

Human Security: A Potential for Cooperation in the EU and East Asia

Sebastian HARNISCH*

Nam-Kook KIM**

〈Abstract〉

This paper explores the differing levels of recognition of human security as an analytical concept as well as a foreign policy strategy in the EU and East Asia. The term emphasizes additional protection and expanded freedoms for individuals: the freedom from want, the freedom from fear, and the freedom to take action on one's own behalf. The idea of combining security and human rights can be construed as a 'narrow version' of human security, often equated with the Responsibility to Protect (R2P), or a so-called 'broad' approach as defined by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). In the EU, human security as a policy concept is currently interpreted as an umbrella term, highlighting concerns about physical integrity and equal participation rather than economic development, reflecting the EU's recent turn towards post-conflict reconstruction and humanitarian assistance missions. In contrast, many governments in East Asia have traditionally asserted security concepts safeguarding internal and external sovereignty, thereby limiting human security claims favouring the individual and its wants. Instead of human security, the term 'non-traditional security concerns', which includes air pollution, food safety, cyber security, and natural disaster relief, is often

* First Author, Professor, Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences, Heidelberg University(sebastian.harnisch@ipw.uni-heidelberg.de)

** Corresponding Author, Professor, Department of Political Science and International Relations, Korea University(nkim98@korea.ac.kr)

used in East Asia. As a consequence, a considerable potential for pragmatic cooperation between East Asia and the EU is apparent, as long as this cooperation remains functionally limited and de-politicized with regard to sovereignty concerns.

Key Words: Human Security, National Sovereignty, European Union, East Asia, Freedom from Want, Freedom from Fear

Contents

- | | |
|---|--|
| I . Introduction: Emergence of the Human Security Concept | V . The Development of Human Security and Threat Perception in East Asia |
| II . The Development of the EU approaches to Human Security | VI . East Asian Policy Response |
| III . Threat Perceptions in the EU | VII . Conclusion: Convergence and Divergence with Possibility of Cooperation |
| IV . EU Policy Responses | |

I . Introduction: Emergence of the Human Security Concept

Human Security means to “protect all human lives in ways that enhance human freedom and human fulfilment,” according to the UN Commission on Human Security’s report.¹⁾ It has two levels of protection: one, protection of the individual from threat of famine, illness, and oppression; the other, protection of the individual from danger of sudden and painful disruption of everyday life.²⁾ Human security is different from national security in which the state’s security takes centre stage, focusing on territorial integrity and political independence through the use of

1) UN Commission on Human Security, *Human Security Now* (United Nations, 2003), p.4.

2) UN Development Program, *Human Development Report 1994* (Oxford University Press, 1994), p.23.

political, legal, or military instruments at the state or international level. Accordingly, human security implies two kinds of shift: on the one hand, a shift from security of territory to security of people; on the other hand, a shift from security through military means to security through sustainable human development.

Nevertheless, this ambitious concept of human security within the international community is becoming more contested, both as an analytical concept and as a foreign policy strategy. As shown in Table 1, the term depicts the conferral of obligations by norm entrepreneurs on governments to provide additional protection and expanded freedoms: the freedom from want (a minimal level of sustainable wellbeing), the freedom from fear (a basic level of physical integrity), and the freedom to take action on one's own behalf (a substantial level of participatory rights).³⁾ It also claims priority of approaches focusing either on protection through social safety net or empowerment of individuals through capacity building.

[Table 1] Elements and Implications of Human Security

	Element	Implications
Component	Freedom from Fear	Efforts to address causes of conflict and develop governance for physical integrity
	Freedom from Want	Efforts to provide basic services and needs for sustainable wellbeing
	Freedom to take Action	Substantial level of participatory rights on one's own behalf
Approach	Protection	development of social safety net
	Empowerment	Strengthening capacity of individuals

Source: Modified from Kim, Bae, and Shin (2015)⁴⁾

3) Peter Burgess *et al.*, *Promoting Human Security: Ethical, Normative and Educational Frameworks in Western Europe* (UNESCO, 2007), pp.7-120; Des Gasper, "Human Security: from definitions to investigating a discourse," M. Martin and T. Owen, ed., *Routledge Handbook of Human Security* (Routledge, 2014), pp.28-42.

4) Eunmee Kim, Seonyoung Bae, and Jihyun Shin, "Human Security in Practice: the

As a scientific concept, the term has undergone substantial scrutiny and re-interpretation⁵⁾: on the one hand, it has been criticized by gender and critical scholars as a policy tool by states from the Global North to rationalize a ‘virtuous imperialism’ over the Global South⁶⁾; on the other hand, various scholars have struggled to define boundaries and thresholds of the concept⁷⁾, so as not to undermine its theoretical, analytical, or emancipatory purchase.⁸⁾

As a political strategy, since its inception in the Human Development Report in 1994, human security has been appropriated by various (mainly) governmental actors and international organizations in a set of diverse interpretations,⁹⁾ resulting in a cacophony of national and international strategies sometimes contradicting each other.¹⁰⁾

South Korean Case,” *JICA Research Institute Working Paper*; No.93 (March 2015), pp.1-36.

- 5) Shaun Breslin and George Christou, “Has the Human Security Agenda Come of Age? Definitions, Discourses and Debates,” *Contemporary Politics*, Vol.21, No.1 (2015), pp.1-10; Daniel Marcos and Nuno Teixeira, “From Security to Human Security: The Evolution of the Concept and Current Perspectives for the Atlantic Basin,” N. Teixeira and D. Marcos, ed., *Evolving Human Security Challenges in the Atlantic Space* (Brookings Institution, 2019), pp.3-22.
- 6) Gunhild Hoogensen-Gjørsv, “Human Security: Lessons Learned from Afghanistan,” M. Dunn-Cavelty and V. Meier, ed., *Routledge Handbook of Security Studies* (Routledge, 2017), pp.106-117.
- 7) Keith Krause, “Critical Perspectives on Human Security,” Mary Martin and Taylor Owen, ed., *Routledge Handbook of Human Security* (Routledge, 2014), pp.76-93; Alexandra Homolar, “Human security benchmarks: Governing human wellbeing at a distance,” *Review of International Studies*, Vol.41, No.5 (2015), pp.843-863.
- 8) Rodha Howard-Hassmann, “Human Security: Undermining Human Rights?” *Human Rights Quarterly*, Vol.34, No.1 (2012), pp.88-112; Victor King and Paul Carnegie, “Towards a Social Science Understanding of Human Security,” *Journal of Human Security Studies*, Vol.7, No.1 (2018), pp.1-17.
- 9) Timo Kivimäki, “Can the Pragmatic East Asian Approach to Human Security Offer a Way for the Deepening of the Long Peace of East Asia,” *Journal of Human Security*, Vol.10, No.1 (2014), pp.76-88; Martin Wählisch, “Human Security: Concept and Evolution in the United Nations,” R. Wolfrum ed., *Max Planck Yearbook of United Nations Law Online*, Vol.18, No.1 (2014), pp.1-31.
- 10) Sangmin Bae and David Diaz, “The Wax and Wane of Human Security Norms:

In sum, over one or two decades, the concept has become both much more salient but also more divisive because of its liberal core claim, that humans and their wants should be at the centre of security concerns in the twenty-first century. This has been challenged by a variety of forces, i.e. non-state actors such as the so-called Islamic State, enslaving whole communities and releasing them for ransom, or state actors, such as Russia, deliberately killing EU citizens with weapons of mass destruction, that have undermined the rules-based international order and also the European Union.

Considering the increasing attention towards this concept, we can trace the changing competence of human security as an analytical concept as well as a foreign policy strategy in both the EU and East Asia. The level of threat perception and policy response are compared from the viewpoint of human security in both continents. We then suggest the possibility of cooperation between the EU and East Asia through the framework of transnational human security issues such as crime, pollution, climate change, and natural disaster. We also raise the question of the necessary conditions to promote this cooperation between the two continents.

II. The Development of the EU Approaches to Human Security

Even in the European Union and its member states, the concept of human security has become more contested. The EU's approach and practice on human security has evolved considerably over time, setting groups of EU institutions and member states with distinguishable policy patterns apart from each other.¹¹⁾ As a

revisiting the Cases of Japan and Canada,” *Journal of Human Security Studies*, Vol.7, No.2 (Autumn 2018), pp.58-78; Carolina Hernandez et al., ed., *Human Security and Cross-Border Cooperation in East Asia* (Springer Nature, 2019), p.284.

11) Benjamin Thompson, “The European Union’s Human Security Discourse:

consequence of these cleavages, the concept has developed from a declaratory strategy to a policy tool-kit over time, informing both country-oriented and functional EU policies to a variant degree, without, however, gaining traction as an overall strategic outlook (yet) as envisioned by its proponents Mary Kaldor and Javier Solana.¹²⁾

Among member states, two more or less distinguishable groups have emerged over time: a group of norm entrepreneurs which assess human security as under risk but not directly under threat. This group consists of countries such as Finland, Sweden, and EU members of the Human Security Network (established in 1999), i.e., Austria, the Netherlands, Greece, Ireland, and Slovenia. While not acting as a formal group, these countries focus on an interpretation of human security, foregrounding concerns about conflict resolution, peacebuilding, as well as gender equality;¹³⁾ a group of norm sceptics and norm contesters, such as France, the United Kingdom, Poland, and Hungary, which have criticized the concept as too fuzzy and unclear in its operational consequences.¹⁴⁾ This latter group recognizes specific security challenges, such as gender equality, which are part of the human security agenda, but they treat these as separate issues and not as human security concerns. It follows that EU member states tend to converge around a low or

Conceptualization and Justification,” *Korean Journal of International Studies*, Vol.14, No.1 (2016), pp.161-186.

The EUGS rarely speaks of (existential) threats or risks to the EU, thereby avoiding the EU’s essentialization. Rather, the document and its predecessor, ‘The European Union in a changing global environment: A more connected, contested and complex world’ refer to ‘challenges’ that are contesting specific EU programmes or goals.

- 12) Javier Solana, “The European Union and Human Security: The Making of a Global Security Actor,” M. Martin and T. Owen, ed., *Routledge Handbook of Human Security* (Routledge, 2014), pp.251-259.
- 13) Karina Marczuk, “Origin, Development and Perspectives for the Human Security Concept in the European Union,” *Romanian Journal of European Affairs*, Vol.7, No.2 (2007), pp.14-32.
- 14) George Christou, “The European Union’s Human Security Discourse: Where are We Now?” *European Security*, Vol.23, No.3 (2014), pp.364-381.

medium threat perception, depending on the specific issue, but diverge in whether to address them as human security issues.

Some countries have thus pushed human security concerns individually and collectively within EU institutions, such as when the Spanish, Slovenian, and Czech presidencies committed themselves to the concept.¹⁵⁾ However, conservative nationalists and populists emergent in governments in (among others) Poland and Hungary have re-interpreted national policies on human security, stifling non-governmental groups campaign on gender issues and abortion rights.¹⁶⁾

Among EU institutions, the concept's evolution has been shaped by two equally influential forces: policy advocacy and bureaucratic politics. First, and based on the liberal core principle "that Europeans cannot be secure while others in the world live in severe insecurity,"¹⁷⁾ a group of academics around Mary Kaldor in collaboration with former NATO Secretary-General Javier Solana and other members of the High Representatives Office have developed the concept in a study group driven process,¹⁸⁾ resulting in a string of advocacy policy reports in 2004, 2007, 2010, and 2016 to the EU. Over time, these reports have foregrounded an expanding number of objectives, starting with physical insecurity, then touching upon organized crime, human rights abuses, and, finally, some developmental concerns as well. But as Kaldor, Rangelov and Selchow¹⁹⁾ argue in their most

15) Solana, *Routledge Handbook of Human Security*, p.255.

16) Andrea Peto and Weronika Grzebalska, "How Hungary and Poland have silenced women and stifled human rights," <http://theconversation.com/how-hungary-and-poland-have-silenced-women-and-stifled-human-rights-66743> (검색일: 2019. 1. 11).

17) Mary Kaldor and Marlies Glasius, "EU Security Architecture in Relation to Security and Development," http://www.cercl.lu/wp-content/uploads/imported/doc/dfd_final.doc (검색일: 2019. 1. 11).

18) Mary Martin and Terry Owen, "The Second Generation of Human Security: Lessons from the UN and EU Experience," *International Affairs*, Vol.86, No.1 (2010), pp.211-224.

19) Mary Kaldor, Iavor Rangelov, and Sabine Selchow "Introduction," M. Kaldor, I,

recent interpretation of the concept, the group's understanding of human security differs considerably from other approaches:

“The version of human security put forward by the study group had its roots in the experience of the Helsinki process in Europe, the idea of combining security and human rights, but could not be construed as the ‘narrow version’ of human security, often equated with Responsibility to Protect [R2P], or the so-called ‘broad’ approach of the United Nations Development Programme, that had coined the term in its 1994 Human Development Report and which stressed the importance of development as a form of security.”

Since 2016, this advocacy group, now chaired by Kaldor and Solana, has promoted a second generation human security approach for the EU, highlighting recent challenges in conflict resolution in Europe's neighbourhood which are to be addressed through a mix of creative diplomacy, smart sanctions, and conditionality as well as civilian-led missions with a strong justice component.²⁰⁾

Among EU institutions, the term's organizational centre of gravity has shifted considerably: early on, during the term of Commissioner Benita Ferrero-Waldner, responsible for external relations, a holistic understanding, enveloping both the ‘freedom from want’ and ‘freedom from fear’ components prevailed.²¹⁾ But other Directorate-Generals, notably DG for International Cooperation and Development (DEVCO), were much more sceptical, thereby reflecting the term's potential to privilege certain bureaucratic policy preferences, such as physical integrity, over others, like economic wellbeing.

Rangelov, S. Selchow, ed., *EU Global Strategy and Human Security Rethinking Approaches to Conflict* (Routledge, 2018), p.2.

20) Human Security Study Group, “From Hybrid Peace to Human Security: Rethinking EU Strategy towards Conflict,” www.fes-europe.eu/fileadmin/public/editorfiles/events/Feb2016/HSSG_Report_Feb_18_2016_FF.pdf (검색일: 2019. 1. 11).

21) Benita Ferrero-Waldner, “Protecting Europe's Security,” https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/26580/11_06_Protecting.pdf (검색일: 2020. 6. 15).

The term re-emerged as part of the Commission's strategic narrative only in 2016, after an almost decade-long period of hibernation. In the EU's Global Strategy(EUGS) of 2016, Federica Mogherini, now representing both the Commission (DG EXI) as well as the High Representative's office, attached the term to the EU's peace and security building efforts.²²⁾ Since then, the Commission has started to use the concept more frequently in its communication with the European Council, the European Parliament, and the public, calling it the "first objective of the national security system" and promoting it as a 'guideline' for its neighbourhood and development policy.²³⁾ As shown in table 2, the EUGS gives the human security perspective more consideration than does the European Security Strategy (ESS) 2003, especially in its emphasis on a cooperative and comprehensive approach including trade, energy, climate change, and immigration.

22) EU High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security, *Shared Vision, Common Action: A Stronger Europe* (Brussels, 2016), pp.9-14.

23) European Commission, "Joint Communication to the European Parliament and the Council: Elements for an EU-wide Strategic Framework to Support Security Sector Reform,"

https://ec.europa.eu/fpi/news/joint-communication-elements-eu-wide-strategic-framework-support-security-sector-reform_en (검색일: 2020.6. 15); European Commission, "Joint Staff Working Document. Lessons drawn from Past Interventions and Stakeholders' Views,"

<https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/c5e37f5e-4382-11e6-9c64-01aa75ed71a1/language-en> (검색일: 2020. 6. 15).

[Table 2] Comparison of ESS 2003 and EUGS 2016

ESS 2003	EUGS 2016
A Secure Europe in a Better World	Shared Vision Common Action: A Stronger Europe
Effective multilateralism	Principled pragmatism
For the past 60years Europe has experienced peace and prosperity	Peace and security is no more unconditional circumstances in Europe
Europe as a peace project under minimal security threat	State and societal resilience under constant unstableness
Strategic objectives to defend security and to promote values	Cooperative and comprehensive approach including trade, energy, climate change, immigration
Towards global player under partnership with the US	Independent security actor with strategic autonomy

Starting with the EU Global Strategy(EUGS) in 2016, the concept of human security has spread more widely among EU institutions in organizational and functional terms. Both the European Commission and Council are now using the term to legitimize crisis prevention, gender mainstreaming and sustainable development actions.²⁴⁾ More specifically, these two institutions now refer to human security as a common policy standard when engaging with external partners, such as the African Union, the African, Caribbean, and Pacific countries or individual partner countries, such as Japan.²⁵⁾ In a similar vein, the European External Action

24) European Commission, “Commission Staff Working Document: A Revised EU International Cooperation and Development Results Framework in line with the Sustainable Development Goals of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the New European Consensus on Development,”

<https://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regdoc/rep/10102/2018/EN/SWD-2018-444-F1-EN-MAIN-PART-1.PDF> (검색일: 2020. 6. 15); European Commission, “Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on Education in Emergencies and Protracted Crises,”

https://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/news/Communication_on_Education_in_Emergencies_and_Protracted_Crises.pdf (검색일: 2020. 6. 15).

Service, under the leadership of High Representative Mogherini, has integrated the concept into its daily operations, mentioning gender inequality as an obstacle to human security or referring to the term when legitimizing resilience programmes against violent extremism in Northern Africa.²⁶⁾

In contrast, the European Parliament and some of its liberal and socialist members have engaged with the concept more proactively, if not differently. First, the Parliament during the drafting phase of the Global Strategy insisted that “human security should be at the heart of the strategy” and not marginalized.²⁷⁾ Secondly, MEPs have used the concept as an alternative security concept, contesting current member states’ or EU institutions’ policies, such as those on arms export control, EU-NATO relations or the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDG).²⁸⁾

-
- 25) European Council, “Memorandum of Understanding between the Africa Union and the European Union on Peace, Security and Governance”; European Council/European Parliament, “Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument,” <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/en/ALL/?uri=CELEX%3A52018PC0460> (검색일: 2020. 6. 15).
- 26) European External Action Service (EEAS), “Working Document of the European External Action Service of 29/06/2018: Civilian Operations Commander Operational Guidelines for Mission Management and Staff on Gender Mainstreaming,” <http://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-12851-2018-INIT/en/pdf> (검색일: 2020. 6.15); EU High Representative/European Commission, “Answer given by Vice-President Mogherini on behalf of the Commission,” https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/E-8-2018-002330-ASW_EN.pdf (검색일: 2020. 6. 15).
- 27) European Parliament, “Report on the EU in a Changing Global Environment: a More Connected, Contested and Complex World,” https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/A-8-2016-0069_EN.pdf (검색일: 2020. 6.15).
- 28) European Parliament and Buşoi, C., *Written Explanation of Vote, Arms Export: Implementation of Common Position 2008/944/CFSP (A8-0335/2018 – Sabine Lösing)*, 14 November 2018; European Parliament and Mamikins, A., *Written Explanation of Vote, Arms Export: Implementation of Common Position 2008/944/CFSP (A8-0335/2018 – Sabine Lösing)*, 14 November 2018; European

Thirdly and more specifically, the EU Parliament has raised human security concerns about online surveillance techniques and their use by various authoritarian intelligence services during the ‘Arab Spring’ revolts, leading it to call for a more restrictive application for dual-use technology.²⁹⁾

From a functional perspective, the term’s usage in day-to-day EU operations suggests that it has been consciously separated from its economic and developmental dimension. So, for example, when the Commission prepared a Working Document on the ‘Revised EU International Cooperation and Development Results Framework in line with the Sustainable Development Goals of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the New European Consensus on Development’, it did not refer to human security under the SDGs related to development, such as SDGs 1-3, but rather to SDG 16, ‘Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions’. Similarly, the European Parliament attaches the term to the R2P norm and conflict resolution rather than economic development.³⁰⁾

Parliament and Post, S., *European Parliament, Plenary debate Minutes*, 12 June 2018; European Parliament and Post, S., *European Parliament, Plenary debate Minutes*, 13 November 2018; European Parliament and Vajgl, I., *Written Explanation of Vote, Arms Export: Implementation of Common Position 2008/944/CFSP* (A8-0335/2018 - Sabine Lösing), 14 November 2018.

29) Mark Bromley, *Export Controls, Human Security and Cyber-surveillance Technology: Examining the Proposed Changes to the EU Dual-use Regulation* (SIPRI, 2017).

30) European Parliament, “European Parliament Recommendation of 5 July 2018 to the Council on the 73rd session of the United Nations General Assembly,” <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52018IP0312> (검색일: 2020. 6. 15); European Commission, “Commission Staff Working Document: A Revised EU International Cooperation and Development Results Framework in line with the Sustainable Development Goals of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the New European Consensus on Development,” <https://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regdoc/rep/10102/2018/EN/SWD-2018-444-F1-EN-MAIN-PART-1.PDF> (검색일: 2020. 6. 15).

III. Threat Perceptions in the EU

The concept of human security, in whatever form or breadth, has never been used directly as a referent object for a security threat analysis by institutions or member states of the European Union. While academics, such as Mary Kaldor, have spoken of “intolerable threats to human security,” ranging from genocide to slavery through natural disasters,³¹⁾ EU policy makers, in general, have (scrupulously) avoided invoking ‘threats to human security’ as cause for action. That does not, of course, mean that human security concerns have been absent from the EU’s or its member states’ threat perception agenda (see above). What it does mean is that the EU and its members have not (yet) used the term when defining threats to the Union’s security.

On closer examination, however, a comparative analysis of the national security strategies of some EU member states (France, UK, Spain, Portugal) has found that, with regard to irregular immigration, crucial dimensions of the concept, such as assuring human rights, dignity, and humanitarian assistance, can be identified in respective policy documents. And yet, the study also identified notable differences between the respective national approaches: while France and the UK appeared to stress the national security dimension of irregular immigration, Spain and Portugal tended to emphasize more the human security dimensions.³²⁾ While this differentiated assessment is, in general, corroborated by Ferreira’s more comprehensive analysis of the EU’s response to the migration crisis in 2015, Ferreira also finds that neither the Union nor its member states met the standards of solidarity and the safeguard of human rights inherent in the human security concept.³³⁾

31) Kaldor et al., *EU Global Strategy and Human Security Rethinking Approaches to Conflict*, p.1.

32) João Esteves, “Human (in)Security and Irregular Migration: The Atlantic Basin,” N. S. Teixeira and D. Marcos, eds., *Evolving Human Security Challenges in the Atlantic Space* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 2019), p.121.

33) Susana Ferreira, *Human Security and Migration in Europe’s Southern Borders* (Palgrave

IV. EU Policy Responses

Thus, gauging the effects of the recent spike in the EU's human security rhetoric is difficult. To begin with, there is no indication that human security, as a defined concept, has been systematically operationalized by the EU, one of its institutions or its member states in one of its functional policies.³⁴⁾ Several studies of the EU's external policies, however, do suggest that some, if not all, elements of human security policy have been put into action. For example, when analysing the EU's approach to conflict management across its wider neighbourhood, extending towards Africa and Central Asia, Kartsonaki and Wolff found that some elements, especially the rule of law (good governance, institutional capacity building and humanitarian aid) featured, albeit to a different degree, in Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) actions in the Sahel region, Sub-Saharan Africa, the Middle East, Central Asia.³⁵⁾ In a similar vein, Giumelli's study on the EU's targeted sanctions policy shows that social and political rights as well as the involvement of non-governmental actors is considered by EU institutions when devising sanction regimes vis-à-vis Russia, Iran, Myanmar, or Northern African states in the aftermath of the Arab revolts.³⁶⁾

In sum, the overall threat perception to human security concerns in EU institutions is low to moderate, indicators being the infrequent use of the term, the rare referral in operational programmes other than broad bilateral policy statements,

Macmillan, 2019), p.2.

34) Efstathios Fakiolas and Nikolaos Tzifakis, "Human Security in EU Strategy: reflecting on the experience of EUPM in Bosnia and Herzegovina and EULEX in Kosovo," *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, Vol.27, No.3 (2019), pp.303-316.

35) Argyro Kartsonaki and Stefan Wolff, "The EU's Responses to Conflicts in its Wider Neighborhood: Human or European Security," *Global Society*, Vol.29, No.2 (2015), pp.199-226.

36) Francesco Giumelli, "Human Security and Sanctions, from security to governance," M. Kaldor, I. Rangelov, and S. Selchow, ed., *EU Global Strategy and Human Security Rethinking Approaches to Conflict* (Routledge, 2018), pp.158-174.

and the lack of urgency when using it. It follows then, that human security as a policy concept is currently interpreted by EU institutions as an umbrella term, highlighting concerns about physical integrity and equal participation rather than economic development. As such, the term reflects the EU's recent turn towards post-conflict reconstruction and humanitarian assistance missions. Institutionally, it appears that the term's usage has been diffused effectively through the position of the High Representative because it has resonated equally in public statements by the Commission, especially DG EXT, the Office of the EU High Representative, and the European External Action Service.

V. The Development of Human Security and Threat Perception in East Asia

The academic and policy debate about human security has brought to light some tensions and conflicts because this new paradigm inevitably collides with the dominant status of national sovereignty. Conceptually, human security redefines sovereignty from a 'right to control' into a 'responsibility to protect.' Kofi Annan, UN Secretary General at the time, contrasted this changing concept of security by foregrounding the shift from a defence of territory facing external attack to a protection of communities and individuals from internal violence when he addressed definition of human security in a 2001 speech.³⁷⁾ He also highlighted that human security can no longer be understood in military terms – rather, it must encompass economic development, social justice, environmental protection, democratization, disarmament, respect for human rights, and the rule of law.

This broad version of human security soon faced criticism in a 2008 UNESCO report entitled 'Human Security: Approaches and Challenges.'³⁸⁾ The report criticized

37) Kofi Annan, *Millennium Report* (United Nations, 2001), pp.43-44.

38) UNESCO, *Human Security: Approaches and Challenges* (United Nations, 2008).

the earlier UNDP's Human Development Report because it focused too much on economic security, without distinguishing potential threat from real threat. It also claimed that human security and the sovereignty of nation state can be compatible and that the empowerment of citizens from below required the role of the state. Later, in 2010 and 2012, UN Secretary General Ban Ki Moon in his report on human security also supported complementary cooperation between state sovereignty and human security.³⁹⁾ In other words, even among UN institutions, the period of an expansive interpretation of human security as a policy concept has now given way to an interpretation that emphasizes the role of national security, balancing concerns for human security with concerns for national sovereignty.

In this vein, given its principal role of national sovereignty in East Asian countries, human security has not been the major variable of their foreign and security policies. As a rule, it can be said that there has been no perception of serious threat to human security in East Asia. In other words, most East Asian nations and the EU and its member states have similar, if not converging, official threat assessments (low to medium) when it comes to human security concerns. In turn, however, it has been argued that East Asia has been haunted by a number of serious threats to human security, arising from natural disasters such as volcanoes, earthquakes, typhoons and subsequent tsunamis; from infectious diseases, such as Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) and Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (AIDS), the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS), or the Coronavirus disease 2019 (Covid-19) epidemic; but also from social problems, such as wars, violent conflict, terrorism, human trafficking, and land grabbing. It is difficult to establish an overarching Asian unit of analysis. Instead we have adopted regional specific

39) UN General Assembly, "Human Security: Report of the Secretary General. United Nations. A/64/701,"

<http://responsibilitytoprotect.org/human%20security%20report%20april%206%202010.pdf> (검색일: 2020. 6. 15); UN General Assembly, "Follow-up to General Assembly Resolution 64/291 on Human Security," <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/726045> (검색일: 2020. 6. 15).

characteristics within Asia focusing on China, Korea, and Japan with a brief explanation on the ASEAN region.

VI. East Asian Policy Response

China first proposed a New Security View in 1995 at the ASEAN Regional Forum, which was different from its traditional viewpoint. China developed its contents into a more concrete report in China's Position Paper on the New Security at the 2002 ASEAN Regional Forum, which emphasized that the core of the new security view is mutual trust, mutual interest, equality, and cooperation. In other words, the essence of the new view is to surpass a unilateral security perspective and to achieve common security through mutually beneficial cooperation. In a similar vein, at the 16th Communist Party of China (CPC) National Congress in 2002, General Secretary Hu Jintao proposed a Scientific Outlook on Development which focuses on a people-oriented approach, arguing that a nation should be governed on the basis of people's interests as an essential part of nationhood.⁴⁰⁾ Scholars argue that human security as an international idea is comparable to the traditional Chinese idea of a 'people-oriented' approach in Hu Jintao's proposal.⁴¹⁾

More recently, President Xi Jinping suggested a Community of Shared Future for Mankind as a new security vision. He first mentioned this concept in the political report to the 18th National Congress of the Communist Party of China in 2012. Xi Jinping advocated a community sense of human destiny that would bring the

40) Xinhua, "Hu stresses Scientific Development," http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/china/2012cpc/2007-06/26/content_15833868.htm (검색일: 2020. 3. 6).

41) Guan, X. and Guo, Y, "'Human Security': Concept Analysis, International Development, and the Meaning for China," *Study and Practice* 5 (2007), p.105.

interests of different nations together.⁴²⁾ Chen Xiangyang, the Director of Chinese Institutes of Contemporary International Relations explains that Xi's security vision includes three levels: human security, international security, and national security. First, human security means all human lives in the same planet facing the same challenges such as climate change, internet security, and economic crisis. Second, international security refers to security relations among states, including both traditional and non-traditional security issues. Third, national security includes territorial integrity and social stability.⁴³⁾

This review of the recent development of various security visions confirms that China has never officially used the concept of human security. Rather, it has argued that China already has a similar concept in its tradition. Chinese leaders invented new security concepts to include the changing environment of the world order but never moved away from the traditional focus of national security. China carefully manages not to allow an unstable situation that human security considerations could bring about to Chinese politics and society.

In contrast, Japan has been at the forefront of engaging with human security since the inception of the term in the early 1990.⁴⁴⁾ It actively used the term since 1990s, especially emphasizing its experiences of natural disaster. Prime Minister Keizo Obuchi in 1998 argued that “we must deal with these difficulties with due consideration for the socially vulnerable segments of population” in light of human

42) Xinhua, “Full text of Xi Jinping's report at 19th CPC National Congress,” http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/china/19thcpcnationalcongress/2017-11/04/content_34115212.htm (검색일: 2020. 3. 6)

43) Chen, X., “To Construct A Community of Shared Future for Mankind, Directly Facing Security Weakness, Bravely Shouldering the Responsibility of Political Party,” *China.org.cn*, February 5, 2018, <http://mini.eastday.com/a/180205080009521.html> (검색일: 2020. 3. 6).

44) Bert Edström, *Japan and Human Security: The Derailing of a Foreign Policy Vision, Asia Paper, March* 2011 (Institute for Security and Development Policy, 2011); Misako Kaji, “Why Human Security, Why Japan?” S. Bae and M. Maruyama, ed., *Human Security, Changing States and Global Responses Institutions and Practices* (Routledge, 2015), pp.48-66.

security, which is defined as a concept that “comprehensively covers all the menaces that threaten the survival, daily life, and dignity of human beings and strengthens the efforts to confront those threats.”⁴⁵⁾ This is exactly in line with the UNDP Human Development Report.

Japan has the solid governance at various levels to prevent such catastrophes. Some scholars interpret the strength of Japan’s human security in relation to the Japanese Self-Defense Forces, whose existence is more justifiable in terms of human security rather than national security because it cannot officially aim to defend national sovereignty according to Japan’s peace constitution. Regarding Japan’s relatively weak development towards freedom from fear, scholars connect its cause with Japan’s fear of being exposed to complicated historical matters of physical integrity such as forced labour and ‘comfort women.’⁴⁶⁾

Nevertheless, starting with the Asian Financial Crisis, successive Japanese governments have stressed threats emanating from economic and social dislocation for the Asian region (but also other regions), resulting in Tokyo’s strong support for the UN Trust Fund for Human Security and the promotion of the concept in various bi-, pluri-, and multilateral fora.⁴⁷⁾ While taking a turn towards ‘developmentalisation’ after the terrorist attacks on the New York World Trade Centre in 2001, the concept has lost some of its earlier appeal to Japanese policy makers.⁴⁸⁾

45) Keijo Obuchi, “Opening Remarks at the International Conference on Intellectual Dialogue on Building Asia’s Tomorrow,”

<http://www.jcie.or.jp/thinknet/tomorrow/1obuchi.html> (검색일: 2020. 3. 6).

46) Nam-Kook Kim, “Abe’s Speech and Inherited Responsibility,” *Hankyoreh*, September 6, 2015, <http://n.news.naver.com/article/028/0002288266> (검색일: 2020. 3. 6); Younggeun Kim, “Human Security in the Era of Security Revolution,” Gwangjuin, June 19, 2019, <http://www.gwangjuin.com/news/articleview.html?idxno=203861> (검색일: 2020. 3. 6).

47) Ken Masujima, “‘Human Security’ in EU-Japan Security Relations from a Japanese Perspective,”

http://repository.essex.ac.uk/19871/1/EU-Japan_7_Human_Security_Masujima_Japan.pdf (검색일: 2019. 1. 11).

In South Korea, human security has been discussed as an analytical concept and as a policy strategy in the academic discourse, but the term itself has not made it to the official rhetorical level yet.⁴⁹⁾ Human rights concerns abound, particularly vis-à-vis North Korea; human security issues have been addressed by successive South Korean governments implicitly rather than explicitly.⁵⁰⁾ If the shift from national security is applied to North-South Korea relations, it can bring important changes to state policy in terms of its vision, target, actors, and methods. For example, policy vision would shift beyond a state-centred armaments race and move towards an emphasis on life, welfare, and human rights. Policies would begin to target specific fields of food, health, and environment through the intervention of local and international governmental, as well as non-governmental organizations by enhancing people's participation and human development in both Koreas.

The South Korean Ministry of Foreign Affairs first used the term in 2008 to broaden discussion on foreign policy in its policy document. It defined it as individual security and safety, the protection of human rights, the protection of individuals' basic necessities while facing non-traditional security threats including terrorism, environmental degradation, transnational crimes, internal conflict, poverty, and disaster. Interestingly, former President Geun-hye Park in her foreign policy briefing in 2012 once used the term human security, quoting the Helsinki Process as a model case.⁵¹⁾ Foreign Minister Byung-se Yun in 2013 also used human

48) Sebastian Harnisch and Ken Masujima, "Human Security: More Potential for Cooperation?" E. Kirchner and H. Dorussen, ed., *EU-Japan Security Cooperation: Trends and Prospects* (Routledge, 2018), pp.112-126.

49) Shin-Wha Lee and Chun Young Park, "Korea's Middle Power Diplomacy for Human Security: A Global and Regional Approach," *Journal of International and Area Studies*, Vol.24, No.1 (2017), pp.21-44.

50) Shin-Wha Lee, "South Korea's Refugee Policies: National and Human Security Perspectives," C. Hernandez et al., ed., *Human Security and Cross-Border Cooperation in East Asia* (Palgrave MacMillan, 2019), pp.227-248.

51) Geun-hye Park, "President Candidate Park's Foreign Policy Briefing, 5 November 2012," <http://news1.kr/articles/?880552> (검색일: 2020. 3. 6).

security to explain President Park's vision, describing a changing view of world security trends.⁵²⁾

The South Korean government has not come to grips with the term human security. It has, however, practiced the three components and two approaches to human security: freedom from fear, freedom from want, freedom to take an action, and protection and empowerment in official development assistance (ODA) policies, respectively.⁵³⁾ Having said this, South Korean development policies have contributed substantially to freedom from want and fear in the East Asian region as South Korea turned from being a recipient of foreign aid into a major donor during its economic miracle. Arguably, intensified inter-state rivalry mixed with regional and global security concerns have pushed non-traditional issues to the background of South Korea's foreign policy under President Moon Jae-In.

Paradoxically, human security as a policy concept has been on the rise in the East Asian region that is most unlikely to embrace it: Southeast Asia. In this region, historically composed of young and fragile nation-states, state governments have traditionally asserted security concepts safeguarding internal and external sovereignty, thereby limiting human security claims favouring the individual and its wants among ASEAN member states.⁵⁴⁾ And yet, as Howe and Park note, over a decade, democratic changes in government and a set of serious security challenges have transformed ASEAN's security agenda, turning the "community of erstwhile sovereign nations" into a "community that strives to be people-oriented if not people-centred" when it comes to certain types of threats, such as natural disaster, poverty, environmental issues, transnational crime, and human trafficking.⁵⁵⁾

52) Byung-se Yun, "A Keynote Speech at the International Conference on 'New Strategic Thinking: Planning for Korean Foreign Policy,'" *East Asia Institute*, Vol.29 (April 2013).

53) Eunmee Kim, Seonyoung Bae, and Jihyun Shin, "Human Security in Practice: the South Korean Case," *JICA Research Institute Working Paper*, No.93 (March 2015), pp.1-36

54) Yukiko Nishikawa, "Human security in Southeast Asia: Viable solution or empty slogan?" *Security Dialogue*, Vol.20, No.2 (2009), pp.213-236.

Among ASEAN member states, governments vary widely as to how and how far they address human security concerns which are propagated by an incipient civil society in some countries.⁵⁶⁾ Under democratic rule, Thailand's government has embraced human security as a policy concept in its diplomatic and national administrative policy-making process. In the Philippines, the democratic administration of Benigno Aquino III recognized human security as one guiding principle in its national security policy. Other governments, such as Myanmar's, have rejected the concept while actively participating in coordinated disaster relief, thereby embracing functional components that built on the freedom from fear and want.⁵⁷⁾

VII. Conclusion: Convergence and Divergence with Possibility of Cooperation

Human security concerns and policies still vary considerably between East Asian nations, China, Japan and South Korea as well as between those and the EU.⁵⁸⁾ A recent study of EU-China human security cooperation found that underlying differences on human rights, i.e. the limits of governmental authority vis-à-vis citizens and individuals remained relatively stable over time, informing diverging

55) Brendan Howe and Min Joung Park, "The evolution of the "ASEAN Way: Embracing Human Security Perspectives," *Asia-Pacific Social Science Review*, Vol.16, No.3 (2017), p.6.

56) Amitav Acharya, *Promoting Human Security: Ethical, Normative and Educational Framework in South-East Asia* (UNESCO, 2007), pp.7-88; Rizal Sukma, "Human Security in the ASEAN Political and Security Community," C. G. Hernandez and H. J. S. Kraft, ed., *Mainstreaming Human Security in ASEAN Integration* (Institute for Strategic and Development Studies, 2012), pp.11-31.

57) Brendan Howe, "Cyclone Nargis in Myanmar: The Perfect Storm?" C. Hernandez et al., ed., *Human Security and Cross-Border Cooperation in East Asia* (Palgrave MacMillan, 2019), pp.111-132.

58) Paul Evans, "Human Security and East Asia," M. Martin and T. Owen, ed., *Routledge Handbook of Human Security* (Routledge, 2014), pp.272-281.

concepts of human security.⁵⁹⁾ Whereas EU institutions and most EU member states insist on a broad definition, encompassing the freedom from fear and the freedom to take action on one's own behalf, Chinese officials remain hesitant to use the term officially, preferring the less inclusive and divisive concept of "non-traditional security concerns".

The reluctance to adopt the term explicitly, does not mean that the Chinese government has not engaged in activities to address non-traditional concerns, such as air pollution, food safety or cyber security or natural disaster relief.⁶⁰⁾ But when engaging with foreign actors to address human security issues in China proper, such as during the Sichuan Earthquake disaster relief campaign in 2008, Chinese government agencies carefully drew a line for humanitarian assistance so as to avoid subsequent political instability, which may compromise the government's legitimacy.⁶¹⁾

When compared to the EU and its member states, the Japanese government's strategy has been much more pro-active and focused on containing the freedom from want.⁶²⁾ Japan's strength in early development of human security with emphasis on the freedom from want has been originated from its efforts to deal with inevitable natural disasters such as earthquake, volcano, typhoon, and tsunami. In contrast, the South Korean government has embraced the two components of human security, freedom from fear and freedom from want as well as two

59) Sebastian Harnisch and Kai He, "Competing or Converging Claims on International Order? The EU, China and Human Security," E. Kirchner, T. Christiansen, H. Dorussen, ed., *Security relations between China and the European Union. From Convergence to Cooperation?* (Cambridge University Press, 2016), pp.124-144.

60) Ren Xiao, "Human Security: China's Discourses and Experience," *Journal of Human Security*, Vol.12, No.1 (2016), pp.112-120.

61) Wooyeal Paik, "Sovereignty Issues in a Humanitarian Emergency: The 2008 Sichuan Earthquake," *Hernandez, C. et al., ed., Human Security and Cross-Border Cooperation in East Asia* (Palgrave MacMillan, 2019), pp.41-63.

62) Martyn de Bruyn, "The European Union, Japan, and the Elusive Global Human Security Partnership," S. Bae and M. Murayama, ed., *Human Security, Changing States and Global Responses: Institutions and Practices* (Routledge, 2015), pp.121-134.

approaches of protection and empowerment in its ODA policies. This approach, however, has always been exposed to the controversy of politicizing sovereignty matter in East Asian countries.

Despite growing efforts, particularly in East Asia, the conceptual differences in the EU as well as the disparities among East Asian understandings of human security result in rather meagre levels of concrete cooperation other than spurious common rhetoric.⁶³⁾ This general pattern, of course, does not preclude concrete EU cooperation with some East Asian nations (Japan), or groups of states, such as ASEAN, in specific areas related to human security concerns, such as disaster relief or sustainable development.

In this vein, the paper has argued that despite considerable conceptual and underlying ideational differences, there appears to be substantial potential for EU cooperation with various if not all East Asian states. While underlying differences in emphasis remain, both recent advances and challenges have elevated cooperation on specific human security concerns to the forefront of the diplomatic agenda. In Europe, the growing influence of the High Representative's office in diffusing the term and the new thrust towards human security in the EU's post-conflict management activities have given new life to the concept as a policy tool. In Asia, various human security threats through natural disasters and communicable diseases, and respective expectations by citizens and civil society organizations have instilled a new pragmatism in governments that have been hesitant if not hostile towards the concept.

As a consequence of these developments, there appears to be considerable potential for pragmatic cooperation between the EU and East Asian nations as long as this cooperation remains functionally limited and de-politicized, as sovereignty concerns still loom large, particularly in the various authoritarian regimes in the region. Especially, with a new thrust towards human security in the EU's

63) Brendan Howe, *The Protection and Promotion of Human Security in East Asia* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).

post-conflict management activities, the Trilateral Cooperation Secretariat (TCS) among China, South Korea, and Japan, for example, can serve as a base from which to build a crisis management mechanism for natural disasters and transnational human security issues such as crime, pollution, and climate change in East Asia. ASEAN and the ASEAN Regional Forum can also serve as such a base for regional cooperation.

Conceptually, these coordinated efforts may well benefit from being related to the concept of “human dignity” as Hernandez et al. suggest.⁶⁴⁾ As a relational concept, the term not only stresses the inherent worthiness of every individual of being respected by others, it also relates this respect to political communities beyond the nation-state. In doing so, it may be helpful in focusing on the common concerns about the human while overcoming the scepticism towards the transformational thrust of the human security concept.

64) Carolina Hernandez *et al.*, ed., *Human Security and Cross-Border Cooperation in East Asia* (Springer Nature, 2019), p.284.

References

- Acharya, Amitav, *Promoting Human Security: Ethical, Normative and Educational Framework in South-East Asia* (UNESCO, 2007).
- Annan, Kofi, *Millennium Report* (United Nations, 2001).
- Bae, Sangmin, and David Diaz, "The Wax and Wane of Human Security Norms: revisiting the Cases of Japan and Canada," *Journal of Human Security Studies*, Vol.7, No.2 (Autumn 2018).
- Breslin, Shaun, and George Christou, "Has the Human Security Agenda Come of Age? Definitions, Discourses and Debates," *Contemporary Politics*, Vol.21, No.1 (2015).
- Bromley, Mark, *Export Controls, Human Security and Cyber-surveillance Technology: Examining the Proposed Changes to the EU Dual-use Regulation* (SIPRI, 2017).
- Bruyn, Martyn de, "The European Union, Japan, and the Elusive Global Human Security Partnership," S. Bae and M. Murayama, ed., *Human Security, Changing States and Global Responses: Institutions and Practices* (Routledge, 2015).
- Burgess, Peter, et al., *Promoting Human Security: Ethical, Normative and Educational Frameworks in Western Europe* (UNESCO. 2007).
- Chen, X., "To Construct A Community of Shared Future for Mankind, Directly Facing Security Weakness, Bravely Shouldering the Responsibility of Political Party," China.org.cn, February 5, 2018, <http://mini.eastday.com/a/180205080009521.html> (검색일: 2020. 3. 6).
- Christou, George, "The European Union's Human Security Discourse: Where are We Now?" *European Security*, Vol.23, No.3 (2014).
- Edström, Bert, *Japan and Human Security: The Derailing of a Foreign Policy Vision, Asia Paper, March 2011* (Institute for Security and Development Policy, 2011).
- Edström, Bert, *Japan and the Challenge of Human Security: The Founding of a New Policy 1995-2003* (Institute for Security and Development, 2008).
- Estevens, João, "Human (in)Security and Irregular Migration: The Atlantic Basin,"

N. S. Teixeira and D. Marcos, eds., *Evolving Human Security Challenges in the Atlantic Space* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 2019).

European Commission, “Joint Communication to the European Parliament and the Council: Elements for an EU-wide Strategic Framework to Support Security Sector Reform,”

https://ec.europa.eu/fpi/news/joint-communication-elements-eu-wide-strategic-framework-support-security-sector-reform_en (검색일: 2020.6. 15).

European Commission, “Joint Staff Working Document. Lessons drawn from Past Interventions and Stakeholders’ Views,”

<https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/e5e37f5e-4382-11e6-9c64-01aa75ed71a1/language-en> (검색일: 2020. 6. 15).

European Commission, “Commission Staff Working Document: A Revised EU International Cooperation and Development Results Framework in line with the Sustainable Development Goals of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the New European Consensus on Development,”

<https://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regdoc/rep/10102/2018/EN/SWD-2018-444-F1-EN-MAIN-PART-1.PDF> (검색일: 2020. 6. 15).

European Commission, “Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the

Council on Education in Emergencies and Protracted Crises,”

https://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/news/Communication_on_Education_in_Emergencies_and_Protracted_Crises.pdf (검색일: 2020. 6. 15).

European Commission, “A Modern Budget for a Union that Protects, Empowers and Defends: The Multiannual Financial Framework for 2021-2027,”

<https://www.europeansources.info/record/communication-a-modern-budget-for-a-union-that-protects-empowers-and-defends-the-multiannual-financial-framework-2021-2027/> (검색일: 2020. 6. 15).

European Council, “Memorandum of Understanding between the Africa Union and the European Union on Peace, Security and Governance”; European

Council/European Parliament, “Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing the Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument,”

<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/en/ALL/?uri=CELEX%3A52018PC0460> (검색일: 2020. 6. 15).

European External Action Service(EEAS), “Working Document of the European External Action Service of 29/06/2018: Civilian Operations Commander Operational Guidelines for Mission Management and Staff on Gender Mainstreaming,”

<http://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-12851-2018-INIT/en/pdf> (검색일: 2020. 6. 15).

European Parliament, “European Parliament Recommendation of 5 July 2018 to the Council on the 73rd session of the United Nations General Assembly,”

<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52018IP0312> (검색일: 2020. 6. 15).

European Parliament, “Report on the EU in a Changing Global Environment: a More Connected, Contested and Complex World,”

https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/A-8-2016-0069_EN.pdf (검색일: 2020. 6.15)

European Parliament, “Written Explanation of Vote-8th parliamentary term,”

https://www.europarl.europa.eu/meps/en/124965/NATHAN_GILL/all-activities/written-explanations/8 (검색일: 2020. 6. 15).

European Parliament and Post, S., European Parliament, Plenary debate Minutes, 12 June 2018.

European Parliament and Post, S., European Parliament, Plenary debate Minutes, 13 November 2018.

EU High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security, Shared Vision, Common Action: *A Stronger Europe* (Brussels, 2016).

EU High Representative/European Commission, “Answer given by Vice-President

- Mogherini on behalf of the Commission,”
https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/E-8-2018-002330-ASW_EN.pdf (검색일: 2020. 6. 15).
- Evans, Paul, “Human Security and East Asia,” M. Martin and T. Owen, ed., *Routledge Handbook of Human Security* (Routledge, 2014).
- Fakiolas, Efstathios, and Nikolaos, Tzifakis, “Human Security in EU Strategy: reflecting on the experience of EUPM in Bosnia and Herzegovina and EULEX in Kosovo,” *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, Vol.27, No.3 (2019).
- Ferreira, Susana, *Human Security and Migration in Europe's Southern Borders* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2019).
- Ferrero-Waldner, Benita, “Protecting Europe’s Security,”
https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/26580/11_06_Protecting.pdf (검색일: 2020. 6. 15).
- Gaspar, Des, “Human Security: from definitions to investigating a discourse,” M. Martin and T. Owen, ed., *Routledge Handbook of Human Security* (Routledge, 2014).
- Giumelli, Francesco, “Human Security and Sanctions, from security to governance,” M. Kaldor, I. Rangelov, S. Selchow, ed., *EU Global Strategy and Human Security Rethinking Approaches to Conflict* (Routledge, 2018).
- Guan, X., and Guo, Y. “‘Human Security’: Concept Analysis, International Development, and the Meaning for China,” *Study and Practice* 5 (2007).
- Harnisch, Sebastian, and Ken Masujima, “Human Security: More Potential for Cooperation?” E. Kirchner and H. Dorussen, ed., *EU-Japan Security Cooperation: Trends and Prospects* (Routledge, 2018).
- Harnisch, Sebastian, and Kai He, “Competing or Converging Claims on International Order? The EU, China and Human Security,” E. Kirchner, T. Christiansen, H. Dorussen, ed., *Security relations between China and the European Union. From Convergence to Cooperation?* (Cambridge University Press, 2016).

- Hernandez, Carolina, *et al.*, ed., *Human Security and Cross-Border Cooperation in East Asia* (Springer Nature, 2019)
- Homolar, Alexandra, “Human security benchmarks: Governing human wellbeing at a distance,” *Review of International Studies*, Vol.41, No.5 (2015).
- Hoogensen-Gjørø, Gunhild, “Human Security: Lessons Learned from Afghanistan,” M. Dunn-Cavelty, and V. Meier, ed., *Routledge Handbook of Security Studies* (Routledge, 2017).
- Howard-Hassmann, Rodha, “Human Security: Undermining Human Rights?” *Human Rights Quarterly*, Vol.34, No.1 (2012).
- Howe, Brendan, “Cyclone Nargis in Myanmar: The Perfect Storm?” C. Hernandez *et al.*, ed., *Human Security and Cross-Border Cooperation in East Asia* (Palgrave MacMillan, 2019).
- Howe, Brendan, *The Protection and Promotion of Human Security in East Asia* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).
- Howe, Brendan, and Min Jung Park, “The evolution of the “ASEAN Way: Embracing Human Security Perspectives,” *Asia-Pacific Social Science Review*, Vol.16, No.3 (2017).
- Human Security Study Group, “From Hybrid Peace to Human Security: Rethinking EU Strategy towards Conflict,” www.fes-europe.eu/fileadmin/public/editorfiles/events/Feb2016/HSSG_Report_Feb_18_2016_FF.pdf (검색일: 2019. 1. 11).
- Kaji, Misako, “Why Human Security, Why Japan?” S. Bae and M. Maruyama, ed., *Human Security, Changing States and Global Responses. Institutions and Practices* (Routledge, 2015).
- Kaldor, Mary, and Marlies Glasius, “EU Security Architecture in Relation to Security and Development,” http://www.cercl.lu/wp-content/uploads/imported/doc/dfid_final.doc (검색일: 2019. 1. 11).
- Kaldor, Mary, and Iavor Rangelov, and Sabine Selchow, “Introduction,” M. Kaldor,

- I, Rangelov, S. Selchow, ed., *EU Global Strategy and Human Security Rethinking Approaches to Conflict* (Routledge, 2018)
- Kartsonaki, Argyro, and Sefan, Wolff, "The EU's Responses to Conflicts in its Wider Neighborhood: Human or European Security," *Global Society*, Vol.29, No.2 (2015).
- Kim, Nam-Kook, "Abe's Speech and Inherited Responsibility," *Hankyoreh*, September 6, 2015, <http://n.news.naver.com/article/028/0002288266>. (검색일: 2020. 3. 6)
- Kim, Younggeun, "Human Security in the Era of Security Revolution," Gwangjuin, June 19, 2019, <http://www.gwangjuin.com/news/articleview.html?idxno=203861> (검색일: 2020. 3. 6).
- Kim, Eunmee, Seonyoung Bae, and Ji Hyun Shin, "Human Security in Practice: the South Korean Case," *JICA Research Institute Working Paper*, No.93 (March 2015), pp.1-36.
- King, Victor, and Paul Carnegie, "Towards a Social Science Understanding of Human Security," *Journal of Human Security Studies*, Vol.7, No.1 (2018).
- Kivimäki, Timo, "Can the Pragmatic East Asian Approach to Human Security Offer a Way for the Deepening of the Long Peace of East Asia," *Journal of Human Security*, Vol.10, No.1 (2014).
- Krause, Keith, "Critical Perspectives on Human Security," M. Martin and T. Owen, ed., *Routledge Handbook of Human Security* (Routledge, 2014).
- Lee, Shin-Wha, and Chun Young Park, "Korea's Middle Power Diplomacy for Human Security: A Global and Regional Approach," *Journal of International and Area Studies*, Vol.24, No.1 (2017).
- Lee, Shin-Wha, "South Korea's Refugee Policies: National and Human Security Perspectives," C. Hernandez *et al.* ed., *Human Security and Cross-Border Cooperation in East Asia* (Palgrave MacMillan, 2019).
- Marcos, Daniel, and Nuno Teixeira, "From Security to Human Security: The

- Evolution of the Concept and Current Perspectives for the Atlantic Basin,” Nuno Teixeira and Daniel Marcos, ed., *Evolving Human Security Challenges in the Atlantic Space* (Brookings Institution. 2019).
- Marczuk, Karina, “Origin, Development and Perspectives for the Human Security Concept in the European Union,” *Romanian Journal of European Affairs*, Vol.7, No.2 (2007).
- Martin, Mary, and Terry Owen, “The Second Generation of Human Security: Lessons from the UN and EU Experience,” *International Affairs*, Vol.86, No.1 (2010).
- Masujima, Ken, “‘Human Security’ in EU-Japan Security Relations from a Japanese Perspective,”
http://repository.essex.ac.uk/19871/1/EU-Japan_7_Human_Security_Masujima_Japan.pdf (검색일: 2019. 1. 11).
- Nishikawa, Yukiko, “Human security in Southeast Asia: Viable solution or empty slogan?” *Security Dialogue*, Vol.20, No.2 (2009)
- Obuchi, Keijo, “Opening Remarks at the International Conference on Intellectual Dialogue on Building Asia’s Tomorrow,”
<http://www.jcie.or.jp/thinknet/tomorrow/1obuchi.html> (검색일: 2020. 3. 6).
- Paik, Wooyeal, “Sovereignty Issues in a Humanitarian Emergency: The 2008 Sichuan Earthquake,” Hernandez, C. et al. ed., *Human Security and Cross-Border Cooperation in East Asia* (Palgrave MacMillan, 2019).
- Park, Geun-hye, “President Candidate Park’s Foreign Policy Briefing,” 5 November 2012, <http://news1.kr/articles/?880552> (검색일: 2020. 3. 6).
- Peto, Andrea, and Weronika, Grzebalska, “How Hungary and Poland have silenced women and stifled human rights,”
<http://theconversation.com/how-hungary-and-poland-have-silenced-women-and-stifled-human-rights-66743> (검색일: 2019. 1. 11).
- Solana, Javier, “The European Union and Human Security: The Making of a Global Security Actor,” M. Martin and T. Owen, ed., *Routledge Handbook of Human*

- Security* (Routledge. 2014).
- Sukma, R., “Human Security in the ASEAN Political and Security Community,” C. G. Hernandez and H. J. S. Kraft, ed., *Mainstreaming Human Security in ASEAN Integration* (Institute for Strategic and Development Studies, 2012).
- Thompson, Benjamin, “The European Union’s Human Security Discourse: Conceptualization and Justification,” *Korean Journal of International Studies*, Vol.14, No.1 (2016).
- UN Commission on Human Security, *Human Security Now* (United Nations, 2003).
- UN Development Program, *Human Development Report 1994* (Oxford University Press, 1994).
- UNESCO, *Human Security: Approaches and Challenges* (United Nations, 2008).
- UN General Assembly, “Human Security: Report of the Secretary General. United Nations. A/64/701,”
<http://responsibilitytoprotect.org/human%20security%20report%20april%206%202010.pdf> (검색일: 2020. 6. 15)
- UN General Assembly, “Follow-up to General Assembly Resolution 64/291 on Human Security,” <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/726045> (검색일: 2020. 6. 15).
- Wählisch, Martin, “Human Security: Concept and Evolution in the United Nations,” R. Wolfrum ed., *Max Planck Yearbook of United Nations Law Online*, Vol.18, No.1 (2014).
- Xiao, Ren, “Human Security: China’s Discourses and Experience,” *Journal of Human Security*, Vol.12, No.1 (2016).
- Xinhua, “Hu stresses Scientific Development,”
http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/china/2012cpc/2007-06/26/content_15833868.htm (검색일: 2020. 3. 6).
- Xinhua, “Full text of Xi Jinping's report at 19th CPC National Congress,”
http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/china/19thcpcnationalcongress/2017-11/04/content_34115212.htm (검색일: 2020. 3. 6).

Yun, Byung-se, “A Keynote Speech at the International Conference on ‘New Strategic Thinking: Planning for Korean Foreign Policy,’” *East Asia Institute*, Vol.29 (April 2013).

〈국문초록〉

인간안보: 유럽과 동아시아 사이의 가능한 협력

세바스찬 하니쉬*

김남국**

이 논문은 유럽연합과 동아시아에서 분석적 개념과 외교전략으로서 인간안보에 대한 서로 다른 수준의 인식에 대해 다룬다. 인간안보 개념은 결핍으로부터 자유, 공포로부터의 자유, 자신의 의사대로 행동할 자유 등 개인의 확장된 자유와 추가적인 보호를 강조한다. 안보와 인권을 결합시킨 이 개념은 보호책임과 동의어로 쓰이는 좁은 의미의 정의와 유엔개발프로그램에서 규정된 넓은 의미의 정의가 존재한다. 유럽연합에서 정책개념으로서 인간안보는 최근의 재건과 인도주의적 지원 미션을 반영한 경제발전 측면보다는 육체적 통합과 동등한 참여를 강조하는 포괄적인 상위용어로 해석되고 있다. 반면 동아시아의 많은 정부는 전통적으로 안보개념을 내적 또는 외적 주권에 대한 보호에 초점을 맞추면서 인간안보 주장을 제한해왔다. 동아시아에서는 인간안보라는 용어 대신 공기오염, 사이버안보, 음식 안전, 자연재해 등을 포괄하는 비전통안보라는 개념이 사용됐다. 결과적으로 주권문제에 대해 탈정치화하고 기능적으로 제약된 협력에 합의한다면 동아시아와 유럽연합 사이에 실용적 협력에 대한 상당한 가능성이 있다고 볼 수 있다.

주제어: 인간안보, 주권, 유럽연합, 동아시아, 결핍으로부터 자유, 공포로부터 자유

* 주저자, 하이델베르그대학교 경제사회과학대 교수
(sebastian.harnisch@ipw.uni-heidelberg.de)

** 교신저자, 고려대학교 정치외교학과 교수(nkim98@korea.ac.kr)

원고접수일: 2020. 06. 16.

심사마감일: 2020. 06. 30.

게재확정일: 2020. 06. 30.