Studying the Politics of Precarity in Southeast Asia

Paul J. CARNEGIE
Institute of Asian Studies
Universiti Brunei Darussalam
paul.carnegie@ubd.edu.bn

ABSTRACT

For disadvantaged individuals and communities, Southeast Asia's pursuit of economic growth and development is shadowed by a deepening everyday precarity. This paper examines how state-led discourse and practice tend to obscure the diverse and situated realities of precarity across the region. The marginalized and dispossessed are routinely aggregated within narrow framings of risk and vulnerability, with the underlying conditions of their precarity largely masked. While ostensibly neutral and technocratic, these assessments remain insufficient for grasping the forces and interests configuring and reproducing the very circumstances they purport to address. This paper advances a precarity lens as a timely and generative means for interrogating the constitutive relationships between political authority, commercial expansion, ecological degradation, and structural inequality permeating Southeast Asia's contemporary condition.

Keywords: inequality, marginality, positionality, precarity, Southeast Asia

Introduction

By way of personal introduction, I am an interdisciplinary social science academic, a native of Scotland, but based in Brunei Darussalam, a country nestled on the northern shores of Borneo and sandwiched between Sarawak (twice) and Sabah, the two states that form the Eastern part of Malaysia. This purposeful choice of work location has had significant bearing on my scholarly sensibilities and thinking about how and why certain subject matters and locations are selected for investigation or deemed relevant for inquiry. The following paper provides a reflexive consideration of the efficacy and scope of precarity research in Southeast Asia. A meaningful understanding of everyday marginality, disadvantage, and inequality demands an analytical move beyond surface appearances. I make the case for a precarity lens as a timely and generative means to decode the complex relationships between politics, commercial interests, ecological degradation, and inequality that permeate Southeast Asia's contemporary condition.

Precarity in Contemporary Scholarship

Precarity has emerged as a valuable conceptual lens for examining the multidimensional forms of insecurity and vulnerability produced through the processes of globalization, environmental degradation, marginalization, and widening inequality (Adams 2012; Allison 2013; Endo 2014; Ettlinger 2007; Munck 2013; Neilson and Rossiter 2008; Paret and Gleeson 2016; Rigg et al. 2016; Apostolidis 2019; Schaap et al. 2022; Standing 2011, 2012, 2013; Waite 2009; Watson and Moran 2005). Put simply, it captures wider transformations in contemporary societies and the heightened uncertainty and risk that attend conditions of vulnerability and insecurity, while emphasizing that threats to human safety and well-being extend well beyond episodes of conflict or natural disaster (Carnegie 2024a, 5).

While precarity cuts across social and geographic boundaries, its effects are most acutely experienced by marginalized and disadvantaged groups whose everyday lives are conditioned by structural inequalities and processes operating beyond their immediate control. The assemblages of forces and interests underpinning their precarity are often sight unseen and reflect political, economic, and socio-cultural asymmetries. To live with precarity is to inhabit a world where the everyday carries its own weight. Ordinary routines—earning a living, caring for family, maintaining dignity are shadowed by uncertainty and risk. Making ends meet, securing work, or simply getting by often involves navigating circumstances where trust is in short supply. This erosion of trust becomes most apparent in dealings with those who hold power or influence—individuals and institutions whose decisions can shape, or unsettle, the brittle footing of one's safety and life chances.

Being multidimensional and socially produced, precarity is both material and psychological. It often takes shape through the absence of stable and secure access to life's basic resources—shelter, sanitation, employment, healthcare, and education (Carnegie 2024a, 6). It is felt most keenly by those in temporary or informal work, by migrant laborers and daily wage earners whose livelihoods depend on fluctuating markets and fragile safety nets. For many, the experience is not only material but also deeply psychological: the constant awareness that one's circumstances are uncertain, that stability can unravel without warning, instills a pervasive sense of vulnerability and unease in everyday life. As James C. Scott (1976) once noted, the rapid pace of socio-economic change can often unravel the social fabric on which people once relied. As traditional bonds and community support networks fray, individuals find themselves increasingly isolated, navigating change without the reassurance of shared anchors. The erosion of which can amplify feelings of alienation and dislocation, deepening the sense that one's place in the world has become uncertain.

When we start to think about the range of issues precarity speaks to, we are confronted with a long list: from climate change-induced dislocation, irregular migration, community displacement, transnational criminality, trafficking and sexual, ethnic, and youth violence, to the consequences of unbridled urbanization, real estate and infrastructural development, and a lack of availability and access to drinkable water and functioning sanitation.[1] In a broad schematic sense, such issues subdivide into seven generally recognized categories: economic security, food security, health security, environmental security, personal security, community security, and political security (UNDP 2005). Maintaining the health and resilience of these interdependent, mutually supportive systems is widely regarded as essential for achieving long-term international security, sustainable development, and meaningful poverty reduction in the twenty-first century (Commission on Human Security 2003).

The intensification of industrialization, urbanization, marginalization, and environmental degradation has led various scholars to reflect on the impact of late modern capitalism and the human condition (Giddens 1990; Beck 1992; Bauman 2007; Zinn 2008; Heine and Thakur 2011). Insecurities and transformations faced by the world's "precariat" are experienced as local manifestations of broader forces inured by global capitalism: a world shaped by privatization, outsourcing, deregulation, and relentless economic expansion (Bhide and Stevenson 1992; Stiglitz 2002; Harvey 2006; Roberts 2007; Standing 2016; Mezzadra and Neilson 2019).

While not without shortcomings, what their work does capture is a growing sense of dissatisfaction with the type of state-led responses to schisms and inequities ever more exposed by economic globalization's "downsides" (Carnegie, King, and Knudsen 2021). They posit that despite globalization's varied and uneven benefits, the velocity of capital flows, technological reach, and a raft of neoliberal policies across countries has precipitated significant socio-economic reconfigurations and new forms of translocal precarity.[2] The impacts of these transformations are neither confined nor uniform; their scales and consequences ripple and intersect across networks of social

relations, linking north and south, rural and urban, and the global with the local. For instance, changes in labor relations, the patterns and types of work, and the restructuring of labor markets have concomitantly led to a dearth of worker protections and new forms of social inequality in our agile "gig" economies (Standing 2014).

A Regional Perspective

Reflecting similar concerns, scholars of East and Southeast Asia have highlighted an enduring lack of human development opportunities and inadequate welfare provision for impoverished communities across the region (Acharya 2001; Nishikawa 2010; Caballero-Anthony 2004; Caballero-Anthony and Cook 2013; Howe 2013; Hewison and Kalleberg 2013; Tjandraningsih 2013; Endres and Six-Hohenbalken 2014; Carnegie, King, and Zawawi 2016; Caballero-Anthony 2018). From environmental degradation, pollution, and dispossession, to insecurity around food, water, and livelihoods, the precarity shaping twenty-first-century Southeast Asia is both pervasive and profound (Carnegie 2024a, 8).

While ASEAN has endorsed a people-oriented human security agenda[3] across much of Southeast Asia, political elites frequently prioritize foreign direct investment, modernization of agriculture and aquaculture, large-scale commercial ventures, resource extraction, and major infrastructure projects over the protection and welfare of local communities and individual citizens (O'Neill 2014; Endicott and Dentan 2004; McCarthy 2010).

For marginalized and disadvantaged individuals and communities, the rapid economic growth, expanding infrastructure, rising consumption, and deepening integration into global supply chains and markets in Southeast Asia hide a less acknowledged and more uneven reality. Their everyday life is characterized by pervasive uncertainty. Some scholars argue that the adoption of a "human security" framework has allowed certain states to present a veneer of concern for citizens while masking the persistent entrenchment of elite priorities and interests (Chandler and Hynek 2011). It

is probably fair to say that traditional security attitudes and capabilities of Southeast Asian nation-states seem ill-suited for dealing with contemporary precarity. Although traditional state-focused notions of security are far from obsolete, there are increasing tensions between them and multifaceted challenges posed by modern forms of insecurity (Duffield and Waddell 2006). It is not merely about protecting sovereign borders and dealing with the threat of conflict, but also ensuring secure livelihoods and access to adequate water, sanitation, and health provision in the face of rapid socio-economic transformation and environmental degradation.

The sheer scale and scope of the above often make it difficult to know where to focus, what to prioritize, or how to implement action (Buzan 2004; Paris 2004). As Yuen Foong Kong (2001, 231–6) wryly noted, "trying to prioritize everything means nothing is prioritized." What this means in practical terms is that we can easily lose sight of what Rob Nixon (2010) terms "unimagined communities." State-level policies (linked closely to commercial activities and vested interests) of many Southeast Asian countries are frequently implemented in the name of national unity, integration, and progress, but also elicit the displacement of non-integrated indigenous or marginalized communities who do not readily fit into the narratives of national ascent (Carnegie 2024a, 10). The everyday struggles of local populations to sustain their lives often clash with state-led and business-driven infrastructure and resource extraction projects. In many cases, these communities undergo an insidious erasure, rendered invisible—both discursively and bureaucratically—as the stage is set for their material dispossession (Nixon 2010; Straumann 2014).

The discussion above points to a persistent tension: the ways in which precarity is understood and lived locally, often do not align neatly with the frameworks and agendas promoted at the national and international level, raising questions about their applicability and relevance in those specific contexts. The following section further considers the challenges of locating and mapping the politics of precarity in Southeast Asia.

Locating the Politics of Precarity in Southeast Asia

The regional articulation of precarity is characteristically uneven and fragmented, producing patterns that are frequently ambiguous rather than coherent. Communities across Southeast Asia confront different contexts of precarity and face specific challenges (King and Carnegie 2018). We are not dealing with static phenomena but a set of relationships and processes that oscillate and interact in situational circumstances. As mentioned, the conditions that configure such precarity are not readily visible, and the disorienting underpinnings are not always well-understood (Carnegie 2024a, 8). They frequently linger, often unnoticed, in the spaces created by a capricious intersection of state policies, commercial activities, and societal changes.

These new translocal forms of precarity are not simply aberrations of growth but are also the byproducts of untrammeled extractive, infrastructural, and deregulated development agendas and practices. The scales and geographies of these processes unfold gradually, often imperceptibly, across seas and rivers, forests and fields, and within the anonymous inlets, corners, and alleyways of everyday life in the region. Their cumulative effects exact a heavy price on the well-being and safety of rural, urban, local, and migrant communities (Carnegie 2024a, 9).

If we think about the forms of social organization in agrarian and fishing communities across the region, the steady erosion in relations of trust and reciprocity acts as a precursor to the precarity they experience. Many Southeast Asian governments continue to justify development interventions in the name of "national interest," often at the expense of local moral economies and the right of communities to determine what takes place on their land or in their waters. Those affected are not without agency, but they possess limited capacity to resist or shape these processes. In turn, their lives become more fragmented, filtered through money-based relations, and subject to the unpredictable tides of global capital and its interests. Without the trust of previous relationships, which in turn entailed respect, uncertainty, and risk intrude on their everyday livelihoods and

ways of getting by (Scott 1976; Scott and Kerkvliet 1977). Everyday lives become engaged in coping with increased risk (McCarthy 2010; NFR 2015; Roughneen 2017). For those of us schooled in critical traditions, it is an issue that sparks a telling response. Our minds turn to recognize feelings of separation and loss, not to mention varying levels of disenfranchisement, exploitation, ennui, disenchantment, anomie, and alienation.

Uncomfortable as this reality may be, for this author at least, it provides a useful point of departure for reflecting on how we interpret the everyday experiences of precarity lived by different peoples and communities across Southeast Asia's diverse settings. In many ways, precarity in Southeast Asia is at once obvious and obscured. Its injurious effects are woven into the ordinary fabric of life, often overlooked amid the region's celebrated economic dynamism. The spectacle of growth and prosperity too easily distracts from the quiet persistence—and near banality—of inequality that underpins it. For whatever reason, this juxtaposition should be jarring, but somehow it is not. There is a pervasive "ordinariness" to it all. It is as if our minds have been subject to a sleight of hand. The dazzling effect of the region's urban growth and dynamism fosters a selective, even collective, blindness to the everyday struggles of those striving for a more dignified, secure, and safer lives (Carnegie, King, and Zawawi 2016).

While I readily recognize and accept that broader perspectives on human development should not be lost sight of as they form an integral part of the field of inquiry, it is a cognitive blind spot that raises serious questions about how we frame risk and vulnerability and the levels of analysis engaged. Across Southeast Asia, issues are often interpreted through the logics of national and regional priorities, with their human and social dimensions correspondingly marginalized (Carnegie 2024b).

Typhoons, storm surges, and sea-level rise undoubtedly endanger countless lives and livelihoods across Southeast Asia, yet these visible "disasters" can also divert attention from the more insidious transformations that deepen everyday precarity (Uson 2017; Yee 2017). State-led disaster management and climate adaptation policies, though seemingly well-

intentioned, often reinforce long-standing problems of land insecurity, iniquity and friable livelihoods (Sovacool, Tan-Mullins, and Abrahamse 2018). Under state-business-capital logics and agendas, risk itself becomes territorialized—a technology for governing people and resources. The selective framing of risk does more than describe—it aims to rationalize, control, and legitimate certain decisions while marginalizing others. In this sense, precarity is not just something that happens by accident at the whim of the natural world, rather it is continually produced and reproduced through overlapping material, discursive, and institutional forces (Carnegie, King, and Knudsen 2021).

Lack of acknowledgment of the different interests and forces conditioning the very territories at risk under consideration evacuates "the political" from the framing of risk (Carnegie, King, and Knudsen 2021, 19). There is a discursive masking of power, politics, and inequality in the assessment of risk and vulnerability. It implies a disciplining, silencing, and trivialization of the concerns of "unimagined communities" whose presence (and resistance) unsettles the highly partial discourses of national development and ascent (Nixon 2010; Human Rights Now 2016, Carnegie 2024a, 16).

Thankfully, an encouraging body of work has begun to chart how institutional structures, embedded power relations, and intersecting forces shape not only people's exposure to risk and vulnerability but also understandings of these condition—and, crucially, the varied ways they navigate and respond to them (McCarthy 2010; Ofreneo 2013; Baird 2016; van Voorst 2016; Carnegie, King, and Zawawi 2016; Carnegie, King, and Knudsen 2021; Uson 2017; Yee 2017; Campbell 2018; Cruz-Del Rosario and Rigg 2019; Griffiths 2019; Kusakabe and Myae 2019; Padawangi 2019a, 2019b; Alejandria and Smith 2020; Chu and Carnegie 2022). Their work unsettles the narrow framings of "risk" and "vulnerability" that too often gloss over the entrenched inequities and forms of discrimination confronting marginalized communities. These communities must navigate persistent threats to livelihood security, particularly in contexts marked

by displacement, contested resource extraction, and state-corporate encroachment. The resulting disaffection is palpable: trust in state policies and interventions is tenuous, not least because these measures frequently compound rather than alleviate existing vulnerabilities. For countless individuals and families engaged in farming, fishing, and other subsistence activities across the region, precarity and marginality are not just episodic disruptions but enduring conditions woven into the fabric of everyday life. From experience, what we witness in many instances is an internalization of insecurity arising from the agendas and practices of what I loosely term "a patronage-linked state-capital-business nexus." Its influence and the vested interests it served are notoriously difficult to pin down and pass almost unacknowledged relative to the circumstances they condition (Carnegie 2024a, 16).

As researchers and practitioners, we risk an analytical lacuna if we fail to connect the perceptual dimensions of risk and uncertainty—those grounded in lived values, beliefs, and affective orientations—with the political dynamics through which risk itself is framed by actors pursuing specific interests, agendas, and visions of development. To overlook this interplay is to miss how meaning, power, and politics converge in shaping not only what counts as "risk," but also whose vulnerabilities and futures are rendered visible—or ignored—in the process. For instance, mapping the politics of precarity involves consideration of the everyday practices of employers, migrants, brokers, NGOs, and even the police or other enforcement agencies, no more so than in borderland areas. Developing the scope of our investigations will take a commitment to context-sensitive and grounded social science perspectives and approaches. This calls for recognizing those living with precarity as speaking subjects and co-analysts of their own lives, rather than merely as data sources or passive recipients of research. Attending to how structural and social dynamics unfold in day-to-day experience helps avoid over-generalization and reveals the multiple, intersecting precarities—political-economic, ethno-cultural, and social—that shape people's lives across the region. Allowing the stories of

those living with precarity to take center stage and attending to the ways they exercise agency and negotiate their circumstances, helps connect everyday experiences to larger structures of state and business power. Such an approach can illuminate the relational dimensions of precarity that are often overlooked in more abstract analyzes.

Only by foregrounding the lived experiences of precarity can we begin to attune ourselves to the interrelated factors and vested interests that configure, sustain, and reproduce everyday vulnerabilities across Southeast Asia—whether that is among marginalized subsistence fishermen, upland farmers, or insecure migrant populations. We can begin to trace connections across seemingly disparate cases. The micro-subjective experiences of precarity among undocumented Sama-Bajau and Moro Filipinos in Sabah, the Penan and Kenyah in Sarawak, the displaced Karen on the Thai-Myanmar border, the shifting cultivators in the Southern Philippines, or the Phnong and Brao in Northeast Cambodia, and the street children in Jakarta, Bangkok, and Manila are all intimately linked to broader political, and economic agendas and strategies shaped by state-business interests (Carnegie 2024b, 192). While each community faces its own distinct histories and socio-political realities, they collectively convey a common message: the rights to protection, support, and the ability to live daily life in relative safety are frequently denied (Carnegie 2024a, 17). These populations are often subordinated to the priorities of politico-business elites, who favor large-scale infrastructural projects and unrestrained natural resource extraction, regardless of their social or environmental consequences.

Conclusion

This paper may have made for rather troublesome reading, but it was not without purpose. If we are to lend interior and localized perspectives to a manifold issue, it should begin with investigations from experience and observations of life at various sites across contemporary Southeast Asia. Re-focusing research choices and agendas onto perceptions and experiences of risk, uncertainty, safety, and trust in local settings and the relationships they

express is a step in that direction. The ability to provide alternative angles of vision and scale to state-centric framing can render visible often obscured but interrelated processes, forces, and interests at work. It offers a plausible way of glimpsing between the strata to uncover how state development agendas, political-business linkages, and commercial interests intertwine with marginality, inequality, and environmental degradation through complex processes to configure relations of precarity.

Within ASEAN affairs, a persistent tension endures between the priorities of the nation-state and political-business elites and the normative imperative to meaningfully address precarity at the level of individuals and communities. Encounters between those who govern and those without influence—whose safety and well-being ostensibly fall under their protection—are frequently uneasy, and the outcomes often exact a heavy toll on their human development aspirations. The mounting pressures of climate-induced migration and the growing threats to water, food, and livelihood security will only bring these contradictions into sharper relief.

Documenting the ordinary and often unseen routines of lived precarity helps reveal how structures, institutions, and processes work their way into the fabric of everyday life. Such attention to the microsocial dimensions of insecurity offers a vital corrective to state-centric analyses that privilege macro-level generalizations and abstraction. Much is overlooked when we fail to see how people negotiate situational precarity in the shadows of state and commercial (dis)interest.

About the Author

Paul J. Carnegie is an Associate Professor of Politics at the Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam. His interests focus on the sociology of the everyday, the politics of development, state formation, marginality, and precarity in Southeast Asia, especially Indonesia. He is the author of *The Road from Authoritarianism to Democratization in Indonesia* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2010) and co-editor *Human Insecurities in Southeast Asia* and *(Re)presenting Brunei Darussalam: A Sociology of the Everyday* (both Springer, 2016; 2023). His

research output has appeared in *Pacific Affairs, Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs, South East Asia Research, Australian Journal of Politics and History, Journal of Population Research*, and the *Australian Journal of International Affairs*.

Declaration of Funding and Conflict of Interest

Endnotes

[1] Contemporary precarity is often couched around issues associated with and arising out of a wider international discourse on human security. Human security entered the lexicon of world affairs in the mid-1990s by way of the now much-cited UNDP's Human Development Report (1994). One of the primary observations of the UNDP's Report was that nation-states continue to privilege military expenditure over and above the human development and welfare priorities of their populations.

[2] See Brickell and Datta (2011). Translocalization posits that relations connect and influence different localities and people temporally. It is a process that connects places and people at different localities across geographical distance and over political borders, i.e., conditions or events in one place can have a tangible impact on other connected places. The emphasis is on locality vis-à-vis mobilities and connections that cross different boundaries. They are sustained and reproduced by webs of social interrelations of situated people on the move.

[3] The Declaration of the Bali Concord II (ASEAN Concord II) at the ninth ASEAN Summit in Bali, Indonesia on October 2003 affirmed ASEAN's commitment to create "a people-oriented" ASEAN Community based on three pillars, namely the ASEAN Security Community (ASC), the ASEAN Economic Community (AEC), and the ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community (ASCC). In 2008, at the 13th ASEAN Summit, ASCC was renamed the ASEAN Political-Security Community (APSC). The blueprint for APSC tasks it with addressing transnational crimes, promoting human rights, and conducting post-conflict peacebuilding (ASEAN Secretariat 2009a, 5-13). ASCC is tasked to deal with illegal drugs, poverty, food security, and healthcare issues, alongside safeguarding against natural disasters, environmental degradation, and development inequality (ASEAN Secretariat 2009b, 6-24).

References

Acharya, Amitav. 2001. "Human Security: East versus West." *International Journal* 56 (3): 442–60.

Alejandria, Maria Carinnes P., and Will Smith, eds. 2020. *Disaster Archipelago: Locating Vulnerability and Resilience in the Philippines.* Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Allison, Anne. 2013. *Precarious Japan.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Apostolidis, Paul. 2019. *The Fight for Time: Migrant Day Laborers and the Politics of Precarity.* New York: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592719004808.

ASEAN Secretariat. 2009a. *ASEAN Political–Security Community Blueprint.* Jakarta: ASEAN Secretariat.

———. 2009b. *ASEAN Socio–Cultural Community Blueprint.* Jakarta: ASEAN Secretariat.

Adams, Vincanne. 2012. "The Other Road to Serfdom: Recovery by the Market and the Affect Economy in New Orleans." *Public Culture* 24 (1): 185–216. https://doi.org/10.1215/08992363-1443601.

Baird, Ian G. 2016. "Non-Government Organizations, Villagers, Political Culture and the Lower Sesan 2 Dam in Northeastern Cambodia." *Critical Asian Studies* 48 (3): 257–77. https://doi.org/ 10.1080/14672715.2016.1157958.

Bauman, Zygmunt. 2007. *Liquid Times: Living in an Age of Uncertainty.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Beck, Ulrich. 1992. *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity.* London: Sage Publications.

Bhide, Amar, and Howard Stevenson. 1992. "Trust, Uncertainty and Profit." *The Journal of Socio-Economics* 21 (3): 191–208. https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-5357(92)90009-V.

Brickell, Katherine, and Ayona Datta, eds. 2011. *Translocal Geographies: Spaces, Places and Connections.* London: Ashgate.

Buzan, Barry. 2004. "A Reductionist, Idealistic Notion that Adds Little Analytical Value." *Security Dialogue* 35 (3): 369–70. https://doi.org/10.1177/096701060403500326.

Caballero-Anthony, Mely. 2004. "Re-visioning Human Security in Southeast Asia." *Asian Perspective* 28 (3): 155–89.

———. 2018. *Negotiating Governance on Non-Traditional Security in Southeast Asia and Beyond.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Caballero-Anthony, Mely, and Alister D.B. Cook, eds. 2013. *Non-Traditional Security in Asia: Issues, Challenges and Framework for Action*. Singapore: ISEAS-Yusof Ishak.

Campbell, Stephen. 2018. *Border Capitalism, Disrupted: Precarity and Struggle in a Southeast Asian Industrial Zone*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Carnegie, Paul. 2024a. "Precarity Matters: Conceptual Travails in Southeast Asia." *IAS Working Paper* 77. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies: 1–32. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4721540.

———. 2024b. "Disaster, Risk and Conducting Human Security Research in Southeast Asia." *Southeast Asia: A Multidisciplinary Journal* 24 (3): 185-197. https://doi.org /10.1108/ SEAMJ-02-2024-0015.

Carnegie, Paul J., Victor T. King, and Magne Knudsen. 2021. "Human Security, Marginality, and Precariousness in Southeast Asia." *International Journal of Asia Pacific Studies* 17 (1): 1–28. https://doi.org/10.21315/ijaps2021.17.1.1.

Carnegie, Paul J., Victor King, and Zawawi Ibrahim, eds. 2016. *Human Insecurities in Southeast Asia*. Singapore: UBD-Institute of Asian Studies and Springer.

Chandler, David, and Nik Hynek, eds. 2011. *Critical Perspectives on Human Security. PRIO New Security Studies*. London: Routledge.

Chu, Ta-Wei, and Paul J. Carnegie. 2022. "Reflections on a Livelihood Study of Sesan Riverine Communities in Cambodia and the Challenges of Transdisciplinary Research in the Global South." *IAS Working Paper* 71. Gadong: Institute of Asian Studies: 1–33. http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4273427.

Commission on Human Security. 2003. *Human Security Now*. Washington, DC: Communications Development Incorporated.

Cruz-Del Rosario, Teresita and Jonathan Rigg. 2019. "Living in an Age of Precarity in 21st Century Asia." *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 49 (4): 517–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/004 72336.2019.1581832.

Duffield, Mark, and Nicholas Waddell. 2006. "Securing Humans in a Dangerous World." *International Politics* 43 (1): 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.ip.8800129.

Endres, Kirsten W., and Maria Six-Hohenbalken. 2014. "Introduction to Risks, Rupture and Uncertainties: Dealing with Crisis in Asia's Emerging Economies." *Cambridge Anthropology* 32 (2): 42–8. https://doi.org/10.3167/ca.2014.320205.

Endicott, Kirk, and Robert K. Dentan. 2004. "Into the Mainstream or Into the Backwater? Malaysian Assimilation of Orang Asli." In *Civilizing the Margins. Southeast Asian Government Policies for the Development of Minorities*, edited by Christopher R. Duncan, 24–55. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Endo, Tamaki. 2014. *Living with Risk: Precarity and Bangkok's Urban Poor.* Kyoto: Kyoto University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1ntg5d.

Ettlinger, Nancy. 2007. "Precarity Unbound." *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 32 (3): 319–40. https://doi.org/10.1177/030437540703200303.

Griffiths, Michael. 2019. "Networks of Reciprocity: Precarity and Community Social Organisations in Rural Myanmar." *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 48 (4): 602–25.

Giddens, Anthony. 1990. *The Consequences of Modernity.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Harvey, David. 2006. "Neo-Liberalism as Creative Destruction." *Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography* 88 (2): 145–58. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0435-3684.2006.00211.x.

Heine, Jorge, and Ramesh Thakur, eds. 2011. *The Dark Side of Globalization.* New York: United Nations University Press.

Hewison, Kevin, and Arne L. Kalleberg. 2013. "Precarious Work and Flexibilization in South and Southeast Asia." *American Behavioral Scientist* 57 (4): 395–402. https://doi.org/10.1177/000276421246623.

Howe, Brendan M. 2013. *The Protection and Promotion of Human Security in East Asia.* Basingstoke: Palgrave.

King, Victor T., and Paul J. Carnegie. 2018. "Towards a Social Science Understanding of Human Security." *Journal of Human Security Studies* 7 (1): 1–17. https://www.jahss-web.org/journal.

Kusakabe, Kyoko, and Aye Chan Myae. 2019. "Precarity and Vulnerability: Rubber Plantations in Northern Laos and Northern Shan State, Myanmar." *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 48 (4): 586–601. https://doi.org/10.1080/00472336.2018.1554161.

Human Rights Now. 2016. *Sarawak, Malaysia. Infringement of the Rights of Indigenous People by Continuous Illegal Logging Practices.* Tokyo: Human Rights Now.

McCarthy, John F. 2010. "Processes of inclusion and adverse incorporation: oil palm and agrarian change in Sumatra, Indonesia." *Journal of Peasant Studies* 37 (4): 821–50. https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2010.512460.

Mezzadra, Sandro, and Brett Neilson. 2019. *The Politics of Operations: Excavating Contemporary Capitalism.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Munck, Ronaldo. 2013. "The Precariat: A View from the South." *Third World Quarterly* 34 (3): 747–62. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2013.800751.

Neilson, Brett, and Ned Rossiter. 2008. "Precarity as a Political Concept, or Fordism as Exception." *Theory, Culture, and Society* 25 (7–8): 51–72. https://doi.org/10.1177 /026327640809779.

NFR (NGOs for Fisheries Reform). 2015. "Land, Property and Tenurial Rights in a Changing Coastal Environment." *Palihan Publication*. Quezon City: NGOs for Fisheries Reform (NFR).

Nishikawa, Yukiko. 2010. *Human Security in Southeast Asia*. London: Routledge.

Nixon, Rob. 2010. "Unimagined Communities: Developmental Refugees, Megadams and Monumental Modernity." *New Formations* 69: 62–80. https://doi.org/10.3898/NEWF .69.03.2010.

Ofreneo, Rene E. 2013. "Precarious Philippines: Expanding Informal Sector, 'Flexibilizing' Labor Market." *American Behavioral Scientist* 57 (4): 420–43. https://doi.org/10.1177 /0002764212466237.

O'Neill, Daniel. 2014. "Playing Risk: Chinese Foreign Direct Investment in Cambodia." *Contemporary Southeast Asia* 36 (2): 173–205. https://www.jstor.org/stable/43281288.

Padawangi, Rita. 2019a. "Forced Evictions, Spatial (Un)certainties and the Making of Exemplary Centres in Indonesia." *Asia-Pacific Viewpoint* 60 (1): 65–79. https://doi.org /10.1111/apv.12213.

————.2019b. "Urban Development, Vulnerabilities, and Disasters in Indonesia's Coastal Land Reclamations: Does Social Justice Matter?" In *People and Climate Change: Vulnerability, Adaptation, and Social Justice*, edited by Lisa R. Mason and Jonathan Rigg, 122–46. New York: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso /9780190886455.003.0007.

Paret, Marcel, and Shannon Gleeson. 2016. "Precarity and Agency Through a Migration Lens." *Citizenship Studies* 20 (3–4): 277–94. https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2016.11 58356.

Paris, Roland. 2004. "Still an Inscrutable Concept." *Security Dialogue* 35 (3): 370–72. https://doi.org/ 10.1177/096701060403500327.

Rigg, Jonathan, Katie J. Oven, Gopi Krishna Basyal, and Richa Lamichhane. 2016. "Between a Rock and a Hard Place: Vulnerability and Precarity in Rural Nepal." *Geoforum* 76 (November): 63–74.

Roberts, David. 2007. *Human Insecurity: Global Structures of Violence*. London: Zed Books.

Roughneen, Simon. 2017. "Southeast Asia is World's Hotspot for Land Disputes: Report." *Nikkei Asian Review*, 3 October. https://asia.nikkei.com/Economy/Southeast-Asia-is -world-s-hotspot-for-land-disputes-report.

Schaap, Andrew, Kathi Weeks, Bice Maiguascha, Edwina Barvosa, Leah Bassel, and Paul Apostolidis. 2022. "The Politics of Precarity." *Contemporary Political Theory* 21 (1): 142– 73. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41296-020-00435-z.

Scott, James C. 1976. *The Moral Economy of the Peasant: Rebellion and Subsistence in Southeast Asia*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Scott, James C., and Benedict J. Kerkvliet. 1977. "How traditional patrons lose legitimacy: A theory with special reference to Southeast Asia." In *Friends, followers and factions,* edited by Steffen W. Schmidt, James C. Scott, Carl Lande, and Laura Guasti. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sovacool, Benjamin K., May Tan-Mullins, and Wokje Abrahamse. 2018. "Bloated Bodies and Broken Bricks: Power, Ecology, and Inequality in the Political Economy of Natural Disaster Recovery." *World Development* 110: 243–55. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.world dev.2018.05.028.

Standing, Guy. 2011. *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

———. 2012. "The Precariat: From Denizens to Citizens?" *Polity* 44 (4): 588–608. http://d x.doi.org/10.1057/pol.2012.15.

———. 2013. "Defining the Precariat: A Class in the Making." *Eurozine*, 19 April. https://w ww.eurozine.com/defining-the-precariat.

———. 2014. "Understanding the Precariat through Labour and Work." *Development and Change* 45 (5): 963–80. https://doi.org/10.1111/dech.12120.

———. 2016. *The Corruption of Capitalism: Why Rentiers Thrive and Work Does Not Pay*. London: Biteback Publishing.

Stiglitz, Joseph E. 2002. *Globalization and its Discontents*. New York: Norton.

Straumann, Lukas. 2014. *Money Logging: On the Trail of the Asian Timber Mafia*. Basel: Bergli Books.

Tjandraningsih, Indrasari. 2013. "State-Sponsored Precarious Work in Indonesia." *American Behavioral Scientist* 57 (4): 403–19. https://doi.org/ 10.1177/0002764212466236.

UNDP (UN Development Programme). 1994. *Human Development Report 1994*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

————. 2005. *Human Development Report 2005: International Cooperation at a Crossroads.* New York: United Nations Development Programme.

Uson, Maria Angelina M. 2017. "Natural Disasters and Land Grabs: The politics of their intersection in the Philippines following super typhoon Haiyan." *Canadian Journal of Development Studies* 38 (3): 414–30. https://doi.org/10.1080/02255189.2017.1308316.

Waite, Louise. 2009. "A Place and Space for a Critical Geography of Precarity?" *Geography Compass* 3: 412–33. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-8198.2008.00184.x.

Watson, Sean, and Anthony Moran, eds. 2005. *Trust, Risk and Uncertainty.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

van Voorst, Roanne. 2016. *Natural Hazards, Risk and Vulnerability: Floods and Slum Life in Indonesia.* New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315716411.

Yee, Dakila Kim P. 2017. "Constructing Reconstruction, Territorializing Risk: Imposing 'no-build zones' in post-Disaster Reconstruction in Tacloban City, Philippines." *Critical Asian Studies* 50 (1): 103–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/14672715.2017.1407663.

Yuen Foong Kong. 2001. "Human Security: A Shotgun Approach to Alleviating Human Misery?" *Global Governance* 7: 231–236

Zinn, Jenns O., ed. 2008. *Social Theories of Risk and Uncertainty: An Introduction.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. https://doi.org/ 10.1002/9781444301489.