-centric neo-liberal model of development. Hence, EST helps reconstruct HS in accordance with rethinking market-centrism together with state-centrism (Bilgin, 2013; Bilgiç, 2013a; 2014; Linklater, 1998, 2005; Tooze, 2005; Thomas, 1999; 2000). By drawing on EST's emphasis on the interconnectedness between security, community and economy, an alternative reconstruction of political communities for an emancipatory HS security necessitates rethinking the role of the market in order to achieve human security (Thomas, 1999; 2000; 2001). In this sense, rethinking the role of the market can help go beyond the market-centric neo-liberal model of development. Furthermore, it can recover the voice of the voiceless by reducing material inequalities and insufficiencies in order to open the way for an appropriate development.

In this regard, transformation of the neo-liberal market centric model of development into the redefined role of the market for an emancipatory HS

perspective can be performed through analyzing existing literature and offering an alternative in line with EST. By drawing on the mistakes of liberal peace-building, Newman (2011: 1749) develops a critical stance on HS:

A critical approach to human security leads us to question and, if necessary, challenge existing constructions such as state sovereignty, 'high politics', national interest and the market. Critical approaches question or challenge prevailing structures of power and power relations, and also prevailing discourses or ways of thinking. Human security encourages us to interrogate and problematize the values and institutions which currently exist as they relate to human welfare, and more thoroughly question the interests that are served the these institutions.

In this regard, the development of a critical stance on the relationship between development and human security is likely to open the way for the reconstruction of the role of the market together with the previously proposed alternative for the role of the state (Booth, 2005c).

In terms of human-centric development, market-centrism prevailed within HS due to the neo-liberal model of development has been much criticized by numerous scholars (Tooze, 2005; Shani, 2007b; Thomas, 1999; 2000; 2007). According to Shani (2007b), even if the development dimension of HS aims to advance capacities of individuals toward overcoming their insecurities, this dimension clashed with a particular structuring of world political economy around "neo-liberal economics" or "the Washington Consensus (Thomas and Williams, 2013; Tooze, 2005). In order to transcend these particular limits, HS can pursue a different direction in order to actualize its immanent potential, that is, the promise of being human-centric.

Development is one of the immanent contradictions within HS. Yet, it is also one of the immanent potentials toward transforming HS into an emancipatory

security perspective. In this sense, an alternative model of development can help rethink the role of the market within HS (Thomas, 1999; 2000; Newman, 2010; 2011). By drawing attention to the role of the market, an emancipatory HS perspective can go beyond or the prevailed market-centrism and the way for a new sort of political economy which can restructure the role of the market and the aim of development (Thomas, 2000; Tooze, 2005).

In this context, EST can propose some utilizable insights in order to transform market-centric development into human-centric development because this line of reasoning also helps strengthen the redefined role of the state for an emancipatory HS perspective. To illustrate, EST can intertwine development issues with a critical international political economy perspective (Tooze, 2005). In terms of human security, Newman (2010: 93) argues that while “international financial institutions” help foster development through “poverty alleviations” and “employment generation,” they also cause to the disempowerment of “communities and results in social deprivation.” In this sense, according to Newman (2010:93), these issues have to be examined “within the broader liberal market context” or the prevailed neoliberal model of development. Otherwise, HS contributes to systemic human insecurity (Booth, 2007: 326).

Similar to the likelihood of the transformation of the bounded community understanding of HS into an emancipatory political community (Booth, 2005c; Linklater, 1998: 2005), the neoliberal market-centric development focus can be transformed through putting forward a human-centric development. In this regard, Thomas (2000: 161) develops a human security perspective conducive to overcoming market-centric causes of human insecurities:

The concept of human security pursued here differs fundamentally from notions of ‘security of the individual’, conceived in the currently fashionable neo-liberal sense. Human security is far removed from liberal notions of competitive and possessive individualism (ie the extension of private power and activity, based around property rights and choice in market place). Rather, 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 community, can be realized. Such human security is indivisible; it cannot be pursued at the expense of others.

In conjunction with this, Thomas (1999; 2000; 2001: 161) intertwines “the material dimension of human security” with “non-material dimension” in order to go beyond “physical survival.” Together with material satisfaction in terms of basic needs, Thomas (2000: 162) integrates human security with development through articulating “personal autonomy,” “control over one’s life,” and “unhindered participation in the life of the community.” What’s more, Thomas (2000: 162) argues the importance of “emancipation from oppressive power structures, be they global, national or local in origin and scope”<sup>11</sup> for human security.

In this context, Thomas (1999; 2000; 2001) re-conceptualizes HS in an emancipatory manner by questioning the market-centric development of neo-liberalism. This sort of analysis offers an alternative by putting forward “personal autonomy,” “control over one’s life,” and “unhindered participation in the life of the community” (Thomas, 2000). Indeed, this three-pillar articulation can pave the way for individual agency and change.

---

<sup>11</sup> The way Thomas (2000) employs emancipation for the achievement of human security differs from the way Booth (1991; 2007) conceptualizes emancipation for Emancipatory Security Theory. However, Booth (2007: 322) emphasizes the similar way in order to analyze a security issue from an emancipatory perspective by evaluating the works of Thomas (1999; 2000; 2001).



## **4.6 Conclusion**

This chapter developed an emancipatory HS perspective. In this regard, first section evaluated the unfulfilled potential of HS and showed how an emancipatory perspective on HS could be advanced. Second section drew attention to the centrality of a human rights culture for EST and its likely potential for an emancipatory HS perspective because EST's dynamic approach to human rights provided HS with a novel way of rethinking the role of the state as well as the role of the market.

By drawing on EST's conceptualization of political community, third section argued that problems resulting from state-centrism such as the lack of a gender perspective and the supra/national interest orientation of countries and the EU within HS could be transcended through articulating a non-gendered emancipatory and cosmopolitan political community. A non-gendered emancipatory political community was likely to provide opportunities to the voiceless, the unheard and the oppressed in order to overcome their particular insecurities. In addition this, the proper functioning of a non-gendered political community necessitated rethinking the development aspect of HS.

The fourth section of the chapter offered an alternative to the market-centric neo-liberal model of development because of neo-liberalism's prioritization of market over individuals. Instead of this, the section frames a human-centric development conducive to material satisfaction as well as "personal autonomy," "control over one's life" and "unhindered participation in the life of the community" (Thomas, 2001).

The transformation of HS into an emancipatory HS perspective was likely to actualize individual agency and change in a bottom-up manner and going beyond the existing parameters of the international system. In conjunction with this, human security could realize its promise of being human-centric.

## **CHAPTER V:**

### **CONCLUSION**

This thesis set out with the aim of (1) investigating the current predicament of HS and (2) offering a transformative alternative to HS. To this aim, the thesis attempted to draw out a novel perspective on HS which is an emancipatory HS perspective. Because many scholars criticized the way in which HS did not fulfill the promise of being human-centric toward enabling individual agency and change, HS turned out to be insufficient to realize what it promised. Nevertheless, the contradictions within HS provided the sources of an emancipatory HS perspective because the existing contradictions of HS were the potentials of HS as well.

In this sense, the first chapter tried to establish a reconstructive dialogue between HS by drawing on distinctive critical approaches to security. Each critical approach to security provided profound insights on the weaknesses and strengths of HS. To illustrate, Securitization Theory (ST) claimed that HS did not put forward a framework to analyze security issues or HS fell into a trap of the securitization of issues such as human rights, identity. However, bearing in mind

these critical insights of ST on HS, ST's approach to HS turned out to be incompatible with the way HS deals with security issues. ST's understanding on the politics of security sheds light on the political use of security language by elites in order to take issues beyond the reach of normal politics (Weaver, 1995; Buzan et al., 1998). Accordingly, the realm of normal politics referred to the desecuritized realm.

Contrary to the normal politics of the desecuritized realm, emergency politics took place in the security realm. Hence, the issues within HS such as human rights, identity, and development cannot be examined through the use of ST's framework by analyzing these issues under the rubric of desecuritized realm, which avoids employing security language. Furthermore, the negative implications of the emergency politics of the security realm could not help to conduct a reconstructive research on HS, which had positive implications on security. Therefore, the likelihood of a dialogue between ST and HS fell short in accordance with the rethinking of HS. Yet, ST's criticism on the lack of the framework for analyzing security issues signified one of the weaknesses of HS.

Another critical approach to security stems from sociological approaches to security. By drawing on the sociological processes of security practices, a sociological approach to security advanced a novel securitization theory which focuses on "practices, context, and power relations" (Balzac, 2011). In this sense, security practices actually revealed how security and insecurity were intertwined with each other through the process of in/securitization managed by security professionals and politicians in order to administer citizens, populations, communities and states. Therefore, sociological approaches to security laid bare the use of security as "another technique of government" to delimit the scope of

freedom, mobility, in/security with reference to fear, risk, criminality, and terrorism (Huysmans, 2006; Bigo, 2013). Thus, the process of in/securitization process showed how security was manipulated as an exclusionary mechanism.

Sociological approaches to security and their takes on HS provided analytical insights on the employment of HS. In terms of establishing a dialogue between sociological approaches to security and HS, HS also became an exclusionary mechanism to govern and shape individuals, populations and communities for “global liberal rule” regardless of taking different contexts and cultures into consideration (Doucet and de Larrinaga, 2011). By deconstructing the associated world-view of HS conducive to a particular way of being a human as well as a state, this sort of analysis showed that HS could not be sensitive to the insecurities of individuals and communities in different contexts as well as cultures. Nevertheless, sociological approaches to HS signified the development of a new sort of political subjectivities going beyond a particular type of an individual as well as a state. Therefore, by shedding light on the processes of security practices, sociological approaches to security provided a fertile imagination on how to come up with the novel sources of being an individual as well as a political community. In this regard, their approach to HS paved the way for a sociological dialogue between purposes of security practices and HS. Yet, its own stance did not aim to offer an alternative for HS in a reconstructive sense. Furthermore, sociological approaches to HS mostly focused on state-driven security practices by politicians, experts and third parties.

Similar to ST’s negative outlook on security, sociological approaches to security embodied the negative take on security because of the way it investigated how security practices functioned as a tool of boundary drawing between insiders

and outsiders, citizens and non-citizens, normal and abnormal, security and insecurity. In this sense, their interrogation of HS reflected the way in which these boundary activities helped govern and shape the lives of individuals, populations, communities. Accordingly, the dialogue between sociological approaches to security and HS did not provide HS with vital tools of rethinking HS in a reconstructive manner. What's more, both ST and sociological approaches to security fell under the rubric of "state-centrism" and "security professionalism" even if their engagement with state-led security practices were in-depth critical studies (Bilgin, 2013; Bilgiç, 2013; 2014). Thus, their dialogue with HS was rather limited.

Contrary to ST and sociological approaches to security, Emancipatory Security Theory (EST) opened the way for rethinking HS toward its reconstruction. Because EST politicized each security theory stemming from a distinctive political theory, EST aimed to reveal political values surrounding every security theories. In this sense, security did not necessarily have a negative content. Distinctive stances on the politics of security determined the content of security. EST helped alternative voices on security to represent themselves apart from the security language of state-led security practices. By drawing on emancipatory politics, EST advanced a security theory with "the idea of emancipation" (Booth, 1991; 2007). The object of emancipation was individuals (Bilgiç, 2013). The dialogue between EST and HS was underdeveloped except few instances. EST's security framework, and correspondingly, its emphasis on rethinking security, community and economy could help reconstruct HS. In conjunction with this, through the method of immanent critique, the problematic issues within HS could be (1) problematized and (2) transformed for an

emancipatory HS perspective. Accordingly, the promise of being human-centric could be recovered toward enabling individual agency and change. Chapter III and IV respectively problematized HS and transform it into an emancipatory HS perspective.

The third chapter of the thesis determined two interrelated contradictions within HS: (1) state-centrism and (2) market-centrism. One of the instances of state-centrism resulted from the lack of the incorporation of a gender perspective into HS. The lack of a gender perspective within HS revealed the clash between the state-centric ontology of traditional security studies and the promise of being human-centric within HS. In this sense, the lack of a gender perspective showed the ontological indeterminacy of HS because while HS promised to be a human-centric approach, it attempted to function under the rubric of “father figure of the state” and coexist with the concerns of national security and national interest.

Another instance of state-centrism resulted from national interest orientation of states because states such as Canada, Norway, Japan and the EU as a supranational body employed HS in accordance with their national interests. In this sense, they utilized the language of HS without actually changing their state-centric mindsets. Thus, they enhanced their roles in the international system. In line with this, HS was coopted by national security/national interest orientation of states.

In a similar vein, market-centrism constituted another contradiction in terms of development because the market-centric neo-liberal model of development informed HS by making markets the referent-object of development instead of individuals. Therefore, the neo-liberal model of development prioritized markets

over individuals. In this regard, the contradictory existence of the neo-liberal model of development within HS could not lead to the realization of the promise of being human-centric. Nevertheless, the contradictory aspects stemming from the lack of a gender perspective and national orientation of states under the rubric of state-centrism and the market-centric neo-liberal model of development constituted the potentials of HS as well.

Chapter IV put forward a likely alternative to HS. In line with this, the reconstruction of HS embarked on the development of a human rights culture proposed by EST in order to pave the way for transcending state-centrism and market-centrism. In this sense, this move enabled the likely transformation of HS into an emancipatory HS perspective by going beyond ahistorical “presentism,” essentialist “culturalism” and objectivist “positivism” (Booth 1999c).

Drawing on the development of a human rights culture necessitated the likely new forms of structures, communities and economies toward realizing the promise of being human-centric. In this sense, rethinking a political community for an emancipatory HS perspective began with articulating a non-gendered stance at the bottom. Because a non-gendered stance on the construction of a political community provided individuals with “the domination free communication,” individuals could overcome their particular insecurities (Linklater, 1998). Accordingly, individual agency and change became realizable from the very beginning by contributing to the on-going construction of political community. In line with this, the realist outlook of states replaced with a cosmopolitan outlook which is consistent with transcending the bounded community imagination of states as well as a non-gendered stance on the construction of political community.



In terms of development, the primacy of market within the neo-liberal model of development led to rethink the role of the market for an emancipatory HS perspective. An emancipatory HS perspective attempted to satisfy material needs as well as non-material needs of individuals. Therefore, the role of the market could be reconstructed by providing material needs of individuals without damaging “personal autonomy,” “control over one’s life,” and “unhindered participation in the life of the community” (Thomas, 2001). With regard to these aspects of the reconstructed role of the market, individuals were likely to obtain their material needs without losing their way of life. Within this context, an emancipatory HS perspective realized promise of being human-centric by proposing an alternative reconstruction of political community as well as market toward enabling individual agency and just change.

Furthermore, the proposed emancipatory HS perspective can be supported with further research. To illustrate, different methods such as participatory action research, semi-structured interviews and focus-group interviews can be utilized to gather analytical insights on further development of this alternative HS perspective. Different cases can show how an emancipatory human security analysis sheds light on the insecurities of individuals in different contexts and cultures.

## SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albrecht, Ulrich, Christine Chinkin, Kemal Dervis, Renate Dwan, Anthony Giddens, Nicole Gnesotto, Mary Kaldor, Sonia Licht, Jan Pronk, Klaus Reinhardt, Genevieve Schmeder, Pavel Seifter and Narcis Serra. 2004. *A human security doctrine for Europe: the Barcelona Report of the Study Group on Europe's Security Capabilities*. Barcelona: Study Group on Europe's Security Capabilities. [http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/40209/1/A\\_human\\_security\\_doctrine\\_for\\_Europe%28author%29.pdf](http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/40209/1/A_human_security_doctrine_for_Europe%28author%29.pdf) [accessed 03.06.2014].
- Albrecht, Ulrich, Christine Chinkine, Gemma Collantes Celador, Stefanie Flechtner, Marlies Glasius, Mary Kaldor, Kimmo Kiljunen, Jan Klabbers, Jenny Kuper, Sonia Licht, Flavio Lotti, Klaus Reinhardt, Genevieve Schmeder, Pavel Seifter, Narcis Serra and Gert Weisskirchen. 2007. *A European way of security: the Madrid Report of the Human Security Study Group*. Madrid: Human Security Study Group. [http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/40207/1/A\\_European\\_Way\\_of\\_Security%28author%29.pdf](http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/40207/1/A_European_Way_of_Security%28author%29.pdf) [accessed 03.06.2014].
- Alker, Hayward. 2005. "Emancipation in the Critical Security Studies Project." In Ken Booth, ed., *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*. Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner, 189-213.
- Alt, Suvi. 2011. "Problematizing Life under Biopower: A Foucauldian versus an Agambenite Critique of Human Security." In David Chandler and Nik Hynek, eds., *Critical Perspectives on Human Security: Rethinking Emancipation and Power in International Relations*. Oxon: Routledge, 144-156.

- Atanassova-Cornelis, Elena. 2005. "Japan and the 'Human Security' Debate: History, Norms and Pro-active Foreign Policy," *Graduate Journal of Asia-Pacific Studies* 3(2): 58-74.
- Ashley, Richard K. 1981. "Political Realism Human Interests," *International Studies Quarterly* 25(2): 204-236.
- Axworthy, Lloyd. 1997. "Canada and Human Security: the Need for Leadership," *International Journal* 52(2): 183-196.
- Axworthy, Lloyd. 1999. *Human Security: Safety for People in a Changing World*. Ottawa: Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade.
- Axworthy, Lloyd. 2001. "Introduction." In Rob McRae and Don Hubert, eds., *Human Security and the New Diplomacy: Protecting People, Promoting Peace*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 3-13.
- Balzacq, Thierry. 2011. "A Theory of Securitization: Origins, Core Assumptions, and Variants." In Thierry Balzacq, ed., *Securitization Theory: How Security Problems Emerge and Dissolve*. Oxon: Routledge, 1-30.
- Balzacq, Thierry, Tugba Basaran, Didier Bigo, Emmanuel-Pierre Giuttet and Christian Olsson. 2010. "Security Practices." In Robert A. Denemark, ed., *International Studies Encyclopedia Online*. Blackwell Publishing. Blackwell Reference Online. 18 March 2010  
[http://www.isacompendium.com/subscriber/tocnode?id=g9781444336597\\_chunk\\_g978144433659718\\_ss1-2](http://www.isacompendium.com/subscriber/tocnode?id=g9781444336597_chunk_g978144433659718_ss1-2)
- Basu, Soumita, 2011. "Security as Emancipation: A Feminist Perspective." In J. Ann Tickner and Laura Sjoberg, eds., *Feminism and International Relations: Conversation about the Past, Present and Future*. Oxon: Routledge, 98-114.

- Basu, Soumita and Joao Nunes. 2013. "Security as Emancipation." In Laura Shepherd, ed., *Critical Approaches to Security: An Introduction to Theories and Methods*. Oxon: Routledge: 63-76.
- Bellamy, Alex J. and Matt McDonald. 2002. "'The Utility of Human Security': Which Humans? What Security? A Reply to Thomas & Tow," *Security Dialogue* 33(3): 373-377.
- Bigo, Didier. 2002. "Security and Immigration: Toward a Critique of the Governmentality of Unease," *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 27(1): 63-92.
- Bigo, Didier. 2013. "International Political Sociology." In Paul D. Williams, ed., *Security Studies: An Introduction*. Oxon: Routledge, 120-133.
- Bilgic, Ali. 2013a. *Rethinking Security in the Age of Migration: Trust and Emancipation in Europe*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Bilgic, Ali. 2013b. "Emancipation and Trust: Individual in the Making." Paper presented at the BISA Annual Conference on "Beyond the Ivory Tower: IR and Real World," held in Birmingham, the United Kingdom, June 20,21.
- Bilgic, Ali. 2014. "Exploring 'What's Good about Security': Politics of Security during the dissolution of Yugoslavia," *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies* 16(2): 260-278.
- Bilgin, Pinar. 2004. "International Politics of Women's (In)security: Rejoinder to Mary Caprioli," *Security Dialogue* 35(4): 499-504.
- Bilgin, Pinar. 2005. *Regional Security in the Middle East*. Oxon: Routledge.

- Bilgin, Pinar. 2007. "Making Turkey's Transformation Possible: Claiming 'Security-speak' – not Desecuritization!," *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies* 7(4): 555-571.
- Bilgin, Pinar. 2013. "Critical Theory." In Paul Williams, ed., *Security Studies: An Introduction*. (2nd ed.) Oxon: Routledge, 93-106.
- Bilgin, Pinar, Ken Booth and Richard Wyn Jones. 1998. "Security Studies: The Next Stage?," *Naçao e Defesa* 84(2): 129-57.
- Black, David R. 2006. "Mapping the Interplay of Human Security Practice and debates: The Canadian Experience." In Sandra J. Maclean, David R. Black and Timothy M. Shaw, eds., *A Decade of Human Security: Global Governance and New Multilateralisms*. Hampshire: Ashgate, 53–62.
- Booth, Ken. 1991. "Security and Emancipation," *Review of International Studies* 17(4): 313-326.
- Booth, Ken. 1997. "Security and Self: Reflections of a Fallen Realist." In Michael C. Williams and Keith Krause, eds., *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 83-119.
- Booth, Ken. 1999a. "Nuclearism, Human Rights and Constructions of Security (Part 1)," *The International Journal of Human Rights* 3(2): 1-24.
- Booth, Ken. 1999b. "Nuclearism, Human Rights and Constructions of Security (Part 2)," *The International Journal of Human Rights* 3(3): 44-61.
- Booth, Ken. 1999c. "Three Tyrannies," In Tim Dunne and Nicholas J. Wheeler, eds., *Human Rights in Global Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 31-70.

Booth, Ken (ed.) 2005. *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*. Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner.

Booth, Ken. 2005a. "Critical Explorations." In Ken Booth, ed., *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*. Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner, 1-18.

Booth, Ken. 2005c. "Introduction to Part 2." In Ken Booth, ed., *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*. Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner, 109-112.

Booth, Ken. 2005d. "Introduction to Part 3." In Ken Booth, ed., *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*. Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner, 181-187.

Booth, Ken. 2005e. "Beyond Critical Security Studies." In Ken Booth, ed., *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*. Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner, 259-278.

Booth, Ken. 2007. *Theory of World Security*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Booth, Ken. 2013. "Foreword." In Laura Shepherd, ed., *Critical Approaches to Security: An Introduction to Theories and Methods*. Oxon: Routledge, xv-xvii.

Brincat, Shannon, Laura Lima and Joao Nunes (eds.) 2012. *Critical Theory in International Relations and Security Studies*. Oxon: Routledge.

Burgess, J. Peter. 2008. "The Ethical Challenges of Human Security in the age of Globalisation." In Goucha, Moufida and John Crowley, eds., *Rethinking Human Security*. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 49-63.

- Burgess, J. Peter and Shahrbanou Tadjbakhsh. 2010. "The Human Security Tale of Two Europes," *Global Society* 24(4): 447-465.
- Burgess, J. Peter and Taylor Owen. 2004. "Special Section: What is "Human Security"?", *Security Dialogue* 35(3): 345-371.
- Burke, Anthony. 2007. *Beyond Security, Ethics and Violence: War against the Other*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Burke, Anthony. 2013. "Post-structural Security Studies." In Laura Shepherd, ed., *Critical Approaches to Security: An Introduction to Theories and Methods*. Oxon: Routledge, 77-88.
- Buzan, Barry. 2004. "A Reductionist, Idealistic Notion that Adds Little Analytical Value," *Security Dialogue* 35(3): 369-370.
- Buzan, Barry, Ole Waever and Jaap de Wilde. 1998. *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner.
- Caprioli, Mary. 2004. "Democracy and Human Rights Versus Women's Security: A Contradiction?", *Security Dialogue* 35(4): 411-428.
- CASE Collective. 2006. "Critical Approaches to Security in Europe: A Networked Manifesto," *Security Dialogue* 37(4): 443-487.
- Chandler, David. 2011. "Rethinking Global Discourses of Security." In David Chandler and Nik Hynek, eds., *Critical Perspectives on Human Security: Rethinking Emancipation and Power in International Relations*. Oxon: Routledge, 114-128.

Chandler, David. 2013. "Rethinking the Subject of Human Security." In Mustapha Kamal Pasha, ed., *Globalization, Difference, and Human Security*. Oxon: Routledge, 38-50.

Christie, Ryerson. 2010. "Critical Voices and Human Security: To Endure, To Engage or To Critique?," *Security Dialogue* 41(2): 169-190.

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

Cox, Robert W. 1981. "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory." *Millennium – Journal of International Studies* 10(2): 126-155.

Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade. 1999. *Human Security: Safety for People in a Changing World*. Online. Available at <http://www.summit-americas.org/canada/humansecurity-english.htm> [accessed 15.04.2014].

Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade. 2002. *Freedom from Fear: Canada's Foreign Policy for Human Security*. Canada: DFAIT.

Detraz, Nicole. 2012. *International Security and Gender*. Cambridge: Polity.

Doucet, Marc C. And Miguel De Larrinaga. 2011. "Human Security and the Securing of Human Life: Tracing Global Sovereign and Biopolitical Rule." In David Chandler and Nik Hynek, eds., *Critical Perspectives on Human Security: Rethinking Emancipation and Power in International Relations*. Oxon: Routledge, 129-143.

Fierke, Karin M. 2012. *Critical Approaches to International Security*. Cambridge: Polity Press.



Floyd, Rita. 2007. "Human Security and the Copenhagen School's Securitization Approach: Conceptualizing Human Security as a Securitizing Move," *Human Security Journal* 5: 38-49.

Franceschet, Antonio. 2006. "Global Legalism and Human Security." In Sandra J. MacLean, David R. Black and Timothy M. Shaw, eds., *A Decade of Human Security: Global Governance and New Multilateralisms*. Hampshire: Ashgate, 31-37.

Golberg, Elissa and Don Hubert. 2001. "Case Study: The Security Council and the Protection of Civilians." In Rob McRae and Don Hubert, eds., *Human Security and the New Diplomacy*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 223-230.

Goucha, Moufida and John Crowley (eds.) 2008. *Rethinking Human Security*. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.

Gibson, Ian R. And Betty A. Reardon. 2007. "Human Security: toward Gender Inclusion." In Giorgio Shani, Makoto Sato and Mustapha Kamal Pasha, eds., *Protecting Human Security in a Post 9/11 World*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 50-63.

Grayson, Kyle. 2004. "Branding 'transformation' in Canadian foreign policy: Human Security," *Canadian Foreign Policy Journal* 11(2): 41-68.

Gwozdecky, Mark and Jill Sinclair. 2001. "Case Study: Landmines and Human Security." In McRae and Don Hubert, eds., *Human Security and the New Diplomacy: Protecting People, Promoting Peace*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 28-40.

Hampson, Fen Osler. 2013. "Human Security." In Paul Williams, ed., *Security Studies: An Introduction*. (2nd ed.) Oxon: Routledge, 279-294.

Hampson, Fen Osler and et al. 2002. *Madness in the Multitude: Human Security and World Order*. Ontario: Oxford University Press.

Hansen, Lene. 2000. "The Little Mermaid's Silent Security Dilemma and the Absence of Gender in the Copenhagen School," *Millennium Journal of International Studies* 29(2): 289-306.

Hansen, Lene. 2010. "Ontologies, Epistemologies and Methodologies." In Laura J. Shepherd, ed., *Gender Matters in Global Politics: A Feminist Introduction to International Relations*. Oxon: Routledge, 17-27.

Held, David. 1995. *Democracy and the Global Order: From the Modern State to Global Governance*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hoogensen, Gunhild and Kirsti Stuvoy. 2006. "Gender, Resistance and Human Security," *Security Dialogue* 37(2): 207-228.

Horkheimer, Max. 1982. "Traditional and Critical Theory." In *Critical Theory: Selected Essays*. Translated by Matthew J. O'Connell and Others. New York: Continuum, 188-243.

Hudson, Natalie Florea. 2012. *Gender, Human Security and the United Nations: Security Language as a Political Framework for Women*. Oxon: Routledge.

Hudson, Heidi. 2005. "'Doing Security' As Though Human Matters: A Feminist Perspective on Gender and the Politics of Human Security," *Security Dialogue* 36(2): 155-174.

Hudson, Natalie Florea, Alex Kreidenweis and Charli Carpenter. 2013. "Human Security." In Laura J. Shepherd, ed., *Critical Approaches to Security: An Introduction to Theories and Methods*. Oxon: Routledge, 24-36.

- Huysmans, Jef. 2000. "The European Union and the Securitization of Migration," *Journal of Common Market Studies* 38(5): 751-777.
- Huysmans, Jef. 2006. *The Politics of Insecurity: Fear, Migration and Asylum in the EU*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Hynek, Nik. 2012a. "The domopolitics of Japanese human security," *Security Dialogue* 43(2): 119-137.
- Hynek, Nik. 2012b. "Japan's Return to the Chequebook? From Military Peace Support to Human Security Appropriation, *International Peacekeeping* 19(1): 62-76.
- Hynek, Nik and David Chandler. 2011. "Introduction: Emancipation and Power in Human Security." In David Chandler and Nik Hynek, eds., *Critical Perspectives on Human Security: Rethinking Emancipation and Power in International Relations*. Oxon: Routledge, 1-10.
- Linklater, Andrew. 1998. *The Transformation of Political Community*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Linklater, Andrew. 2005. "Political Community and Human Security." In Ken Booth, ed., *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*. Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner, 113-131.
- Mark, Gwozdecky and Jill Sinclair. 2001. "Case Study: Land Mines and Human Security." In Rob McRae and Don Hubert, eds., *Human Security and the New Diplomacy*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 28-40.

- Martin, Marry and Taylor Owen. 2010. "The second generation of human security: lessons from the UN and EU experience," *International Affairs* 86(1): 211-224.
- Matlary, Janne Haaland. 2008. "Much Ado about Little: the EU and Human Security." *International Affairs* 84(1): 131-143.
- McDonald, Matt. 2008. "Securitization and the Construction of Security," *European Journal of International Relations* 14(4): 563-587.
- McDonald, Matt. 2012. *Security, the Environment and Emancipation: Constestation over Environmental Change*. Oxon: Routledge.
- McDonald, Matt. 2013. "Constructivisms." In Paul D. Williams, ed., *Security Studies: An Introduction*. (2nd. ed.) Oxon: Routledge, 63-76.
- McRae, Rob. 2001. "Human Security in a Globalized World." In Rob McRae and Don Hubert, eds., *Human Security and the New Diplomacy: Protecting People, Promoting Peace*. Montreal&Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 14-27.
- MOFA. 2000. *Diplomatic Bluebook 2000*. Available at: <http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/other/bluebook/2000/II-3-a.html> (accessed 03.06.2014).
- MOFA. 2001. *Diplomatic Bluebook 2001*. Available at: <http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/other/bluebook/2001/chap1-g.html> (accessed 03.06.2014).
- MOFA. 2002. *Diplomatic Bluebook 2002*. Available at: <http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/other/bluebook/2002/chap1-f.pdf> (accessed 03.06.2014).

MOFA. 2009. *The Trust Fund for Human Security: For the “Human-centered” 21st Century*. Available at: [http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/human\\_secu/t\\_fund21.pdf](http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/human_secu/t_fund21.pdf) (accessed 03.06.2014).

Newman, Edward. 2000. “Human Security and Constructivism,” *International Studies Perspectives* 2(3), 239-251.

Newman, Edward. 2010. “Critical Human Security Studies.” Review of *International Studies* 36(1): 77-94.

Newman, Edward. 2014. “The United Nations and Human Security: Between Solidarism and Pluralism.” In Mary Martin and Taylor Owen, eds., *Routledge Handbook of Human Security*. Oxon: Routledge, 225-238.

Nunes, Joao. 2012. “Reclaiming the Political: Emancipation and Critique in Security Studies,” *Security Dialogue* 43(4): 345-361.

Nuruzzaman, Mohammed. 2006. “Paradigms in Conflict: The Contested Claims of Human Security, Critical Theory and Feminism,” *Cooperation and Conflict* 41(3): 285-303.

Pasha, Mustapha Kamal (ed.) 2014. *Globalization, Difference and Human Security*. Oxon: Routledge.

Pasha, Mustapha Kamal. 2014a. “Introduction.” In Mustapha Kamal Pasha, ed., *Globalization, Difference, and Human Security*. Oxon: Routledge, 1-14.

Paris, Roland. 2001. “Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?” *International Security* 26(2): 87-102.

Pauline, Ewan. 2007. "Deepening the Human Security Debate: Beyond the Politics of Conceptual Clarification," *Politics* 27(3): 182-189.

Peoples, Columbia and Nick Vaughan-Williams. 2010. *Critical Security Studies: An Introduction*. Oxon: Routledge.

Reardon, Betty A. 2010. "Women and Human Security: A Feminist Framework and Critique of the Prevailing Patriarchal Security System." In Asha Hans and Betty A. Reardon, eds., *The Gender Imperative: Human Security vs State Security*. New Delhi: Routledge, 7-37.

Richmond, Oliver. 2007. "Emancipatory Forms of Human Security and Liberal Peacebuilding," *International Journal* 62(3): 459-477.

Richmond, Oliver. 2011. "Post-colonial Hybridity and the Return of Human Security." In David Chandler and Nik Hynek, eds., *Critical Perspectives on Human Security: Rethinking Emancipation and Power in International Relations*. Oxon: Routledge, 43-55.

Robinson, Darryl. 2001. "Case Study: International Criminal Court." In Rob McRae and Don Hubert, eds., *Human Security and the New Diplomacy: Protecting People, Promoting Peace*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 170-177.

Salter, Mark B. and Can Mutlu (eds.) 2013. *Research Methods in Critical Security Studies: An Introduction*. Oxon: Routledge.

Sato, Makoto. 2007. "Human Security and Japanese Diplomacy: Debates on the Role of Human Security in Japanese Policy." In Giorgio Shani, Makoto Sato and Mustapha Kemal Pasha, eds., *Protecting Human Security in a Post 9/11 World: Critical and Global Insights*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 83-96.

- Shani, Giorgio. 2007a. "Introduction: Protecting Human Security in a Post 9/11 World." In Giorgio Shani, Makoto Sato and Mustapha Kamal Pasha, eds., *Protecting Human Security in a Post 9/11 World: Critical and Global Insights*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 1-14.
- Shani, Giorgio. 2011. "Securitizing 'Bare Life': Critical Perspectives on Human Security Discourse." In David Chandler and Nik Hynek, eds., *Critical Perspectives on Human Security: Rethinking Emancipation and Power in International Relations*. Oxon: Routledge, 56-68.
- Shani, Giorgio, Makoto Sato and Mustapha Kamal Pasha (eds.) 2007. *Protecting Human Security in a Post 9/11 World: Critical and Global Insights*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Shani, Giorgio and Mustapha Kamal Pasha. 2007. "Conclusion." In Giorgio Shani, Makoto Sato and Mustapha Kamal Pasha, eds., *Protecting Human Security in a Post 9/11 World: Critical and Global Insights*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 193-199.
- Shaw, Timothy M., Sandra J. MacLean and David R. Black. 2006. "Introduction: A Decade of Human Security: What Prospects for Global Governance and New Multilateralisms." In Sandra J. MacLean, David R. Black and Timothy M. Shaw, eds., *A Decade of Human Security: Global Governance and New Multilateralisms*. Hampshire: Ashgate, 3-18.
- Shepherd, Laura (ed.) 2013. *Critical Approaches to Security: An Introduction to Theories and Methods*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Small, Michael. 2001. "Case Study: The Human Security Network." In Rob McRae and Don Hubert, eds., *Human Security and the New Diplomacy*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 231-235.

- Solana, Javier. 2014. "The European Union and Human Security: The Making of a Global Security Actor." In Mary Martin and Taylor Owen, eds., *Routledge Handbook of Human Security*. Oxon: Routledge, 251-259.
- Spear, Joanna and Paul D. Williams. 2012. "Conceptualizing the Security-Development Relationship: An Overview of the Debate." In Joanna Spear and Paul D. Williams, eds., *Security and Development in Global Politics: A Critical Comparison*. Washington: Georgetown University Press, 7-33.
- Suhrke, Astri. 1999. "Human Security and the Interests of States," *Security Dialogue* 30(3): 265-276.
- Tadjbakhsh, Shahrbanou and Anuradha M. Chenoy. 2007. *Human Security: Concepts and Implications*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Taylor, Owen. 2004. "Human Security – Conflict, Critique and Consensus: Colloquium Remarks and a Proposal for a Threshold-Based Definition," *Security Dialogue* 35(3): 373-387.
- Taylor, Owen. 2010. "Human Security: A Contested Contempt." In J. Peter Burgess, ed., *The Routledge Handbook of New Security Studies*. Oxon: Routledge, 39-49.
- Thomas, Caroline. 1999. "Introduction." In Caroline Thomas and Peter Wilkin, eds., *Globalization, Human Security and the African Experience*. Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1-19.
- Thomas, Caroline. 2000. *Global Governance, Development and Human Security: The Challenge of Poverty and Inequality*. London: Pluto Press.



- Thomas, Caroline. 2001. "Global Governance, Development and Human Security: Exploring the Links," *Third World Quarterly* 22(2): 159-175.
- Thomas, Caroline and Paul D. Williams. 2013. "Poverty." In Paul D. Williams, ed., *Security Studies: An Introduction*. London and New York: Routledge, 295–310.
- Thomas, Nicholas and William T. Tow. 2002. "The Utility of Human Security: Sovereignty and Humanitarian Intervention," *Security Dialogue* 33(2): 177-192.
- Tickner, J. Ann. 1992. *Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Tickner, J. Ann. 1997. "You Just Don't Understand: Troubled Engagements Between Feminists and IR Theorists," *International Studies Quarterly* 41(4): 611-632.
- Tickner, J. Ann. 2001. *Gendering World Politics: Issues and Approaches in the Post-Cold War Era*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Tooze, Roger. 2005. "The Missing Link: Security, Critical International Political Economy, and Community." In Ken Booth, ed., *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*. Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner, 133-158.
- Turner, Mandy, Neil Cooper and Michael Pugh. 2011. "Institutionalised and Co-opted: Why Human Security Has Lost its Way." In David Chandler and Nik Hynek, eds., *Critical Perspectives on Human Security: Rethinking Emancipation and Power in International Relations*. Oxon: Routledge, 83-96.

United Nations Development Programme. 1994. *Human Development Report, 1994*. New York: United Nations Development Programme.

Wæver, Ole. 1995. "Securitization and Desecuritization." In Ronnie D. Lipschutz (ed.), *On Security*. New York: Columbia University Press, 46-77.

Walker, Rob B. J. 1997. "The Subject of Security." In Michael C. Williams and Keith Krause, eds., *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 61-81.

Wilkinson, Claire. 2007. "The Copenhagen School on Tour in Kyrgyzstan: Is Securitization Theory Usable Outside Europe?," *Security Dialogue* 38(1): 5-25.

Williams, Michael C. and Keith Krause. 1997a. "Preface: Toward Critical Security Studies." In Michael C. Williams and Keith Krause, eds., *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, vii-xxi.

Williams, Michael C. and Keith Krause. 1997b. "From Strategy to Security: Foundations of Critical Security Studies." In Michael C. Williams and Keith Krause, eds., *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 33-59.

Williams, Paul D. (ed.) *Security Studies: An Introduction*. (2nd. ed.) Oxon: Routledge.

Whitworth, Sandra. 2013. "Feminisms." In Paul D. Williams, ed., *Security Studies: An Introduction*. (2nd. ed.) Oxon: Routledge, 107-119.

Wyn Jones, Richard. 1999. *Security, Strategy, and Critical Theory*. Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner.

Wyn Jones, Richard. 2005. "On Emancipation: Necessity, Capacity, and Concrete Utopias." In Ken Booth, ed., *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*. Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner, 215-235.