

HUMAN SECURITY: A PRECONDITION FOR PEACE, DIGNITY AND DEVELOPMENT

GJON CULAJ

gjon.culaj@ubt-uni.net

Professor of Faculty of Political Science – Departement of Security Studies, University for Business and Technology – UBT, Prishtina (Kosovo). He earned his PhD in Political Science from the University Paris 2 in France and also holds a Master Degree in Political Science - Strategic Studies from the University of Paris 13. His research interests focus on International Relations, EU Foreign and Security Policy, EU Enlargement Policy as well as National and International Security. He is author and co-author of edited book chapters and papers in international peer-reviewed journals. <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4655-1943>.

ELTON TOTA

elton.tota@ubt-uni.net

Experienced lawyer who has worked for different public and private institutions. He has also been committed to projects in the sector of rule of law implemented by: National Democratic Institute (NDI), GIZ International, B&S Europe, KLSC. He earned his Ph.D in Law from the Chemnitz University of Technology in Germany and also holds an LL.M Degree in EU and International Law from the University of Bremen. He is professor of EU law at the Faculty of Law and Security Studies Department - UBT College (Kosovo). Earlier, he has lectured the modules of EU Law, EU Judicial Protection, EU Competition Law and Policy in BA and MA levels at the Faculty of European Integrated Studies and the Faculty of Law at the ISPE College in Pristina. <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5354-5245>.

GRAMOS SEJDIU

gramos.sejdiu@qkss.org

Research and Project Assistant at the Kosovar Centre for Security Studies (Kosovo), a leading non-governmental organization/think tank for security policies in Kosovo. His research interests primarily focus on human security, social cohesion, inter-ethnic relations, and (de)radicalization processes, as well as national, regional and international security. He is author and co-author of reports and research papers in security fields published by KCSS. <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-9318-9139>.

Abstract

Whereas the traditional conception of security has been considered as state ability to protect territorial integrity and sovereignty from external military threats, the human security gives priority to individuals, their basic needs, sustainable development and human dignity. The concept of human security, broadly defined, is presented for the first time in the 1994 in the Human Development Report of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) affirming that human security is "freedom from fear and freedom from want". Promoters of human security do rightly argue that intra-state conflicts, terrorism, organized crime, poverty, hunger, environmental degradation and disease, due to their wide-ranging impact, do kill far more people than wars. Moreover, such chronic threats are often related to each other and undermine the human well-being. The purpose of this research paper is to argue that traditional security which is focused on priority of state activities do remains relevant and



indispensable for the wider concept of state security but it is not automatically associated with security of individuals, their human rights and welfare. Therefore, a balance pursuit of state-centric security and people-centric approach to security is critical for each other mutual's reinforcement and peaceful coexistence in the current international order.

Keywords

Security, Human, Concept, State, Well-Being, National, International.

Resumo

Enquanto a concepção tradicional de segurança tem sido considerada como a capacidade do Estado de proteger a integridade territorial e a soberania contra ameaças militares externas, a segurança humana dá prioridade aos indivíduos, às suas necessidades básicas, ao desenvolvimento sustentável e à dignidade humana. O conceito de segurança humana, definido em sentido lato, é apresentado pela primeira vez em 1994 no Relatório sobre o Desenvolvimento Humano do Programa das Nações Unidas para o Desenvolvimento (PNUD), que afirma que a segurança humana é "a ausência de medo e a ausência de carência". Os promotores da segurança humana argumentam, com razão, que os conflitos intra-estatais, o terrorismo, o crime organizado, a pobreza, a fome, a degradação ambiental e as doenças, devido ao seu vasto impacto, matam muito mais pessoas do que as guerras. Além disso, estas ameaças crônicas estão frequentemente relacionadas entre si e prejudicam o bem-estar humano. O objetivo deste trabalho de investigação é argumentar que a segurança tradicional, centrada na prioridade das actividades do Estado, continua a ser relevante e indispensável para o conceito mais amplo de segurança do Estado, mas não está automaticamente associada à segurança dos indivíduos, dos seus direitos humanos e do seu bem-estar. Por conseguinte, a procura de um equilíbrio entre a segurança centrada no Estado e a abordagem da segurança centrada nas pessoas é fundamental para o reforço mútuo e a coexistência pacífica na atual ordem internacional.

Palavras-chave

Segurança, Humana, Conceito, Estado, Bem-Estar, Nacional, Internacional.

How to cite this article

Culaj, Gjon, Tota, Elton & Sejdiu, Gramos (2024). Human Security: A Precondition for Peace, Dignity and Development. *Janus.net, e-journal of international relations*. VOL 15 N.º 2, November 2024-April 2025, pp. 165-184. <https://doi.org/10.26619/1647-7251.15.2.6>.

Article received on 18 August 2023 and accepted for publication on 2 March 2024.





HUMAN SECURITY: A PRECONDITION FOR PEACE, DIGNITY AND DEVELOPMENT

GJON CULAJ

ELTON TOTA

GRAMOS SEJDIU

Introduction

Since the end of the Cold War, the international order has gone through a major transformation. If the collective security founded on the territorial integrity and sovereignty of States has been the reference for peace and security, the human security has emerged as alternative approach and credible policy framework for understanding and facing with new non-military global threats that confronts states as well as individuals.

However, since the security is being faced with contemporary threats and conflicts and their complexity related issues, it's becoming increasingly crucial to rethink the response which needs to be given to the new security concerns. The nature of the threats raised on many fronts, have been among the main reasons of suggesting a shift from traditional state security concept to the human beings as the primary reference of security. Affirming and enhancing this concept as a dynamic and ongoing process indeed requires coordinated actions at both the national and international levels. It emphasizes the importance of addressing not only the new threats but also promoting good governance, rule of law as well as fostering cooperation among nations, and ensuring that policies and strategies are inclusive and responsive to the human needs.

The end of bipolarity has created an opportunity and necessity for a new approach of national and international security agenda, in which the realist paradigm of national security centered exclusively on territorial integrity and sovereignty of nation-states, worn out throughout this war, has been seriously challenged by human security concept as a new framework for national, regional and international peace and security (Collins, 2022:129).

Human security is, by definition, a reactive discipline (Alkire 2003:2), based on the idea that people are often more likely to be affected by everyday events such as health, environmental and economic problems than global cataclysmic events (UNDP, 1994). Although, the implementation of human security concept is based on the framework provided by the UNDP Human Progress report of 1994, its origin, as a fundamental value, was theorized earlier. Decades ago, the American President, Franklin D. Roosevelt in



1941, in his address to the American Congress, gave his idea for a democratic world which would guarantee four (4) freedoms:

"In the future [that we are trying to secure], we look forward to a world based on four fundamental human freedoms. The first is freedom of expression - everywhere in the world, the second is freedom of belief, everywhere in the world, the third is freedom from want, with economic understanding which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants - everywhere in the world. The fourth is freedom from fear, a global reduction of weapons to eliminate acts of physical aggression - everywhere in the world" (Roosevelt, 1941).

During the Cold War Order, the fear of mutual destruction through nuclear power conditioned different aspects of security issues only through freedom from fear and protection from external military threats. But, the main question of this article is: can we still consider *freedom from fear* the only reference to guarantee the fundamental human rights and prosperous society, how the concept of human security has evolved over the past three decades to address emerging global threats, and what are the current limitations and challenges in applying this concept to contemporary security concerns?

Implications of Human Security

For more than three centuries, the national security has been defined as a right and obligation of sovereign states to protect their territorial integrity and political independence from external military threats. According to this idea, the right to security and liberty of individuals has been assimilated to the national security, and the state based on force and control should be in the constant competition to ensure it (Fjäder, 2014:115).

The emergence of the concept of human security, introduced for the first time in the Human Development Report of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) of 1994, has produced numerous security policy debates among politicians as well as academics but it is not yet coherent and still remains unclear if this concept is a real challenge for traditional security based on the primacy of states and their military capacities to protect the security of the Nation-State (Tadjbakhsh, 2005:7). However, in the post-Cold War era, human security as an approach, has seriously influenced national and international politics as well as evolution of international relations and should be used as a conceptual framework at the heart of international order (Oberleitner, 2002:9).

The end of the Cold War between East and West has increased security for many states that has suffered consequences of this rivalry and hostility in a bipolar world. However, this period witnessed the resurgence of new civil wars and increasing prevalence of fragile or failed states as well as resurgence of non-military threats such as organized crime, poverty, nationalism, terrorism, spread disease and environmental degradation (Fjäder, 2014:117).

According to Barry Buzan, the state is at the same time a complex autonomous organizational structure as well as an instrument of policy. In this sense, even with



emergence of new threats and security challenges, the nation-state should be still considered as provider of security before being the subject or referent of security. Nevertheless, he had adopted a clear definition of security as "*survival or liberation from threats*" and had built his problematic from it (Buzan, 1991:432).

The definition of human security concept (as introduced in the Human Development Report of UNDP) was particularly ambitious, and associated with seven distinct elements: economic security, food security, health security, environmental security, personal security, collective security and political security, which defined it as the security of people through protection from the various threats arising from human activities (UNDP, 1994:24-25). The report also states that "*It will be a time for all nations to recognize that it is far cheaper and far more humane to act early and to act upstream than to pick up the pieces downstream, to address the root causes of human insecurity rather than its tragic consequences*" (UNDP 1994:24-25). Human security is an essential element of the global development policy agenda. Two ideas guided it: first, the protection of people is strategic for both national and international security; and second, the conditions for safe human development are not limited to the traditional issues of security in the context of inter-state relations, but such conditions do include all the political, economic and social dimensions that make possible to be protected from fear and to live in peace and dignity.

In liberal democracies, state welfares normally reflect the welfares of citizens as well as military capacities to ensure national security, political stable system, promoting of rule of law and sustainable economic development. However, state interests are not always in compliance with the interests of citizens, but rather the interests of political elites within the state (Adeyeri & Ogunniyi, 2016:142). In this context, national security is frequently used as a pretext to maintain regimes and their political ideologies. For example, under the banner of "rule of law and economic development" governments of many countries, such as Russian, Turkish, Chinese..., have consolidated the power through dictatorial rule, a strategy that is well-known as dictatorial or authoritarian development (Scheppele, 2018: 551; Albertus & Menaldo, 2018:20).

Structural realism stands out as an aggressive view of security. Through increasing military spending, each state tries to extend its domination and increase its sphere of influence. Although the realist principle has many main points, the defense measure that actively increases global or regional tensions remains the balance of power. States always debate whether to use force to break the balance of power (revisionist states) or to protect the status quo (status quo states). Due to state goals, realist neighboring states constantly increase their military budgets to anticipate each other's actions. Although on the surface it looks like survival politics, it is often the center of rising tensions (Cooley, Nexon & Ward 2019). But, does changing the reference point of security from a state-centric to an anthropo-centric one help reduce and prevent conflicts? The contemporary conflicts, in the most cases are connected with serious violations of humanitarian and human rights law. Human security requires mutually solutions, seeking to forge alliances for understanding and addressing these interdependent threats. The interconnectedness of cross-border nature of threats means ultimately additional problems of spillover effects from one to another country. Human security, based on its core vision, also recognizes



the interlinkages between peace, sustainable development, human rights and other fields, which are all relevant in countries affected by violence or conflict (HSU, 2016:6).

The breakdown of the balance of power post-Cold War proves that the war casualties decreased over the time, based on statistics that prove the decline of political violence at the global level. During the wars of the 1950s, about 700,000 people were killed, in contrast to 2002, where this figure was only 20,000 people. At the same time, the number of coup d'état (including attempts) has been massively reduced. For example, 1963 saw 25 coups, the most since the end of World War II, compared to 2004, which saw 10 failed attempts. The number of massacres and genocides against civilians fell by 80% and international crises (considered the harbingers of war) saw enormous declines alongside declines in arms trafficking, defense budgets and military personnel. In parallel, with the decrease in wars, the number of refugees plummeted (Collins, 2022:144).

In addition to reduction of war casualties and external military encroachments, human security also highlighted that people are largely threatened by asymmetric threats rather than by large-scale wars. At the same time, human security through the UNDP report branched out the focus point for security and created an image of comprehensive security where national security is formed by an inseparable binomial between military and humanitarian security. Although the military aspect is a determining factor of security, "needs for global human security require a positive relationship between all states, leading to a new era for development through cooperation." (UNDP, 1994:4). This concept has also been used to address issues of conflict and violence. In many conflicts, civilians are the most exposed and affected. Human security pursues to offer protection and support to these individuals by working with communities to identify and manage sources of conflicts and how to peacefully resolve them. This approach aims to encourage dialogue and reconciliation, rather than force and violence (Miller, 2005:24).

Reinforcing the idea that human security is an indispensable discipline in the 21st century, the relationship between conflict and development in Africa must be analyzed. Not coincidentally, most modern conflicts take place in poorer countries (Collins, 2022:131) and the "Westphalian" analytical scheme fails to analyze them because in contemporary conflicts do not fit the idea of conflicts between diverse communities or an oppressive regime. Consequently, through the UNDP report which underlines economic security as a fundamental right (UNDP, 1994:61), the combination of poverty, destroyed GDP, poor infrastructure, abundance of weapons, etc., make civil conflict inevitable (Collins, 2022:131).

Decades of inter-ethnic and religious violence have undermined the process of creating state authority which must face the presence of local governments, which are usually more trusted than the central government. People-centered human security concept that embraces holistic framework, emphasize interlinkages of violent conflicts and human development as well as various actors placing the human being at the center of the security concerns. While conceptual ambiguities among policy-makers, academicians and security analysts in the human security field, still existent, the promoters of this issue, maintain that its wide-ranging and holistic approach indicate its highest value in a world affected by crises and inequalities. According to the UNHCR, "At the end of 2022, 108.4 million people worldwide were forcibly displaced as a result of persecution, conflict,



violence, human rights violations and events seriously disturbing public order. This represents an increase of 19 million people compared to the end of 2021 – more than the populations of Ecuador, the Netherlands or Somalia. It is also the largest ever increase between years according to UNHCR’s statistics on forced displacement” (UNHCR, 2023).

To conclude, although the balance of power is a pillar of the view of realism, often, this leads to unnecessary tensions. These tensions can only be avoided through cooperation for resources and fundamental democratic values and interrelation between states to include human security as a security discipline, alongside the military one. Despite a comprehensive consensus on the basis of this concept, this matter still remains an open question and there is no widely accepted definition of human security and its concern. The approach of human security has been recognized for many years, mainly as a reaction to new security challenges also known as unconventional threats such as pandemics, poverty, hunger, environmental degradation as well as violation of fundamental rights and freedoms, affecting individuals and peoples regardless of their gender, race, ethnicity, religion or nationality (Alkire, 2003:3). Human security tries to address these challenges through collaborative and cohesive approach by bringing together various sectors and actors to confront and overcome the most common causes of human insecurity.

Three decades after it was introduced, the concept of human security seems sufficiently flexible in the security policy debate, because it involves too many variables that are not necessarily interconnected (Tadjbakhsh, 2005:2). The actors involved in security issues are therefore numerous: regional and international organizations, non-governmental organizations and civil society have been permanently involved in some security issues such as global epidemics, disarmament, the fight against land mines and mass mobilization in favor of human rights. But, the notion of human security in an increasingly globalized world also refers to the idea of deprivation, pollution, poverty, access to water resources as well as to safeguarding of the vital core of all human lives (Tabyshalieva 2006:7-8).

The lack of education, as we know, represents a long-term threat to human security, since out-of-school children’s risk being disadvantaged later in their work, even as parents or as citizens who can act on their environment. According to Oscar A. Gomez and Des Gasper

“Human security is a flexible approach and can be tailored to different contexts and topics, according to the specific context. No matter which topic is addressed, a guiding principle of the human security approach is that it requires understanding the particular threats experienced by particular groups of people, as well as the participation of those people in the analysis process” (Gomez & Gasper, 2013:2).

Threats to human security do exist and as such it deserves more attention. Therefore, in both, national and international level, the strategies that prioritize the shared responsibility of protecting populations should be the main concern for states as well as for international organizations.



New Approach or transformation of National Security

The post-Cold War era imposed changes in the security discourse and the international community began to accept the importance to defend not only states but also individuals and the community, thus approaching security in a new way (Gasper, 2010:4). For the first time, the protection of people, especially their welfare, safety and well-being, previously considered as the sovereign responsibility of nation-states, potentially became an important issue of the national, regional and international politics. The development of non-traditional security approaches has been presented and recognized not only in academia but also in foreign and security policy-making communities as well as in the various countries and within international community (Ballin, Dijstelbloem & Goede, 2020; Oberleitner, 2005), In order to create a system where national security is based on civil and military aspects, the term national security must first be defined. How do we define National Security?

Walter Lippmann perceives national security as: "*A nation has security only when it does not need to sacrifice its legitimate interests to avoid war and is able, in case of challenge, to maintain them through war*" (Lippmann, 1943). While, according to Arnold Wolfers "*National security objectively means the absence of threats to acquired values and subjectively, the absence of fear that such values will be attacked*" (Wolfers, 1952) or, "[National and international security] may be understood as a shared freedom from fear and want, and the freedom to live in dignity. It implies social and ecological health rather than the absence of risk... [and is] a common right (Ammerdown Group, 2016).

Expanding national security in seven (7) more fields, the UNDP report highlights the need of focus in economic, health, environmental, personal, social, political and food security (UNDP 1994:24-25), which, while holistic, are directly related to freedom from need with the reference point of the individual, as opposed to the narrow need for freedom from fear with a state-centric point of reference, that have previously hindered multi-party international cooperation. National security by being focused on humanity as its central point, excluding military security as a core of its definition and making well-being the most important issue, it consequently creates conditions where the basic human needs are more important to the state than traditional security.

Sustainable peace cannot be achieved as long as the state cannot develop the human aspect without military security. But, on the other hand, the state cannot be stable in case of being exposed to humanitarian and economic crises, despite the absence of an external threat (Stewart, 2004:12). The predominance of the military idea of security has proven that the social welfare is among the main challenges and through this, it has developed the basic conditions for existence where human needs and rights are just as important for a state as the conventional military security. Therefore, when the state may not be the only point of reference for security, new opportunities such as cooperation through regional and international organizations with civil society and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) becomes much more accessible.

Human security is intentionally based on individuals and their communities and is intentionally non-discriminatory (Alkire 2003:8), since human security consider people as the main asset within a state and focuses on strengthening basic people's well-being



to increase pressure on state (and sub-national elites) towards democratization as well as more concentrated on bottom-up international assistance and strengthening it.

With the diminishing of wars between states and the rise of transnational threats such as organized crime, terrorism and environmental problems, national security will need a redefinition to remain relevant in the future, which can be only achieved through the creation of a national security framework consisting of elements of human security in combination with conventional state security (Tadjbakhsh, 2005:18). So, the lack of military security consequently causes a lack of human security due to the so-called "security binomial". National Security will evolve, and its definitions will still change (as they did in the past). Analyzing national security by using a wider definition involving human security in its core does make sense, specifically if taking into consideration the 21st century security perspective.

Taking into account the existence of transnational threats such as: climate change; international terrorism, organized crime and global pandemics; and the lessons learned from interstate wars, the national security requires a redefinition in order to be relevant in a changing international order (Lizak, Zajączkowski & Kołodziejczak, 2021:7). Incorporating human security into a National Security matrix creates a definition (and a new prism of analysis) that gives us a new perspective on 21st century security problems focused on well-being and individuals within the states. Human security does not substitute traditional national security but transforms it by integrating it into a wider, more comprehensive security framework. It complements state-centric security by addressing underlying issues that can impact state stability (Tadjbakhsh & Chenoy, 2007:10).

By integrating human security, national security strategies can become more effective. For example, addressing economic inequalities and human rights abuses can help prevent conflicts and promote a more stable environment (Trobbiani, 2013:3-4). It represents both a new approach and a transformation of traditional national security. As a new approach, it redefines the dimensions of security to include individual well-being and non-traditional threats. As a transformation, by integrating them into national and international security frameworks, it creates a more comprehensive and effective strategy for addressing both state and individual vulnerabilities. Such dual functions, helps ensure that security efforts are more inclusive, proactive, and sustainable, ultimately contributing to a more stable and secure environment.

Human Security in International Politics: Evolution and Limits

For 45 years after the World War II, the greatest powers in the world had cohabited and applied national and international security based on a balance of state forces to guarantee the sovereignty and territorial integrity of states. According to this prevailing realist view, the state was the referent point of national security in a very Hobbesian way, "*the security of the state means the security of people*" (Theviet, 2008:7-8). The international order, designed after World War II was established to ensure states and people, institutions and values within borders as well as unity and harmony among nations (Evans, Jones & David, 2010:3). However, these principles of the regional and



international security established decades ago have changed rapidly by the changing nature of conflicts and threats as well as by the effects of globalization.

This new international order has maintained collective security by legitimating the right of states to use force only in self-defense in accordance with Article 51 of the UN Charter (UN Charter 1945). In order to prevent conflicts, the United Nations Charter's framers hoped that war would soon be a thing of the past and would no longer be an acceptable method of settling international disputes. But the current international security system is facing with various types of security threats and certainly the International Community should provide new preventive measures and effective political and military responses to successfully prevent and counter global threats (Sakamoto, 2023:2). The persistent rivalry of Nations for more power and influence can cause consequences and serious implications for national and international security in a rapidly changing World. After the World War II, many efforts have been undertaken, particularly in the area of fundamental freedoms and human rights for all. In fact, Articles 55 and 56 of the Charter of the United Nations do implicitly affirm the obligation of Member States to undertake collectively and individually measures to promote "*universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion*" (UN Charter 1945).

The end of the Cold War did not bring peace for everyone and the state remains even in this period dominant actor in International Politics. However, it was a time to review the traditional security based on military state-centric approach and to concentrate resources to a wide scope of threats faced by individuals with a particular attention on a human development and human rights (Kerr, Tow & Hanson, 2008:90). The credence that force remains the only component of national interests and actions is no longer a plausible approach to international politics. The last three decades have also shown more strongly than ever before the need to address the problems of millions of human beings who suffer from increasing political, economic, environmental, social, health, personal and cultural insecurity. However, there are many relationships between traditional security approaches and human security concept, such as conflict prevention because both of them cannot be accomplished in the context of armed conflict (Alkire, 2003:6).

The international system has been changed and reformed radically as a result of the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the liberation of Eastern Europe from communism. Thus, this event was seen as the victory of one system over the other and therefore the triumph of liberal democracy. But this new context also resulted with increasing of intrastate conflicts of the Third World and its constant crises (Koslowski, 1994; Yilmaz, 2008: 44). The post-Cold War era witnessed the emergence of new dynamics and actors as well as new security threats and challenges having more influence on international relations - and not only international organizations capable of acting on their environment, but also numerous transnational forces which are expressed with force in multinational corporations and non-governmental organizations (Tadjbakhsh, 2005:6). Thus, Barry Buzan, notes, with the notion of "societal security", that the evolution of the international context no longer allow to consider State as the main or best guarantor of security, sometimes on the contrary has become the main threat to the own population (McSweeney, 1996:81). According to Gerd Oberleitner "*In today's world of rising non-traditional, non-conventional and trans-national threats, the protection of borders and*



the preservation of territorial integrity cannot be the ultimate goal of security. In focusing on people rather than on States, human security tries to challenge traditional concepts of security and thus also established concepts of international law such as States' rights, national sovereignty and territorial independence" (Oberleitner, 2002).

The relevance and perspective of human security as a multi-sectorial approach that includes all the dimensions of human rights and human development is important for analyzing current international relations, the influence of international organizations, and especially that of the United Nations. And, in this regard, it's worth mentioning that the Security Council is inevitably the necessary tool to understand the implementation of this new concept within a rapidly changing world marked by episodes of violence and insecurity. It is true that this concept was introduced by UNDP Report in mid-90's, but it was traced in the early 40s, when reporting to his government on the results of the San Francisco conference, the Secretary of State, Edward R. Stettinius, already mentioned the need for a wide vision of international peace and collective security: *"The battle of peace has to be fought on two fronts. The first is the security front where victory spells freedom from fear. The second is the economic and social front where victory means freedom from want. Only victory on both fronts can assure the world of an enduring peace"* (Macfarlane, 2004). Moreover, the principles, values and norms of human dignity and human well-being were established in Preamble of UN Charter as well as in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights:

"To save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom" (UN Charter 1945).

"Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world, Whereas disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind, and the advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want has been proclaimed as the highest aspiration of the common people" (UN UDHR, 1948).

Furthermore, human security as a new concept was successfully introduced in international politics through the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) highlighted in its 2001 report entitled *The Responsibility to Protect*:

"The current debate about intervention for human protection purposes also takes place in a historical, political and legal context of evolving international standards of conduct for states and individuals, including the development of



new and stronger norms and mechanisms for the protection of human rights. Human rights have now become a mainstream part of international law, and respect for human rights a central subject and responsibility of international relations” (ICISS, 2001:6).

The report also underlines that sovereign state’s primary responsibility is protection of integral territoriality and sovereignty from external threats as well as to protect their own citizens: based on basic needs and human dignity:

“This Commission certainly accepts that issues of sovereignty and intervention are not just matters affecting the rights or prerogatives of states, but that they deeply affect and involve individual human beings in fundamental ways. One of the virtues of expressing the key issue in this debate as “the responsibility to protect” is that it focuses attention where it should be most concentrated, on the human needs of those seeking protection or assistance” (ICISS, 2001:15).

The international community witnessed severe humanitarian crises in the late 20th century, notably Rwanda (1994), Srebrenica (1995) and Kosovo (1998). These events highlighted the failure of the international community to act decisively to prevent or stop mass atrocities, despite having the capability to do so (Evans, 2006:706). Failures of conflict prevention in these cases raised questions about the effectiveness and morality of the principle of non-intervention in internal affairs of states, especially when it came to preventing human rights violations. The debates around these crises led to a growing recognition that state sovereignty should not be an obstacle to addressing severe abuses of human rights, moreover, States has obligation to respect and ensure their observance as stated in the UN Charter and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Gerhards, Antoine & Ollroge, 2024:155-156).

Academics and policymakers began advocating for a new approach that would reconcile state sovereignty with the need for international humanitarian intervention. Similar to how territorial integrity and sovereignty of nation-states are protected by international law, the rights of individuals are protected by a variety of documents and above all the Universal Declaration of Human Rights from 1948. However, according to Jacob Dolinger *“the Declaration has no force of law as it is a mere declaration with no effect over the horrors suffered by many peoples since its adoption by the UN. Therefore, it is not correct to incorporate it in the realm of International Law”* (Dolinger, 2016:156). The International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) report outlined the concept of Responsibility to Protect (R2P), emphasizing that sovereignty is not just a right but a responsibility (Payandeh, 2010:474-475). It proposed that when states fail to protect their populations from grave harm, the international community has a responsibility to intervene (ICISS, 2001). The concept gained significant traction at the 2005 World Summit held at the United Nations. World leaders unanimously endorsed R2P as part of the summit's outcome document, recognizing that the international community has a duty to protect populations from ethnic cleansing, war crimes, genocide and crimes against humanity (Lau, 2023:35-36). R2P has been referenced in several UN Security



Council resolutions, including those related to Libya (2011) and Syria (2012). However, its application has been inconsistent and controversial, often affected by political considerations and the geopolitical interests of powerful states (Jarvis, 2022:245). The implementation of R2P remains a subject of debate. Critics argue that it can be used to justify interventions that serve the interests of powerful states, while proponents stress its importance in addressing severe human rights violations and promoting international moral and legal standards (Paris, 2014:572-573).

Kosovo, Libya and Syria are three cases with different understanding of R2P: The case of Kosovo is often cited in discussions about the Responsibility to Protect (R2P), a principle that proclaims the international community's obligation to prevent and take actions by force to mass atrocities when states fail to fulfill this duty. The primary justification for NATO's intervention was the need to protect civilians from systematic violence. The situation in Kosovo met the criteria for R2P, given the scale of atrocities and the failure of the international community's diplomatic efforts to prevent humanitarian catastrophe (Newman & Visoka, 2024:632). Although R2P as a formal principle was not yet fully articulated at the time of the Kosovo intervention, the intervention was later viewed as a predecessor to the R2P doctrine, which formally emerged from the 2005 World Summit. The Kosovo intervention highlighted the need for a stronger and more consistent application of the R2P principle. The 2005 World Summit formally endorsed R2P, defining it as the international community's obligation to prevent genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity, and to take collective action when states fail to protect their populations (Evans, 2006: 714-715). The case of Kosovo is a significant example in the context of R2P, illustrating the complications of international intervention in response to mass atrocity crimes. While the intervention was inspired by the need to protect civilians from severe human rights violations, it also raised important legal and ethical questions. (Payandeh, 2010:470; Newman & Visoka, 2024:632). The lessons from Kosovo contributed to the development and refinement of the R2P doctrine, which now provides a more structured framework for addressing similar humanitarian crises while seeking to balance respect for state sovereignty with the imperative to protect human lives.

The case of Libya is a prominent example in the application of R2P doctrine. The 2011 intervention in Libya provides a complex and controversial illustration of how R2P can be operationalized, and it has been a significant case study in the evolution and interpretation of the doctrine. By adopting UNSC Resolution 1973: On March 17, 2011, which authorized member states to take "all necessary measures" to protect civilians under threat of attack in Libya (UNSC, 2011), International Community allowed the use of force to protect civilians, marking a formal authorization of the R2P principle by UN (Gerhards, Antoine & Ollroge, 2024:159). Following the UNSC resolution, NATO led a coalition of countries in a military intervention that included air strikes and other measures aimed at enforcing the no-fly zone and protecting civilians. It was the first major implementation of R2P (Ogunnowo & Chidozie, 2020:5). Unlike the Kosovo intervention, the Libyan case had explicit UNSC authorization, providing a clear legal basis for international action under R2P (Gerhards, Antoine & Ollroge, 2024:159). The Libyan intervention was a significant test case for R2P, demonstrating the challenges of implementing such a doctrine. It was the first time that the UN Security Council authorized coercive military actions against a state for the purpose of human protection



(Brockmeier, Stuenkel & Tourinho, 2016:113). While it achieved its immediate goal of protecting civilians from Libyan regime, the following instability highlighted the difficulties in managing post-conflict scenarios and ensuring long-term stability (Paris, 2014:570). The Libya intervention emphasized the need for a comprehensive approach to R2P that includes not only immediate protection but also strategies for post-conflict stabilization and reconstruction. It encouraged discussions about the limits of R2P, the risks of military interventions, and the importance of having clear, attainable objectives. However, the subsequent fallout, including instability and conflict in Libya, raised significant questions about the principle emphasized the importance of prevention and reconstruction rather than military intervention (Paris, 2014:570).

The case of Syria has been also a significant example of R2P in action, with many challenges and criticisms. The conflict involved various international actors, including two permanent members of the UN Security Council, United States and Russia. This geopolitical complexity made it difficult to build a unified international response, because the UN Security Council (UNSC) was often paralyzed by the threat of Russia and China to veto for any coercive measures (Williams, Worboys & Ulbirck, 2012:475). Due to this deadlock of the UN, on March 19, 2011, a coalition of states, led by the United States, began NATO military intervention in Syria. The perception of selective intervention affects the credibility and sparked debates of R2P, because effective application of R2P requires a unified international response, which was hindered by regional alliances and international rivalries in the Syrian conflict (Ogunnowo & Chidozie, 2020:5). The Syrian case remains a profound and ongoing challenge for the international community in its efforts to respect the principles of R2P and protect populations from severe human rights violations and mass atrocity crimes.

The European Union (EU) and NATO both play key roles in the implementation of human security, in different but complementary ways, both institutions recognized importance of human security. The EU has incorporated human security into its strategic documents, such as the European Security Strategy (2003), Global Strategy for the European Union's Foreign and Security Policy (2016) as well as EU Security Union Strategy (2020), emphasizing the operationalization of human security for 21st century conflicts and institutions. The intersection of these efforts provides a broader understanding that security encompasses more than just state-centric concerns and includes well-being of individuals. However, critics argue that the EU has been focused only on relatively low intensity missions and EU's human security agenda can sometimes prioritize regional stability and geopolitical interests over the immediate needs of affected populations (Rieker & Riddervold, 2021:461-462). This focus on external diplomacy and security concerns may overshadow direct humanitarian needs (Bailes, 2008:120). On the other hand, NATO's approach to human security is different, of course NATO's core mission is collective defense, but it increasingly incorporates elements of human security into its operations (Atkinson, 2021:9; NATO, 2023). The Alliance's operations in recent decades (Kosovo, Lybia and Syria) have included a focus on protecting civilians and addressing humanitarian concerns, which aligns with R2P objectives. NATO's operations are often constrained by the mandates provided by the UN Security Council or member states' national interests. This can limit the scope of interventions related to R2P and complicate efforts to address human security comprehensively (Carati, 2017:293-294). However, NATO has increasingly integrated human security and protection considerations into its



strategic framework. The ongoing conflict in Ukraine and other global crises have highlighted the need for the Alliance to address human security concerns more explicitly.

It is well known that human security promotes a holistic view of international issues, encouraging policies that address root causes of conflict and instability rather than merely responding to symptoms. This influences diplomatic strategies, aid allocation, and conflict resolution efforts. By focusing on early warning signs and preventative measures, human security advocates for proactive engagement rather than reactive responses to crises (Alkire, 2003:3). This approach shapes international policies and the roles of states and organizations in managing global security challenges. Human security's multi-sectorial approach is highly relevant in contemporary international relations and the work of international organizations. By addressing the full spectrum of human needs and rights, it shapes how global challenges are understood and managed. The UN, as a key player in international governance, has integrated human security principles into its policies and initiatives, reflecting a commitment to addressing both the immediate and underlying causes of global issues (Gazizullin, 2016:4). A resolution (A/RES/66/290) adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in September 2012 has, for the first time in UN history, officially recognized human security as an approach to "*assist Member States in identifying and addressing widespread and cross-cutting challenges to the survival, livelihood and dignity of their people*" (UNGA, 2012). This comprehensive perspective continues to influence how the international community responds to crises, develops policies, and works towards sustainable and inclusive solutions. However, critics argue that while the concept of human security is broadly endorsed, there are significant gaps between policy frameworks and actual implementation. By prioritizing everything, efforts to address human security might be undermined by a lack of coordination or insufficient resources (Johns, 2014:3).

Conclusion

The national security (state-centric) as traditionally defined is still relevant because the security among states remains a necessary condition for the security of people. However, such a concept of security focused only on political sovereignty and territorial integrity cannot in itself guarantee the security of its people. The concept of human security by drawing attention of institutions on human beings may assist us to evaluate the effectiveness of our security policies; it also highlights the importance of preventive actions to reduce vulnerability and to reinforce remedial action, where prevention fails.

The last three decades also show more than ever before the need to address the problems of millions of human beings who suffer from increasing political, economic, environmental, social, health, personal and cultural insecurity. However, there are many relationships between traditional security approaches and human security concept, such as conflict prevention because both of them cannot be accomplished in the context of armed conflict.

The development of the concept of human security is directly connected to the lack of democracy and human rights as well as a result of profound redefinition of national and international security approach shifting the attention from state centered security to the values of humanity and community's interests. The traditional paradigms used until the



end of the Cold War to understand and analyze international relations, find themselves obsolete and unable to meet the basic needs and security concerns of individuals and to address new threats and realities in the age of globalization.

Indeed, the problem of security arises in a new way. In the past, security was considered to be threatened from the outside: ensuring state security was mainly about protecting the state against any external attack; the security of individuals flowed directly from the security of their state which protected them from any external threat. Many threats to individuals today come from the state itself. The human security concept has profoundly reversed the way in which national and international politics has been established and conducted during the Cold War era. Incorporating Human Security into a National Security matrix creates a definition (and a new prism of analysis) that gives us a new perspective on 21st century security problems. Such a concept reduces and prevents conflicts, creates conditions for peace, sustainable development and promotes fundamental freedoms and well-being for all. In this context, the human security concept is an indispensable instrument facing to existing and emerging multiple forms of human insecurity in today`s rapidly changing world.

In conclusion, human security emphasizes the protection of individuals and communities against a broad range of threats that affect their daily-life in many ways. The concept remains very important because it recognizes that security cannot be attained by focusing exclusively on the territorial integrity and political sovereignty of the state and the military solutions, but rather by taking a more cohesive and wide-ranging approach that addresses the main causes of insecurity. The focus on people, their fundamental freedoms and human rights, their needs, safety and well-being are preconditions for human dignity and development as well as for a more equal, peaceful and prosperous world. However, while human security offers a comprehensive approach to addressing global security challenges, its effectiveness is sometimes hindered by issues related to its scope, implementation, and political dynamics. Addressing these criticisms requires refining the concept to ensure clarity, coherence, and practical application, while balancing state sovereignty and responsibility to protect populations as well as individual and collective needs within a framework that `humanize` national sovereignty and addresses broader security concerns.

References

- Adeyeri, J. O, & Ogunniyi J. O. (2016). Conflict between National Interest and Human Rights. *Africa Development / Afrique et Développement*, Vol. 41, No. 4, pp. 139-151.
- Albertus, M., & Menaldo, V. (2018). *Authoritarianism and the Elite Origins of Democracy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Alkire, S. (2003). *A Conceptual Framework for Human Security*, CRISE, Department of International Development, University of Oxford. Available at: <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/57a08cf740f0b652dd001694/wp2.pdf>.
- Ammerdown Group. (2016). *Rethinking Security: A discussion Paper*. Available at: <https://rethinkingsecurityorguk.files.wordpress.com/2016/10/rethinking-security-a-discussion-paper.pdf>.



- Atkinson, A. (2021). *The Protection of Civilians within Collective Defense*, Stimson Center. Available at: https://www.stimson.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Stimson_CollectiveDefense_FinalHiRes.pdf
- Bailes, A. J. K. (2008). The EU and a 'better world': what role for the European Security and Defence Policy?, *International Affairs*, Volume 84, Issue 1, Pages 115–130.
- Ballin, E. H., Dijstelbloem, Huub. D., & G. D., Peter. (2020). The Extension of the Concept of Security. In: Ballin, E. H., Dijstelbloem, Huub. D., & G. D., Peter. (eds) *Security in an Interconnected World*, Research for Policy. Springer, Cham. pp.13-39, at: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-37606-2_2
- Brockmeier, S., Stuenkel, O., & Tourinho, M. (2015). The Impact of the Libya Intervention Debates on Norms of Protection. *Global Society*, 30(1), 113–133.
- Burke, A. (2010). Caught between National and Human Security: Knowledge and Power in Post-crisis Asia. *Pacifica Review: Peace, Security & Global Change*, Vol. 13, No.3, pp. 215-239.
- Buzan, H. (1991). New Patterns of Global Security in the 21 Century. *International Affairs*, Vol. 67, No.3, pp.431-451.
- Buzan, H. (1991). *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era*, second edition, Harvester Wheatsheaf, London.
- Carati, A. (2017). Responsibility to protect, NATO and the problem of who should intervene: reassessing the intervention in Libya. *Global Change, Peace & Security*, 29(3), 293–309.
- Collins, A. (2022). *Contemporary Security Studies*, Oxford University Press, 2022.
- Cooley, A., Nexon, D., & Ward, S. (2019). Revising order or challenging the balance of military power? An alternative typology of revisionist and status-quo states. *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 45, No.4, pp. 689-708.
- Dolinger, J. (2016). The Failure of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 47 U. Miami Inter-Am. L. Rev. 164 (). Available at: <http://repository.law.miami.edu/umialr/vol47/iss2/4>
- Evans, A., Jones, B., & Steven, D. (2010). *Confronting the Long Crisis of Globalization: Risk, Resilience and International Order*, Brookings, 2010.
- Evans, G. (2006). From Humanitarian Intervention to the Responsibility to Protect. *Wisconsin International Law Journal*, Vol. 24, No. 3, pp.703-722.
- Fjäder, C. (2014). The nation-state, national security and resilience in the age of globalization. *Resilience*, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 114-129.
- Gaspar, D. (2010). The Idea of Human Security. in A. L. Karen O'Brien, *Climate Change, Ethics and Human Security*, Cambridge University Press, 2010, pp. 23-46.
- Gazizullin, A. (2016). The Significance of the 'Human Security' Paradigm in International Politics. *E-International Relations*. Available at: <https://www.e-ir.info/2016/02/29/the-significance-of-the-human-security-paradigm-in-international-politics/>



Gerhards, J., Antoine, L., & Ollroge, R. (2024). State Sovereignty and the Protection of Human Rights. How Military Humanitarian Intervention is Supported by Citizens Around the World. *International Journal of Sociology*, 54(3), 155–176.

Gomez, O. & Gasper, D. (2013). *Human Security: A Thematic Guidance Note for Regional and National Human Development Report Teams*, New York: United Nations Development Programme. Available at: <https://hdr.undp.org/system/files/documents/humansecurityguidancenoter-nhdrspdf.pdf>

Human Security Unit, (2016). *Human Security Handbook*. United Nations, New York, Available at: <https://www.un.org/humansecurity/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/h2.pdf>

ICISS, (2001). *The responsibility to protect: report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty*. International Development Research Centre, Ottawa, Available at: <https://idl-bnc-idrc.dspacedirect.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/7321d402-4733-4e62-98f2-8fbed4db04c1/content>.

Jarvis, S. (2023). The R2P and atrocity prevention: Contesting human rights as a threat to international peace and security. *European Journal of International Security*, 8(2), pp.243–261.

Johns, L. (2014). A Critical Evaluation of the Concept of Human Security`, *E-International Relations*. Available at: <https://www.e-ir.info/2014/07/05/a-critical-evaluation-of-the-concept-of-human-security/>

Kerr, P., Tow, W., & Hanson, M. (2008). The utility of the human security agenda for policy – makers. *Asian Journal of Political Science*, 11(2), pp.89-114.

Koslowski, R., & Kratochwil, F. V. (1994). Understanding Change in International Politics: The Soviet Empire's Demise and the International System. *International Organization*, Vol. 48, no.2, pp.215-247.

Lau, R. K.S. (2023). Operationalizing Human Security: What Role for the Responsibility to Protect? *International Studies*, 60(1), 29-44.

Lippman, W. (1943): *U.S. foreign policy: shield of the republic*, Little, Brown and Co., Boston, 1943.

Lizak, W., Zajączkowski, K., & Kołodziejczak, M. E. (2021). Introduction to the Special Issue "Non-military aspects of security in the changing international order`. *Security and Defence Quarterly*, 33(1), 7-13.

Macfarlane, S. N. (2004). Charters Values and the Responses to Terrorism. in Boulden, J. & Weis, Th. G. (Eds.): *Terrorism and the UN: Before and after 11 September*, Indiana University Press, pp.27-55.

McSweeney, B. (1996). Identity and Security: Buzan and the Copenhagen School. *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 22, No.1, pp. 81-93.

Miller, E. C. (2005). *A glossary of terms and concepts in peace and conflict studies*, Second Edition, University for Peace.



- NATO. (2023). *Human Security in NATO*. Available at: <https://www.act.nato.int/article/human-security-in-nato/>
- Newman, E. & Visoka, G. (2024). NATO in Kosovo and the logic of successful security practices, *International Affairs*, Volume 100, Issue 2, pp. 631–653.
- Oberleitner, G. (2002). Human Security and human rights. *European training and research center for human rights and democracy*, No.8. Available at: <https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/31301/08.pdf>.
- Oberleitner, G. (2005). Human Security: A Challenge to International Law?. *Global Governance*, Vol. 11, No. 2, pp. 185-203. at: Available at: <http://www.uni-graz.at/gerd.oberleitner/OberleitnerHumanSecurityGlobalGovernance.pdf>.
- Ogunnowo, O. E., & Chidozie, F. (2020). International Law and Humanitarian Intervention in the Syrian Civil War: The Role of the United States. *Sage Open*, 10(2), 1-11.
- Paris, R. (2014). The 'Responsibility to Protect' and the Structural Problems of Preventive Humanitarian Intervention. *International Peacekeeping*, 21(5), 569–603.
- Payandeh, M. (2010). With Great Power Comes Great Responsibility? The Concept of the Responsibility to Protect Within the Process of International Lawmaking. *The Yale Journal of International Law*, vol.35, No.2, pp.469-516.
- Rieker, P., & Riddervold, M. (2021). Not so unique after all? Urgency and norms in EU foreign and security policy. *Journal of European Integration*, 44(4), 459–473.
- Roosevelt, F. D. (1941). State of the union address ("Four Freedoms Speech") speech delivered at the Joint Session of Congress, Washington, DC, United States of America.
- Sakamoto, T. (2023). Threat Conceptions in Global Security Discourse: Analyzing the Speech Records of the United Nations Security Council, 1990–2019` ` , *International Studies Quarterly*, Volume 67, Issue 3, sqad067.
- Scheppele, K. L. (2018). Autocratic Legalism. *University of Chicago Law Review*, Vol.85, No.2, pp.545-583.
- Stewart, F. (2004). Development and Security. *CRISE, Department of International Development, Queen Elizabeth House-University of Oxford*. Available at: <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/57a08cd140f0b652dd00159c/wp3.pdf>
- Tabyshalieva, A. (2006). *Promoting Human Security: Ethical, Normative and Educational Frameworks in Central Asia*. UNESDOC digital library. Available at: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000149376>
- Tadjbakhsh, S. (2005). Human Security: Concepts and Implications with an Application to Post-Intervention Challenges in Afghanistan. *Les Études du CERI*, n.117 -118.
- Tadjbakhsh, S., & Chenoy, A. (2007). *Human Security: Concepts and implications* (1st ed.). Routledge.
- Theviet, D. (2008). Thomas Hobbes: a Philosopher of War or Peace? *British Journal for the History of Philosophy*, Vol.16, No.4, pp.701-721.



- Trobbianni, R. (2013). How Should National Security and Human Security Relate to Each Other?. *E – International Relations*. Available at <https://www.e-ir.info/pdf/36454>
- UN General Assembly. (2012). *Resolution (A/RES/66/290)*. Available at: <https://www.un.org/humansecurity/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/N1147622.pdf>
- UN Security Council, Security Council resolution 1973 (2011) [on the situation in the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya], S/RES/1973(2011), 17 March 2011. Available at: <https://documents.un.org/doc/undoc/gen/n11/268/39/pdf/n1126839.pdf>
- UNDP. (1994). *Human Development Report: Dimensions of Human Security.*, Available at: <https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-1994>
- UNHCR. (2023). *Global Trends*. Available at: <https://www.unhcr.org/global-trends>
- United Nations. (1945). *The Charter of the United Nations*. Available at: [un.org/en/about-us/un-charter](https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter).
- United Nations. (1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, Available at: https://www.un.org/en/udhrbook/pdf/udhr_booklet_en_web.pdf
- Williams, P.R., Worboys, J., & Ulbrick, T.J. (2012). Preventing Mass Atrocity Crimes: The Responsibility to Protect and the Syria Crisis, *Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law*, 45(1&2), pp.473-503. Available at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/jil/vol45/iss1/13>
- Wolfers, A. (1952). National Security as an Ambiguous Symbol. *Political Science Quarterly*, vol.67, no.4, pp.481–502.
- Yilmaz, M. E. E. (2008). The New World Order: An Outline of the Post-Cold War Era. *Alternatives: Turkish Journal of International Relations* Vol.7, No.4, pp.44-58.