

## The Human Security Perspective on Human Rights in Asia

### アジアにおける人権に対する人間の安全保障の視点

David Wessels

デヴィッド・ウェッセルズ

#### Abstract / レジюме

Security analysis in international relations has changed in recent decades as historical events removed some long-term threats from international politics and produced newly-emerging threats in a globalizing world. As a result, the perception that a state's interests were constant has given way to an understanding that people are the core reality of security. There has been an accompanying shift from a state-centered approach (state security) to a human-centered approach (human security) in the theoretical and policy literature in the field. The term human security has been used extensively in reflection on economic and social development. It also has been introduced into the discourse that once focused primarily on military security but now includes sectors of societal security that extend to politics, culture, environment, and religion.

The present study looks at East and Southeast Asia over the last few decades as a region that has shown both successes and failures in the achievement of human rights. Human rights encapsulate values grounded in human dignity, which is also the foundation for human security. By tracing major developments in human rights and human security in the Asian region, new insights into global change and a well-rounded theoretical understanding of international relations are enhanced.

The nexus of human rights and human security is examined particularly through five empirical examples: (1) China in the context of the Tiananmen Square massacre of 1989 and later changes. (2) Progress in democracy in the Asian region, including polities like the Philippines, South Korea, and Taiwan. (3) The reverberations of the Asian financial crisis of 1997. (4) The process of self-determination in East Timor. (5) The ramifications of terrorism for rights and security in the region, especially after September 11, 2001. The continuing military confrontations in the divided states of China and Korea, particular issues facing Japan, and the increased saliency of religious identity are also considered from the perspective of problems and policies for human security.

# The Human Security Perspective on Human Rights in Asia アジアにおける人権に対する人間の安全保障の視点

David Wessels

デヴィッド・ウェッセルズ

## Abstract / レジюме

近年、国際関係論における安全保障の分析は変化している。歴史的出来事によって、長年の国際政治の脅威が取り除かれたが、グローバル化する世界に新たな脅威が出現することになったからである。その結果、国家利益は一定であるという認識は、人間こそ安全保障の中核的現実であるという理解にとって代われつつある。それに伴い、この分野の理論と政策に関する文献に、国家中心のアプローチ（国家安全保障）から人間中心のアプローチ（人間の安全保障）への変化が生じている。人間の安全保障という言葉は、社会経済的発展を考慮する際に広く用いられてきた。かつては主として軍事的安全保障に焦点を当て、今では政治、文化、環境、宗教に亘る社会の安全保障のセクターをカバーする言説にも、この言葉は持ち込まれている。

本研究は、人権達成の成功と失敗の両方を示してきた地域として、過去数十年の東アジアと東南アジアを捉える。人権には人間の尊厳に基づく価値が包含されるが、人間の尊厳は人間の安全保障の基礎でもある。アジア地域における人権と人間の安全保障の主要な展開を辿ることにより、グローバルな変化に対する新しい洞察と国際関係に対するバランスのとれた理論的理解が深まるだろう。

人権と人間の安全保障の結びつきは、特に5つの実例を通じて検討される：(1) 1989年の天安門事件とその後の変化の文脈から見た中国、(2) フィリピン、韓国、台湾などの政体を含むアジア地域における民主主義の進展、(3) 1997年のアジア通貨危機の波紋、(4) 東ティモールの民族自決の過程、(5) 特に2001年9月11日後の、この地域の人権と人間安全保障に対するテロの副次的影響。中国と韓国・朝鮮という分断国家での軍事的対峙の継続、とりわけ日本が直面する問題について、また宗教的アイデンティティの突出した重要性についても、人間の安全保障の問題と政策の観点から考察される。

## THE HUMAN SECURITY PERSPECTIVE ON HUMAN RIGHTS IN ASIA

デヴィッド・ウェッセルズ  
David Wessels

### I. Introduction

Historical changes and intellectual trends have combined to bring new understanding to basic issues in international relations in recent decades. The end of the Cold War and dissolution of the Soviet empire, a heightened attention to human rights and democracy, and complex elements of contemporary security needs have all affected the countries of East and Southeast Asia, as well as other areas of the world. Theories, approaches, and other academic tools used to examine these global conditions add new perspectives from many sides. But these developments are not without a price. It is as if one wanted to paint a picture of the world that one sees, but the scenes are constantly changing and the materials one has to use differ for each painting session. A certain selection of the object of study and a particular way of studying it are necessary.

In this study, I will focus on the question of human rights in Asia (generally speaking, East and Southeast Asia), and use some of the elements of human security discourse to focus on that question. While the language of international human rights has entered into the mainstream of international relations in the twentieth century, the realization of the ideals of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other key norms has lagged behind. Language regarding the field of security has developed over the years as analysts and practitioners have tried to conceptualize aspects of its meaning: national security, comprehensive security, common security, and so on. In this context, the use of the term “human security” has added significant new insights into who really is the subject of security and also into the role that human rights play in achieving that security.

First, I will discuss some of the concepts and theoretical developments that are affecting the way we view security. Given the use of the discourse of human security in recent years, I have tried to situate that discourse in the political, social, and intellectual climate within which it can be understood. As both an analytical term and a policy orientation, human security has become part of the vocabulary of international relations in recent years. Then I will use the concept to consider some new aspects of human rights in Asia and consider the link between rights and security through the examination of cases that have arisen in Asia, specifically East and Southeast Asia, in

recent years. This will help to identify the principal issues in this field. And finally, I will survey the problems and policies that currently confront people striving for rights and security. Diverse actors at many levels of international society play important roles in the contemporary context. Shifting social, political, economic, military, environmental, religious, and other factors are redefining the reality of human security in Asia.

## II. Security: Concept and Theory

The ordinary concept of security in international relations for many decades after World War II fitted into a theory or tradition often called **realism**. This way of understanding the structures and processes of world politics favored certain concepts. For example, states were viewed as sovereign entities, domestically self-contained and internationally engaged on a stage populated primarily by other like entities. Furthermore, the international scene was thought to be one of turmoil, with potential if not actual conflict a continuous danger. The military and political confrontation between the United States (and other countries associated with it, the “West”) and the Soviet Union (and other countries associated with it, the “East”) was a security problem under this view of the world, with endemic military confrontation as part of an overarching international politics (often summarily expressed as the “Cold War”). Other issues on the agenda included decolonization, development, and the conduct of various international organizations. The security issue, however, was seen as a question of survival, and interpreted as requiring a military posture vis-à-vis other countries. As peace research and other theoretical approaches challenged this view of security over the years, they found both empirical and normative elements of the realist tradition to be wanting.

The unexpected, sudden end of the military threats posed by the Cold War, and the subsequent dissolution of the Soviet Union have changed world politics and the way people theorize about world politics. The concept of security has been particularly debated since then. Actually even under the historical conditions of the Cold War, ideas about security were being analyzed and reformulated.<sup>1</sup> For example, the “national security” concept in American foreign policy (and similar thinking in the views of other states and theorists) was challenged by ideas of “common security” and “comprehensive security” that broadened the security agenda of states and regions. Since the perception of threat is regarded as a fundamental element of the meaning of security, the radical change that took place when the United States and the Soviet Union

(and their allies) no longer regarded the other as an enemy and a potential war threat has made the traditional concept of security untenable. A whole new worldview is implied by that change.

To state the question rather simplistically, if there is no (military) threat, has security ceased to be *an* issue (not to say *the* issue) of international relations? What is the meaning of all the existing national and other institutions created to address security if there is no coherent way (theory) of understanding them? And how do we explain the continuing verbal and other behavior associated with “security” in international relations or other venues? To answer these and other questions, theorists have proposed a variety of new approaches to security. Practitioners and analysts of world politics have added “human security” to the current vocabulary in this field.<sup>2</sup>

One new approach to this field has been called a theory of securitization (sometimes referred to as the Copenhagen school), proposed by scholars such as Barry Buzan and Ole Wæver. This approach emphasizes that speech-acts elevate situations to issues of security. This involves: (1) referent objects—things existentially threatened and thought to have a legitimate claim for survival; (2) securitizing actors—who declare the referent object to be so threatened; and (3) functional actors—different from those in (1) and (2), but with significant roles in security sectors.<sup>3</sup> The sectors examined in their 1998 book were five: military, environmental, economic, societal, and political. Another sector, religion, was considered in a later extension of the theoretical framework.<sup>4</sup>

This securitization/sectoral approach highlights the reality that threats are not givens in international relations, but rather conditions that are perceived and communicated. The range of sectors analyzed also moves the treatment of security beyond the narrow confines of military matters to the whole range of existential threats that can and do affect people today. Threats are experienced by people, and they extend over a range of issues from physical conditions of the environment and economic life to cultural and social relations and even religious faith.

In the 1990s, the more expansive intellectual and political climate regarding security included widespread discussion of **human security**. Perhaps the most influential use of the term was in the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) *Human Development Report 1994*<sup>5</sup>, which put the issue this way:

The concept of security must thus change urgently in two basic ways:

- From an exclusive stress on territorial security to a much greater stress on people’s security.

- From security through armaments to security through sustainable human development.

The list of threats to human security is long, but most can be considered under seven main categories: economic security, food security, health security, environmental security, personal security, community security, political security. (pp. 24-25, style simplified)

Political security: One of the most important aspects of human security is that people should be able to live in a society that honours their basic human rights. (p. 32, style simplified)

This politically charged discourse reflects the easing of Cold War tensions and the heightened awareness that an understanding of human needs and fears is the basis for analyzing how people view their own security in a wide range of fields. It is not a denial of traditional military concerns, but an elaboration of the many ways that human beings experience insecurities and strive to overcome them. The term human security has been used by publicists and scholars, too, as a way to counteract a bias that tends to place the state over and above the person in international politics.

The concept of human security has been especially useful as a link to concerns in the area of human rights, as the UNDP Report makes clear. The language of rights, and of human rights in particular, has shown a progressive development over several centuries.<sup>6</sup> In the twentieth century, particularly after World War II, and under the auspices of the United Nations, the international promotion and protection of human rights have advanced considerably.<sup>7</sup> The philosophical foundation for human rights is located in the dignity of the human person, which prescribes certain ways to treat all people in the civil, political, economic, social, and cultural areas. When these rights are ignored or violated by governments or other actors, existential conditions of threat to personal security arise. And so the observance of human rights is a benchmark of human security, as well.<sup>8</sup>

Rights language has been on the ascendancy in international relations for more than a half-century. It is not just historical coincidence that a major conference on human rights was sponsored by the United Nations in Vienna in 1993,<sup>9</sup> that that conference led to the establishment in the following year of a new international bureaucracy in the form of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, and that the “human security” discourse in the *Human Development Report 1994* appeared in the early years after the easing of Cold War tensions. The “human” designation in these terms signaled a political will to view the world in more

global and personal terms than the ideological categories of the previous era. Numerous other examples (human environment, human development, human settlements) of similar terminology may be found; and in the dramatically changed conditions of world politics in the early 1990s, re-envisioning security as human security was a step that captured the imagination of many.

In practical terms, the political and diplomatic conditions for cooperative efforts in the matter of human security have emerged. This is not to say that the world has necessarily responded in timely fashion to actual urgent needs, as the failures to act immediately and vigorously against genocides in Rwanda and the Balkans, and more recently, Darfur, and the social and economic plight of Africa have demonstrated. In terms of theory, the traditional emphasis on structures and military capabilities in the inter-state system has been challenged by those who emphasize other security sectors and the psychological, reflexive, and relational aspects of human security. Military considerations are not the blind guides for knee-jerk security policies.

Security theory has been enriched particularly by insights from social theory. In a survey of developments in security studies, Pinar Bilgin points out the shift toward individual and societal dimensions of security, as opposed to classical military approaches.<sup>1 0</sup> Bilgin uses Ulrich Beck's argument (that risk is a systematic way that modern societies deal with hazards and insecurities) to shift the dominant security discourse from risks inherent in nuclear weapons to various societal and individual dimensions. The normative implication is that societies today can and should take a "risk for peace" through a culture of human rights and through the contributions of many actors to a more secure global governance.<sup>1 1</sup>

A more comprehensive theory that addresses the social dimensions of security is that of Bill McSweeney.<sup>1 2</sup> He uses what he explicitly calls a social constructionist approach to move the analysis of security from what he calls "objectivist approaches" to a sociological discussion that sees agent and structure interacting in a structuration or reflexivist theory. In this view, the relation between identity and interests is seen as recursive, that is to say, there is an on-going process by which agents redefine themselves rather than being determined by some supposed state interest.<sup>1 3</sup> This kind of approach helps to understand the dissolution of enmity that brought an end to the Cold War, the building of a security community through the evolution of European Union institutions after World War II, and forward momentum in resolving the conflict in Northern Ireland. As human identities change, the interests of individuals and groups change, as well. McSweeney's approach is consistent with some of the new

theoretical awareness of the role of ideas in international relations,<sup>14</sup> but it excludes considerations of natural threats to human welfare (such as those relating to health and the environment) on conceptual grounds.<sup>15</sup>

There is great diversity in terminology, concepts, presuppositions, and theories in the field of security studies. My aim here is not to reconcile the various approaches or even to identify all of them.<sup>16</sup> Rather, my point here is to explain how the discourse on human security fits into the issues examined in this study. In particular, numerous historical and intellectual trends help to situate human security in relation to human rights today in both theory and practice. In a broad sense, the social constructivist approach helps to legitimate this discourse.<sup>17</sup>

Constructivism is compatible with the identification of numerous actors in world politics other than the nation-state that is so emphasized in traditional realism. This is important both normatively and empirically. For even if one acknowledges the crucial importance of states in the development of international society over the last several hundred years, it is clear that states have not always been the champions of security for the people living in them during these centuries. Rather, states have frequently exploited and repressed their own people, and state-oriented ideologies<sup>18</sup> have often been used to justify the continuity of regimes and adventurous wars.

By offering a new view of the state itself, constructivism provides new approaches to both security and human rights. At levels above the state, broad-based organizations of states (the United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and so on) have taken on a wide variety of functions, not least in the field of military security.<sup>18</sup> Nongovernmental groups and networks, to say nothing of transnational businesses, intimately affect the well-being and security of people through activities as diverse as health care and communications, economic development and human rights. The words and actions of these various actors serve to construct the world's security in a much more complex way than the words and actions of the sovereign state's representatives alone that are emphasized in realist views.

Perhaps even more significant for a reorienting of security theory than the list of actors to be considered, is the way that constructivism has changed our view of the identity of the actors involved. Many theories, including some based on rational choice, simply take for granted that the interests of the state are both clear and dominant in the conduct of international relations. A standard neo-realist position is that in the anarchic world of international politics, states adopt a principle of self-help in their efforts to preserve and strengthen their position relative to each other.<sup>19</sup> When the



perspective of identity is considered, however, it is evident that many actors, including states, reconstitute their identities over time, leading to important changes in their calculations of interests. New ideas emerge; new expectations prevail; new values take hold. From this point of view, the “softer” side of international politics, including culture and communication, carries a weight in the very definition of security. In this sense, identities mold the way people determine their interests and perceive the world around them, including their relationships with other actors.

To illustrate my point about this kind of identity politics, let me digress from the Asian focus and offer some examples from the global scene of the last decades. As the specific threat of nuclear war or even conventional war along the East-West divide in Europe dissolved in the 1980s and 1990s, new and different perceptions of threat emerged. A flood of migrants from East to West and South to North unsettled many societies in this period; this led to a backlash in electoral politics, including anti-foreigner and anti-immigration rhetoric, throughout several European countries. From the historical perspective of the 1950s to today, the guest workers who stayed in their western European host countries over the last half-century are a challenge to the identity and integration of countries, as the widespread rioting by youths of foreign Islamic origins in France in October-November 2005 amply demonstrated. The Middle East is another region of changing security identities and interests. The Gulf War of 1991 brought an unprecedented number of United States military personnel to the Middle East, particularly Saudi Arabia, unsettling cultural and religious habits, provoking numerous insecurities and stimulating the growth of terrorist organizations. When globalization in financial transactions contributed to an economic crisis in several Asian countries in the late 1990s, the insecurities experienced by people in the region spread over several sectors: economy, society, polity.

Culture and religion are themes closely associated with identity and the social construction of reality. They are realities in today’s international relations that require greater analysis and understanding, in themselves and particularly in relation to the themes of security, human security, and human rights that I am considering here.<sup>20</sup> The conditions of globalization in the contemporary world heighten, rather than diminish, the saliency of cultural characteristics and religious commitments.

Culture is a term that overlaps with other concepts and categories in international studies, such as ethnic groups and civilizations. In the security field, conflicts with an ethnic component have been conspicuous in the immediate aftermath of the Cold War. Samuel Huntington has projected an image of future conflicts along

the fault lines of civilizations, which are delineated largely in cultural and religious terms.<sup>2 1</sup> When one tries to specify what it is that people hold dear, and therefore, what it is that takes on significance from the standpoint of security, one immediately confronts culture as a deeply embedded value at the heart of the matter. This is not to say that cultural differences inevitably lead to conflict. Cultural identity may indeed be a source of friction, but more fundamentally it is a constitutive aspect of individuals and social groups, including those acting in the arena of world politics.

Religion is a perennial feature of our world, although it has frequently been overlooked in the study and practice of international relations. Since the terrorist attacks in the United States of September 11, 2001, more attention has been paid to religious factors,<sup>2 2</sup> particularly in the field of security studies. In fact, sociologists have been pointing out for some time that there has been a resurgence of religion globally, and that this has taken a public turn.<sup>2 3</sup> This has direct meaning for tolerance and human rights, which are the basis for a stable and secure practice of religion. As with culture, religion is associated with identity for persons and groups. The holistic character of religious experience, linking the individual with community and the transcendent, makes it a particularly powerful factor in achieving security. Indirectly, through various institutions and organizations, religion becomes a force for order and change across the whole range of human experience.

### III. Rights and Security

*Introduction.*<sup>2 4</sup> As we survey Asia over recent decades, the interplay of the themes of human rights and human security becomes apparent. From domestic problems in specific countries to region-wide issues and Asia's links with the whole world, new questions have arisen that can be better understood through the perspective of these concepts. Human rights specify values that are recognized more and more, at least officially, but are not always achieved in practice. Violations of human rights deprive individuals of their human security and threaten societies with similar insecurities. Effective improvement of human security is intricately linked to advances in human rights achievement. I have selected several examples to illustrate some of the specific ways in which human rights and human security have intersected in Asia over the last decades. (1) China, the biggest country in the region, continues to lack basic rights and security. (2) Progress in democracy in the region (Philippines, South Korea, Taiwan) shows the positive link between basic political rights and security for people. (3) The Asian financial crisis of 1997 demonstrates regional and global aspects

of security and economic rights. (4) The case of the self-determination of East Timor focuses attention on the international community's role in humanitarian intervention, or the responsibility to protect, as an aspect of attaining human security. (5) The ramifications of terrorism for rights and security are considered.

#### (1)China

The event that has set the tone for human rights and human security in the People's Republic of China in recent decades is the military crackdown of June 3-4, 1989. It is remembered particularly for the massacre of pro-democracy protesters by the Red Army in Tiananmen Square and elsewhere in Beijing, but it extended to many locations throughout the country. On that day, and for months and years afterwards, many thousands of people were killed, arrested, detained, or executed in this decisive governmental repression of political dissent within China after a thaw that had occurred since the late 1970s. There are, of course, numerous problems of violations of human rights in China in sectors other than political dissent: judicial proceedings; population policy; ethnic relations; religious freedom; and so on. As society has evolved, new issues have come to the fore, such as governmental withholding of information on medical emergencies (AIDS, SARS, avian influenza), governmental control over the internet, unemployment and the lack of social welfare in connection with the restructuring of the economy, environmental damage associated with economic growth. The geopolitical background of insecurities and human rights violations in Tibet has a long history; governmental designation of some Uighur groups in Xinjiang as terrorists is a more recent phenomenon. Threats to human security in Hong Kong and Taiwan are linked largely to the Chinese government's policies regarding political rights.

The major international nongovernmental human rights monitors, such as Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, routinely report severe violations of a wide range of human rights in China, as do the Annual Reports on Human Rights Practices and on International Religious Freedom of the United States Government's Department of State. Following the Tiananmen incident, the United Nations Sub-Commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities censured China for its poor human rights record. During the 1990s, resolutions of censure against China were frequently considered in the United Nations Human Rights Commission, but astute Chinese diplomacy prevented them from passing. As China began to take a larger role in the international economy, diplomatic attention has turned towards its entry into the World Trade Organization (achieved in December 2001) and related trade issues, with the result that human rights issues have been less prominent

internationally.

China has ratified several of the major international treaties and conventions relating to human rights, although it has not ratified the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (which it signed), and it submitted a reservation on free trade unions when it ratified the International Convention on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights. As one observer has remarked:

Moreover, what stands out in China's multilateral human rights diplomacy is that its participation has so far only led to adaptive learning about how to defend its sovereignty and national interests, rather than a change of heart about the importance of safeguarding human rights at home.<sup>2 5</sup>

China has been working with various international agencies on particular policy questions related to human rights, and has even engaged in dialogue with the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights, but the general problems of freedom in an authoritarian polity remain.

The Chinese Government has been particularly repressive toward religions in the last few years, after some degree of openness in the early years of Deng Xiaoping's economic drive (prior to Tiananmen). The policies have been neither uniform nor consistent, with variations in different cities and regions, periods of special crackdowns, and geopolitical implications to actions in Tibet and Xinjiang. The policy toward Falungong (Fa Lun Da Fa), a fast-growing group with common practices relating to meditation, calisthenics, breathing, and religion, has been particularly harsh. Many followers have been jailed and harshly treated, and public organization of group activities has been banned.<sup>2 6</sup>

## *(2) Progress in Democracy*

Several countries of East and Southeast Asia have witnessed remarkable progress in achieving democracy over the last two decades. This was not limited to rights of political participation, but to other freedoms and rights, as well, including freedom of expression and higher standards of welfare. Of particular interest are the Philippines, South Korea, and Taiwan, all of which have replaced authoritarian governments with freely elected regimes during this period. In doing so, human security was enhanced not only by removing immediate threats, but by establishing political systems based on human rights that offered long-term promise of a secure future.

The turning point in the Philippines was in 1986, when Corazon Aquino took over the presidency from Ferdinand Marcos in a People's Power revolution achieved

largely through peaceful protest. Although the country has experienced a rocky political and economic road since then, including another transfer of the presidency, from Joseph Estrada to Gloria Macapagal Arroyo, prompted by popular protests in 2001, the Philippines represents the front of the democratic wave in global politics (which extended all the way to Eastern Europe and elsewhere) from the late 1980s through the 1990s.

South Korea also emerged from a long period of military or military-dominated governments in the late 1980s, as a pro-democracy movement reached a crescendo from 1987, a new constitution introduced genuine multiparty democracy in 1988, and Kim Young Sam was elected president in 1992. Accompanied by sustained economic growth and the symbolic success of staging the Olympic Games in Seoul in 1988, South Korea significantly expanded the degree of human security for its citizens despite the continuing military confrontation with North Korea. Its economic success, in particular, has helped to show that authoritarian repression is not a prerequisite for rapid growth.

Unlike China, but like the Philippines and Taiwan, South Korea had the advantage of international ties that aided its development of liberal-democratic institutions. During the long period of military authoritarianism, South Korea's constitution officially guaranteed human rights; the suspension of such rights in times of martial law or emergency was always treated officially as an exception rather than the norm of the polity. But like Taiwan, South Korea was also caught up in the negative effects of politics in a divided country and the divisive international relations during the Cold War. The conditions of military insecurity that prevailed led to distortions that prevented a deeper and wider appreciation of all the sectors of human security. In the climate of thaw in the Cold War from the late 1980s, South Korea made rapid advances in civil and political rights.

Taiwan (Republic of China) has also significantly advanced its protection of civil and political rights in the last two decades, while continuing to grow economically in tandem with its rival state, the People's Republic of China. The People's Republic had taken over the seat of China in the United Nations already in 1971; but when the United States officially recognized the People's Republic in 1979 and severed official diplomatic ties with the government on Taiwan, an already complex international situation became even more so. Domestically, after the death of Chiang Kai-shek in 1975, and despite the economic advances of the period, little political reform took place until the late 1980s. Gradually, a multi-party democratic system has emerged, with a

successful transition of power from the Nationalist (Kuomintang) Party to the Democratic Progressive Party, restoration of civil rights, and increased social freedom.

The dilemma that Taiwan faces is related to the People's Republic of China's claim to Taiwan as an integral part of its own sovereign state. Taiwan's own claim for an independent status in international law is hindered by diplomatic, military, and political realities. Thus, while tensions between Taiwan and the mainland government abound, social, economic, and domestic political rights flourish on Taiwan, but the military security issues remain. The Taiwan case shows dramatically that rights in the political and associated sectors can improve, but that total human security depends fundamentally on the achievement of military security.

### *(3) Asian Financial Crisis*

A run on the Thai baht in July 1997 cascaded throughout the region, leading to severe financial crises in several East Asian economies. Indonesia, Thailand, and South Korea were hit particularly hard, but other countries and economies were affected as well, with repercussions not only in the financial sector, but throughout their economies, societies, and polities to this day.<sup>27</sup> This ongoing crisis is particularly illustrative of the links between the reality of human security and new aspects of human rights in Asia. The drop in the value of the various Asian currencies, the unavailability of credit, the rise in prices of necessities from food to medicine, and the severe impact on unemployment and underemployment were interconnected phenomena that unsettled societies and polities throughout the region. The threats to well-being and livelihood, the poverty and social unrest, the life and death issues associated with this crisis certainly permit use of the term human security crisis for these events.<sup>28</sup>

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), the Document and Programme of Action of the Vienna Conference on Human Rights (1993), and other international instruments have stressed that economic, social, and cultural rights are indivisible from civil and political rights. Also, these rights are universally applicable and based on the principle of non-discrimination. Philosophers have argued specifically that economic, social, and cultural rights are not only compatible with civil and political rights, but that they are essential in a holistic understanding of rights that involves not only avoidance, but also protection and aid as part of public policy and action for people.<sup>29</sup> When we view them from the actual circumstances of history, as in the Asian financial crisis from 1997, it is evident that the rights to work, to an adequate standard of living, to education, to social security, and so on are both human rights and aspects of human security. These rights have been violated extensively

during this Asian crisis.

This example of the Asian financial crisis also illustrates the complex interplay of domestic, regional, and international factors in the evolution of the crisis, and in the effective achievement of human rights and human security. No two countries took exactly the same policy steps to deal with the situation because their social and political systems differed from each other. Simultaneously, they were all being affected by region-wide trends, including Japan's lengthy recession, China's emergence as a trading power, and greater demands for political accountability. The international dimensions included varying degrees of United States commitment, the evolving regional economies of the European Union and the North American Free Trade Area, and nongovernmental actors' roles. The terms "globalization" and "global" were used often in connection with analysis of the crisis, and with good reason.

The rapid growth of global financial markets, dominated by private institutions and individuals, has given new significance to their impact on economies everywhere. The Asian financial crisis demonstrated the effects of these nongovernmental forces on the global system of production and trade, and their indirect but powerful influence on local politics and society. The resignation of President Suharto of Indonesia in 1998 (after 32 years in office) is perhaps the most dramatic example of globally-induced change in a national government brought about by this crisis.

The impact of global or international institutions was also felt in the policies of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), which played a major role in the unfolding of the crisis throughout the region, through its forced application of economic restructuring plans. As Stiglitz has pointed out, the IMF's policies in the Asian case followed a pattern which they adopted elsewhere, often characterized by inadequate knowledge of local conditions and needs.<sup>30</sup> The IMF's role also illustrates the influence of ideologies or mind-sets in the making of public policies, and in how those policies are applied to the lives of people. Human rights violations can sometimes result from inadequate understanding or poor analysis, when these reverberate on the making and implementing of policies.

#### *(4) East Timor*

Another major case of the overlap of human rights and human security in Asia, with a distinctly international aspect, has been the case of East Timor (now known as the independent state Republica Democrática de Timor-Leste, or the Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste). The story goes back to 1975, when Portugal abandoned its colony of five centuries, and local groups declared an independent East Timor in

November. In December of the same year, Indonesian troops invaded and occupied the territory, declaring it part of Indonesia. Although the United Nations Security Council demanded Indonesian withdrawal (Resolutions 384 [22 December 1975] and 389 [22 April 1976]), and despite years of repression and human rights violations, there was no major movement on the question of independence until the 1990s. Portugal, Indonesia, and the United Nations, with pressure from the United States and other countries in the background, moved the issue to one of a popular ballot in August 1999 on accepting or rejecting East Timorese autonomy within the Republic of Indonesia. When the people of East Timor chose independence rather than autonomy status, the Indonesian military (which was charged with security for the territory) aided local militias in a frenzy of bloodshed and destruction against the people of East Timor. A subsequent U.N. mandate (Security Council Resolution 1264 [1999]) authorized a U.N.-sponsored military intervention, which led to a U.N.-led transitional government, and finally independent status for the new state on 20 May 2003.

This case is remarkable in several respects. The glaring violations of human rights of the people of East Timor by the Indonesian military and government were attested by multiple independent sources over several years, and even publicly condemned by United Nations bodies. East Timor is also a case of the group right of self-determination, which has been enumerated in the lists of human rights in international instruments. That violations of human rights were also violations of human security in the most glaring way was evident throughout the history of East Timor's independence process.

The other element that stands out in this case is the role of the international community. In the post-Cold War world, there have been frequent examples of humanitarian intervention in international relations. The United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, other states or groups of states, and even nongovernmental actors have acted under the rubric of humanitarian intervention, and with varying degrees of international legal authority and legitimacy, to alleviate human suffering within states. The protection of the Kurds in Iraq after the Gulf War of 1991, the failed mission in Somalia in 1992, the armed interventions in Bosnia and Kosovo, and other actions had strong military components. In Cambodia, Namibia, and elsewhere, the political and economic components of the interventions outweighed the military. In the case of East Timor, the role of the United Nations ultimately was carried out with the official consent of the government of Indonesia, but only because of the threat of economic and political sanctions hanging over their decision. In the



stages of the independence process which preceded the popular referendum in August 1999, and especially in those which followed, military and police forces under the auspices of the United Nations played a crucial role in protecting the people of East Timor.

Discussion about the tasks for peace that are appropriate to the United Nations and other international actors has been going on for many years. Some of the major documents that chronicle this discussion are the reports (*Agenda for Peace*) of Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali in 1992 and 1995<sup>3 1</sup>, the report of Lakhdar Brahimi on U.N. peace operations in 2000<sup>3 2</sup>, the Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty in 2001,<sup>3 3</sup> and the Report of the Secretary General's High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change (*A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility*).<sup>3 4</sup> *The Responsibility to Protect* and later U.N. documents have explicitly tried to advance the discussion of appropriate conditions for "intervention" by conceptualizing the "responsibility to protect." Intervention, humanitarian or otherwise, is an issue in international law and politics that has become ever more complex as the United States has taken on a role of sole super-power in the minds of many, as international organizations have been redefining themselves since the end of the Cold War confrontation, and as globalization of communications and economic life has progressed.

What all these reports show, and what the experiences in East Timor and the other cases mentioned above indicate, is that values of human rights and human security do take center-stage in international relations today, sometimes trumping national sovereignty. The transformation of state sovereignty under the impact of these and other values, as well as the material conditions for a more integrated world, make state borders less significant for the realization of rights and security than they once were. An international or global response to violations of human rights and threats to human security is part of the reality of politics in Asia and elsewhere. This is not to say that responses will necessarily be timely or consistent, but that these issues are on the table regardless of what some national political elites may wish.

#### (5) *Terrorism*

National, regional, and global concerns with terrorism and the threat of terrorism have reached new highs after the coordinated terrorist acts of September 11, 2001, in the United States. National legislation, United Nations resolutions, and international police cooperation have been some of the tools used to address the problem. The bombing in Bali on 12 October 2002, violence and kidnappings

associated with revolutionary groups in several Southeast Asian states, and the penetration of Al Qaeda networks in East Asia highlight the degree to which terrorism is an issue specifically in Asia. Increased maritime piracy in Southeast Asian waters is also viewed as (at least potentially) terrorist-related rather than simply ordinary international crime. On 1 August 2002, the United States Government and the Governments of the Member Countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) issued a Joint Declaration for Cooperation to Combat International Terror,<sup>3 5</sup> and the ASEAN Summit in October 2003 established an ASEAN Security Community (ASC) under the Bali Concord II.<sup>3 6</sup>

The diversity of the terrorist threat in the region is exemplified by the attack on the Tokyo subway system with sarin gas by Aum Shinrikyo in March 1995. Terrorist acts and threats affect wealthy and poor states, elites and ordinary people throughout Asia and the world. These are not only issues of national security, but also matters of human rights and human security for all. As Christopher Joyner has noted: “Acts of terror violence clearly aim at the destruction of human rights and fundamental freedoms in a society. There is no question that in striving to attain some political purpose, terrorists seek to destroy human rights...”<sup>3 7</sup>

As civil libertarians have pointed out, the balance between the legitimate effort by police and other authorities to protect the public against terrorism on the one hand and the maintenance of human rights standards on the other can be difficult. Governments can capitalize on public fears of terrorists by limiting the freedoms of individuals and groups that oppose government policies or actions in peaceful ways that are protected under human rights standards. In this way, governmental agents add insecurities to the lives of ordinary people, in addition to the human insecurities induced by terrorism itself. This vicious circle of human rights violations and human insecurities is a danger facing Asia today.

*Concluding Remarks.* The preceding pages have offered a brief empirical account of some of the major contemporary cases of human rights and human security in Asia. As the data demonstrate, problems affect countries large and small, old and new; and ultimately the problem is not a national problem, but a human problem, a problem affecting people, even in a framework of globalization. The use of a discourse about security can be related to one about rights precisely by viewing the human dimensions of the two.

Violations of human rights and of human security feed upon themselves in a vicious circle, making human conditions generally worse and creating tensions in the

efforts to protect either rights or security. However, there can also be a positive feedback or beneficent circle in which progress in human rights, and related values such as democracy, creates conditions for solid human security within and beyond national borders. Security advances at global, regional, and national levels can also establish an atmosphere in which all manner of human rights can flourish—political, economic, and other. Appreciation of the values of rights and security, and acceptance of appropriate differences of culture, religion, identity, and so on, become sources of human enrichment, empowerment, and solidarity rather than potential sources of a clash among peoples

#### IV. Problems and Policies

History and theory have converged to make possible, if not necessary, a new understanding of human rights and human security today. Particularly in Asia, these two concepts combine to provide insights into the current dynamics of international politics in the region. The cases considered in the previous section illustrate how broad these concepts are, and how they provide a basis for both negative critiques of contemporary affairs and positive values of global and regional transformation. In the present section, I will consider more analytically the kinds of problems that are faced at various levels in East Asia and how policies molded according to these standards can be put into relevant practice.

The dominant discourses about economic and social development in the last half of the twentieth century showed a gradual evolution from state-centered to human-centered concepts. The process of decolonization during that period, though it included strong statist and nationalist elements, also was rooted in values such as freedom and equality. Not surprisingly, the result of these mixed principles in economic, social, and political life has been mixed public policy. Domestic polities, inter-state relations, and international organizations have, in practice, promoted diverse, if not contradictory approaches to change and order: authoritarianism and democracy, the prosperous state and popular welfare, closed systems and open globalization.

A thumb-nail sketch of history would note that economic growth through industrialization was an ideal of the 1950s that progressed through various approaches such as import substitution policies and export-led development. The patterns of policy implementation varied from country to country, and different combinations of resource-based, agricultural, and industrial growth were pursued. In the background of these policy measures were related theories of modernization (sometimes perceived as

westernization), which included distorted notions of superior and inferior peoples, and of progress as a process of catching up with an historically different and geographically distant other. The remnants of imperial conquest, colonialism, and racist ideologies of evolutionary progress contributed to distorted development. Gradually, however, even state-dominated institutions like the World Bank and the United Nations Development Program began to reorient their policies and practices from the economies of states to the welfare of people.

The heightened awareness of rights also provided an alternative view of what development might mean and how it might be undertaken in domestic and international politics. Philosophers and practitioners alike addressed these issues from a perspective of human rights more thoroughly from the 1970s. Reflection on what it means to be human led to consideration of an approach to development that starts with the *basic needs* of individual human beings: food, shelter, health care, education, and so on. And a differentiated philosophy of human rights attended to the notion of *basic rights*, including not only physical and legal protection of individuals, but also their access to the basic necessities of well-being and welfare. Even the increased attention given to recent policies regarding ecology have explicitly addressed these as *human environmental issues*, or rights to a clean and healthy environment for people.

Human rights thought thus advanced within countries and in international relations, and specifically through the activities of various regional and universal international organizations into the twenty-first century. At the global level, as the Eastern bloc disintegrated, a transition occurred from communism to new political and economic forms from the late 1980s. This helped to promote human rights ideals through the related political principle of democracy, so that liberal-democratic regimes grounded on principles of both human rights and democracy became a more widely accepted standard. A third dominant principle, market-based economic systems, has also spread, though its convergence with concepts of human rights and basic needs is not always clear. As illustrated above, the case of China over the last quarter-century has shown that certain market-centered reforms can be independent of political reforms in the matter of democracy and human rights.

As noted earlier, the other significant transformation directly related to the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the disappearance of the Warsaw Pact military bloc has been in the field of security. Several of the theoretical developments associated with this change have been discussed above.<sup>3 8</sup> Security in Asia, in particular, has been of special interest, because of both numerous military tensions and the wider

human security issues facing peoples in the region.<sup>39</sup> Even the statist approach to a research strategy for security employed by Alagappa<sup>40</sup> refers to many of the diverse actors and values that the human security approach considers, and admits the importance of constructivist and liberal insights in addition to the neorealist strategy that it adopts. It is not traditional matters of state security alone that explain cases considered above such as China, East Timor, or the financial crisis of 1997; rather, human security issues inextricably associated with questions of human rights are central.

Strategic thinking based on military considerations dominates analysis of relations between the divided nations of China and Korea. Security in the Taiwan Straits and along the demilitarized zone on the Korean peninsula continues to have that military component. Of course, this affects other states and peoples in the region, too, as Japanese foreign policy and the military dimension of the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) testify. The hegemonic role of the U.S.A.<sup>41</sup> in this area has increased, as the Cold War conflicts have receded and the projection of its military power in the Middle East and elsewhere have increased the American profile throughout the world. In particular, American development of a National Missile Defense (NMD) system and Theater Missile Defense (TMD) in East Asia, as well as its announcement in August 2004 of future troop redeployments throughout the world, is certain to affect perceptions of security in the region into the future.

Meanwhile, issues other than strictly military questions have become more prominently related to security. Increasing economic interdependence within the region of East Asia and particularly between China and the U.S.A. testify to the fact that even in these cases the question is no longer a one-dimensional military issue, but a broader set of issues within an increasing pattern of globalization. The positive contribution of democratization to human security in the Philippines, S. Korea, and Taiwan is an established reality. And the progress in these countries may provide models for emulation elsewhere that are based on human rights.

Another security issue which at first glance seems to be primarily military is the development by North Korea of nuclear weapons and delivery systems. Since 2003, attention has been focused on the Six-Party Talks (or Four-Plus-Two; U.S.A., Russia, China, Japan, plus North and South Korea) on the future of North Korea's nuclear programs. Peter Van Ness calls this multilateral approach to negotiating a mutually beneficial solution to the military standoff a "cooperative security" design.<sup>42</sup> Of course, in the background of this military issue is the continuing failure of the North

Korean state to provide broader human security to its own citizens. With the example of West Germany's absorption of East Germany in recent history and with the continuing capitalist economic policies in other Asian "socialist" states (China, Vietnam), the security perceptions of both North Korea and its multilateral interlocutors certainly include both people and states, with military, economic, and other dimensions.

In addition to the flash points in the cases of China and Korea, there are numerous territorial disputes in East and Southeast Asia, but the latter have rarely spilled over into violent international conflicts in recent decades. However, military cooperation between the U.S.A. and several states in the region demonstrates that military security remains a preoccupation. And individual states continue to maintain strong military postures. For example, Japan has updated its defense guidelines for military cooperation with the U.S.A., sent its forces abroad on various peacemaking operations, strengthened its weaponry and intelligence services, clarified its domestic legislation relating to emergency situations, and is considering constitutional changes that may give its military forces a higher official status. Responses from its neighbors (particularly China and the Koreas) to these moves show the security dilemma faced by Japan. Due to historical reasons (especially related to colonialism in Korea, aggression in China, and human rights violations during those events) and contemporary disputes (especially relating to religious rites, interpretations of history, and economic relations including reception of foreign workers), Japan's military policies are often viewed as threatening or at least unwelcome.

For its part Japan has been trying for decades to elaborate a foreign policy in which military issues are considered in a non-traditional form. The war-renouncing Article 9 of the 1947 Constitution of Japan continues to provide a framework for such a policy. Also, since joining the United Nations in 1956, Japan has contextualized its security aims through its participation in that organization. In recent decades, Japan has articulated the goal of comprehensive security that extends to non-military arenas such as beneficial economic relations with countries throughout the world. From at least the time of Prime Minister Obuchi's administration (July 1998-April 2000), Japan's foreign policy has explicitly included the language of human security in enunciating its stance toward the world. Since that time, Japan has made efforts to promote human rights, particularly throughout the Asian region, a policy which fits in well with the pursuit of human security.

The crucial role of non-state or nongovernmental actors in the achievement of human rights and human security was evident in several of the cases examined above.

They were active in the matter of informing people throughout the world<sup>4 3</sup> of repression in China and East Timor, or of spreading the voice of democratic claims in the Philippines, South Korea, and Taiwan. Clearly, the economic actors of importance in the Asian financial crisis from 1997 were not merely states or inter-state bodies like the International Monetary Fund. Banks, corporations, and investors with large and small stakes in enterprises throughout the region played important roles in the evolution of the crisis. In diverse ways, religions have also played a significant role in the process of achieving (and sometimes threatening) human rights and human security in several of these cases.<sup>4 4</sup> Religious groups were among those in the forefront of democratic advance in the Philippines and South Korea. In Indonesia, Malaysia, East Timor, and elsewhere, religious identities have been salient elements in the processes of social change that swept through the region. In China, a government seemingly worried about its own legitimacy has cracked down on religious groups on numerous occasions. Terrorist groups have frequently used religious rhetoric to recruit and mobilize members. Focusing on these religious actors and the role of public religion opens a viewpoint on international relations that converges on the significance of human rights and human security.

In a fundamental sense, the use of the discourses of human rights and human security makes us attend to persons rather than structures, organizations, groups, or roles. Article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights claims that “All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.” This is a clear affirmation that the basis of rights claims is independent of the (imperfect) formulation of those rights, even in the Universal Declaration itself, and that the rights themselves surpass institutions or structures. In particular, it affirms that human rights are precisely that, rights attributed to human beings, not to special groups or privileged classes, or even specifically to citizens of a polity. When the same conceptual approach is used in the rhetoric of security, a similar claim is made. Security is no longer seen as something that states seek for themselves or even that states exclusively provide for some people (citizens or others). Rather, the foundation of the discourse becomes the human person; and the public policy relating to security is seen to serve that person’s needs and conditions. Of course, this requires knowing the threats to human security that people face in their specific circumstances of time and place. It also means that policies—domestic, foreign, global—need to be carried out to provide that existentially experienced security in the political order.

One case that illustrates this link between human rights and human security in an

international context, and yet is focused on individual persons, is the abduction by North Korean agents of a number of Japanese nationals since the 1970s. Eventually, the North Korean government admitted in 2003 that it carried out those kidnappings; and negotiations on the matter between the governments of Japan and North Korea are continuing, while some of the kidnapped persons have been released and have returned to Japan in a flurry of publicity. These cases show quite clearly the link between protection of the most basic rights (personal rights to life and liberty) and the existential enjoyment of security. The government of a state (North Korea) was involved in the violation of the rights in question, and two governments (Japan and North Korea) are involved in the process of resolving the matter. On the other hand, it is particular individuals, not the states that are the referents here. Furthermore, the existential threat that such abductions posed to a broad segment of Japanese society shows the link between traditional rights discourse and contemporary security discourse. The extraordinary amount of attention given to the cases by the Japanese media and public shows how today's perceptions of threats to security are not limited to high political conflict and international war, but extend to the personal level.

In the previous section of this study, we saw how terrorism and counter-terrorism are now global issues of high priority. As with previous issues in international relations such as the East-West standoff or nuclear weapons, we are faced with the problem of understanding these issues in a coherent and general way, rather than simply as so many isolated incidents or randomly selected strategies. From this perspective, the two concepts and principles, human rights and human security, together supply important tools for today's theory of international relations or global politics. Both human rights and human security have become established concepts within international relations discourse, sometimes developing along independent trajectories, and sometime complementing each other. In this study, I have tried to show that in contemporary Asia (specifically East Asia and Southeast Asia), the two concepts together provide a balanced means for considering the problem of terrorism and the policies needed for counter-terrorism. While some people in the region have engaged in terrorism, terrorists have not been able to offer a convincing justification for their activities; and the vast majority of people, governments, and nongovernmental groups have preferred human security that rejects terrorism, because terrorism violates human rights. Of course, policies that balance all the pertinent values may not be simple in particular cases where counter-terrorism is pursued.

Finally, I will add some concluding remarks about how human rights and human



security might be situated in a broader theory of international relations. Viewed as a normative undertaking, international relations theory selects certain values for attention and advancement. Human rights are grounded in human dignity, with a thrust toward full and authentic personal development; human security is similarly grounded, with a recognition that existential threats to persons require appropriate defensive actions. There can be tensions between rights and security when policy choices only imperfectly realize the values of the two. Viewed as an empirical undertaking, international relations theory addresses the actual conditions of today's global interactions, in political, economic, social, cultural, religious, and other dimensions. Demands for human rights and human security in Asia have become more explicit and have increased in recent years. At the beginning of this study, I indicated that history and theory have intertwined in international relations. The present examination of human rights and human security in Asia confirms this insight, and suggests some particular ways in which that intertwining is happening today.

In particular, identity is a key concept for understanding what is occurring in international relations and international relations theory, and how it might be evaluated. Perhaps the most familiar use of "identity" in recent international relations literature has been in reference to "post-Cold War" studies, which postulate vigorous national identities stimulating claims for autonomy, and spilling over in ethnic and religious conflicts. Actually, the ideological rivalries and the anti-imperialist, de-colonization trends of an earlier era exhibited identity politics of a different sort. Even the "globalization" of society and politics that has been occurring in numerous ways depends upon a sense of global identity. The exclusions and inclusions involved in identity formation have been, and still are, going on at personal and structural levels. In any case, affirming an identity grounded in the values of human rights and human security has become a significant element in the lives of people and thus in global politics.

How are these identities understood in our theories of international relations? And how might international relations theory be formulated better to grasp the realities that people face in today's world? Broadly speaking, more attention to cultures and religions in international relations is helping to clarify the actual identities that people bring to their social interactions.<sup>4 5</sup> This helps to provide us with a better understanding of the real interests of people rather than a postulated national interest in the context of international politics. Taking the argument one step further, as explained above in the context of McSweeney's theory of security, identity and interest

may be viewed as recursive rather than isolated and independent of each other. In terms of the general theories of international relations, this insight helps to bridge the gap between some realist positions that emphasize interests and constructivist positions that emphasize identities.<sup>4 6</sup> The concept of human dignity—an essential feature of human identity—in the foundation of thought on human rights and human security can be approached through the cultural and religious roots of human identity. This combination of insights into human rights and human security via human identity and human dignity, can shed new light on contemporary international relations.

## NOTES

---

<sup>1</sup> Walt, Stephen M., “The Renaissance of Security Studies,” *International Studies Quarterly* 35 (1991), pp. 211-239. For a contemporary systematic treatment of theories and approaches to security issues in international relations, see Kolodziej, Edward A., *Security and International Relations*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

<sup>2</sup> United Nations Development Program (UNDP), *Human Development Report 1994*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994. Commission on Global Governance, *Our Global Neighborhood: The Report of the Commission on Global Governance*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995. A recent survey of the norms of human security in the context of global governance is: 栗栖薫子「人間安全保障『規範』の形成とグローバルガヴァナンス—規範複合化の視点から—」*国際政治* 143 (2005年11月), 76 - 91 頁。[Kurusu, Kaoru, “Ningen Anzen Hoshoo ‘Kihan’ no Keisei to Global Governance: Kihan Fukugooka no Shiten kara,” (Norm construction of human security and global governance: from the point of view of norm complex, in Japanese), *Kokusai Seiji* (International Relations), No. 143 (November 2005)]

<sup>3</sup> Buzan, Barry, Ole Wæver, and Jaap de Wilde, *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*, Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner, 1998, pp. 35ff.

<sup>4</sup> Laustsen, Carsten Bagge, and Ole Wæver, “In Defense of Religion: Sacred Referent Objects for Securitization,” in Petito, Fabio, and Pavlos Hatzopoulos, (eds.), *Religion in International Relations: the Return from Exile*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003, pp. 147-180.

<sup>5</sup> UNDP, *Human Development Report 1994*, *op.cit.* Compare: Commission on Global Governance, *Our Global Neighbourhood*, *op.cit.*

<sup>6</sup> Claude, Richard P., “The Classical Model of Human Rights Development,” in Claude, (ed.), *Comparative Human Rights*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976.

<sup>7</sup> Wessels, David, 「国際人権の進歩」*国際政治* 76 (1984年5月), 83 - 101頁。[“Kokusai jinken no shimpo (Progress in international human rights, in Japanese),” *Kokusai seiji* (International Relations), No. 76 (May 1984)].

<sup>8</sup> Booth, Ken, “Nuclearism, Human Rights and Constructions of Security (Part I),” *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 3:2(Summer 1999), pp. 1-24; and Booth, “Nuclearism, Human Rights and Constructions of Security (Part II),” *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 3:3(Autumn 1999), pp. 44-61.

<sup>9</sup> United Nations World Conference on Human Rights, Vienna Declaration and

---

Programme of Action, adopted 25 June 1993 (United Nations Document A/CONF.157/24).

<sup>10</sup> Bilgin, Pinar, "Individual and Societal Dimensions of Security," *International Studies Review* 5 (2003), pp. 203-222.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 217-220.

<sup>12</sup> McSweeney, Bill, *Security, Identity, and Interests: A Sociology of International Relations*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, especially Part II.

<sup>14</sup> Goldstein, Judith, and Robert Keohane, (eds.), *Ideas and Foreign Policy*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993.

<sup>15</sup> McSweeney, *op.cit.*, p. 99.

<sup>16</sup> The survey by Kolodziej noted above in note 1 is a broad review of security theory from the viewpoint of international relations theory.

<sup>17</sup> Although this paper is not suitable for rehearsing the place of constructivism in social theory or international relations generally, a few comments are in order.

It is not really possible to talk about *one* constructivism or social constructivism. Rather different epistemological and ontological claims are made in the name of constructivism. Some emphasize language, rules, and intersubjective meaning, while others focus on the material world and how we grasp it. The former include Onuf, Kratochwil, and McSweeney; the latter include Wendt and Walt. Onuf, Nicholas, *World of Our Making: Rules and Rule in a Constructed World*, Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1989. Kratochwil, Friedrich, *Rules, Norms, and Decisions: On the Conditions of Practical and Legal Reasoning in International Relations and Domestic Affairs*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1989. McSweeney, *op.cit.* Wendt, Alexander, *Social Theory of International Politics*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1999. Walt, Stephen, "International Relations: One World, Many Theories," *Foreign Policy*, 110 (1998), pp. 29-46.

For a careful account of constructivism within the intellectual discipline of international relations, see Smith, Steve, "Foreign Policy Is What States Make of It: Social Construction and International Relations Theory," in Kubalkova, Vendulka, (ed.), *Foreign Policy in a Constructed World*, Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 2001, pp. 38-55. Smith is inclined to the approach of Onuf, but treats all the main lines of constructivism.

<sup>18</sup> Iriye, Akira, *Global Community: The Role of International Organizations in the Making of the Contemporary World*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

<sup>19</sup> Waltz, Kenneth N., *Theory of International Politics*, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1979.

<sup>20</sup> Lapid, Yosef, and Friedrich Kratochwil, (eds.), *The Return of Culture and Identity in IR Theory*, Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1996. Petito and Hatzopoulos, (eds.), *op.cit.*

Philpott, Daniel, *Revolutions in Sovereignty: How Ideas Shaped Modern International Relations*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001. Rudolph, Susanne Hoeber, and James Piscatori, (eds.), *Transnational Religion and Fading States*, Boulder: Westview Press, 1997. Carlson, John D., and Erik C. Owens, (eds.), *The Sacred and the Sovereign: Religion and International Politics*, Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2003.

<sup>21</sup> Huntington, Samuel, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1996.

---

<sup>2 2</sup> Philpott, Daniel, "The Challenge of September 11 to Secularism in International Relations," *World Politics*, 55 (October 2002), pp. 66-95.

<sup>2 3</sup> Casanova, José, *Public Religions in the Modern World*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994. Berger, Peter L., (ed.), *The Desecularization of the World: Resurgent Religion and World Politics*, Ethics and Public Policy Center/ William B. Eerdmans, 1999. 津城寛文 『公共宗教の光と影』 春秋社、2005。 [Tsushiro, Hirofumi, 'Kookyoo Shuukyoo' no hikari to kage (The light and shade of 'Public Religion', in Japanese) Shunjusha, 2005]

<sup>2 4</sup> As this study was being prepared, a new and comprehensive report on human security was being published. This work by Andrew Mack and others at the Human Security Center of the University of British Columbia, *The Human Security Report 2005*, surveys the conditions of genocides, wars, and other aspects of contemporary human security, and examines how the United Nations has acted more assertively in recent decades to promote human security. Cf. *Human Security Report 2005* (available from Oxford University Press, and on the internet at <http://www.humansecurityreport.info/> [accessed January 11, 2006]).

<sup>2 5</sup> Wan, Ming, *Human Rights in Chinese Foreign Relations: Defining & Defending National Interests*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001, p.127.

<sup>2 6</sup> Human Rights Watch, *Dangerous Meditation: China's Campaign Against Falungong*, New York: Human Rights Watch 2002. (Accessed on July 22, 2004, at <http://www.hrw.org/reports/2002/china>)

<sup>2 7</sup> A survey of the crisis that emphasizes the interplay of politics and economics, along with the domestic, regional, and international aspects of the causes and developments in the crisis may be found in Pempel, T.J., (ed.), *The Politics of the Asian Economic Crisis*, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1999.

<sup>2 8</sup> Yue, Chia Siow, and Shamira Bhanu, "Human Security Dimensions of the Asian Financial Crisis: A Compendium of Research Materials," in *The Asian Crisis and Human Security: An Intellectual Dialogue on Building Asia's Tomorrow*, Tokyo and New York: Japan Center for International Exchange, and Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 1999, pp. 53-103.

<sup>2 9</sup> Shue, Henry, *Basic Rights: Subsistence, Affluence, and US Foreign Policy*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.

<sup>3 0</sup> Stiglitz, Joseph E., *Globalization and Its Discontents*, New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 2002.

<sup>3 1</sup> Boutros-Ghali, Boutros, *An Agenda for Peace*, Report of the Secretary-General (1<sup>st</sup> ed., 1992), and *Supplement to An Agenda for Peace* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 1995), New York: United Nations.

<sup>3 2</sup> Brahimi, Lakhdar, *Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations*, (United Nations Document A/55/1305, S/2000/809, August 2000).

<sup>3 3</sup> International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, *The Responsibility to Protect*, Ottawa: International Development Research Centre, 2001.

<sup>3 4</sup> United Nations, Department of Public Information, 2004. (DPI/2367, December 2004).

<sup>3 5</sup> Dalpino, Catharin, and David Steinberg, eds., *Georgetown Southeast Asia Survey 2002-2003*, Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Asian Studies Program, 2003. Appendix 1, pp. 109-111 (Source: <http://www.state.gov/p/eap/rls/ot/12428.htm>).

---

<sup>3 6</sup> *Declaration of ASEAN Concord II (Bali Concord II)*, October 2003, in Dalpino, Catharin, and David Steinberg, eds., *Georgetown Southeast Asia Survey 2003-2004*, Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Asian Studies Program, 2004. Appendix 1, pp.107-113 (Source: <http://www.aseansec.org/15159.htm>).

<sup>3 7</sup> Joyner, Christopher C., "The United Nations and Terrorism: Rethinking Legal Tensions Between National Security, Human Rights, and Civil Liberties," *International Studies Perspectives* 5(2004), p. 243.

<sup>3 8</sup> See notes 1, 3, 4, 8, 10, 12, 24, and related text.

<sup>3 9</sup> Alagappa, Muthiah, (ed.), *Asian Security Practice: Material and Ideational Influences*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998. Tow, William T., Ramesh Thakur, and In-Taek Hyun, (eds.), *Asia's Emerging Regional Order: Reconciling Traditional and Human Security*, Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2000. *The Asian Crisis and Human Security*, *op.cit.*

<sup>4 0</sup> Alagappa, Muthiah, "Introduction," in Alagappa (ed.), *Asian Security Practice*, *op.cit.*, pp. 15-23.

<sup>4 1</sup> Van Ness, Peter, "Globalization and Security in East Asia," *Asian Perspective*, Vol. 23, No. 4 (1999), pp. 315-342.

<sup>4 2</sup> Van Ness, Peter, "The North Korean Nuclear Crisis: Four-Plus-Two—An Idea Whose Time Has Come," *Asian Perspective*, Vol. 27, No. 4 (2003), pp. 249-275.

<sup>4 3</sup> Various terms are used to name the audience for this information, for example, the international community, world public opinion, civil society, and so on. I will not try to define that audience any more specifically, because it would involve a discussion of concepts not immediately relevant to this study. Of course, in many instances, the information is meant for governmental bodies, as well, with an immediate aim of protecting persons whose rights have been violated or threatened.

<sup>4 4</sup> Wessels, David, "Capacities for Global Politics: Religions and Cultures in the Pacific Rim," *Bulletin of the Faculty of Foreign Studies, Sophia University* (No. 40, 2005).

<sup>4 5</sup> Lapid and Kratochwil, *op.cit.* Albert, Mathias, David Jacobson, and Yosef Lapid, (eds.), *Identities, Borders, Orders: Rethinking International Relations Theory*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001. Beyer, Peter, *Religion and Globalization*, Sage Publications, 1994. Esposito, John L., and Michael Watson, (eds.), *Religion and Global Order*, Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2000. Van der Veer, Peter, "Political Religion in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century," chapter 15, pp. 311-327, in Paul, T.B., and John A. Hall, (eds.), *International Order and the Future of World Politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. Thomas, Scott M., *The Global Resurgence of Religion and the Transformation of International Relations: The Struggle for the Soul of the Twenty-First Century*, New York: PalgraveMacmillan, 2005.

Additional references may be found above, at note 20.

<sup>4 6</sup> McSweeney, *op.cit.*