

"Human Security" From Liberal Perspective: Is It a Comprehensive Model?

Res. Assist. Dr. Cansu Güleç ARAS

MEF University

Classical liberal ideas were built on the concepts of equality, rationality, freedom and property. In the 18th century, Locke from England, David Hume and Adam Smith in Scotland, Montesque and Voltaire from France and Kant from Germany were the leading liberal thinkers. As an international theory that explained international politics and foreign policy, Liberalism emerged after the First World War. Names like Woodrow Wilson, Hobson, David Mitrany, Karl W. Deutsch, Michael Doyle, Francis Fukuyama, Stanley Hoffmann, Robert O. Keohane are among the most important representatives of liberal thought in international relations. According to Liberalism, world peace might occur with the residence of political and economic liberal norms at both national and international levels; the increase of interdependence and interaction; the international cooperation that carried out under the leadership of intergovernmental organizations; and the protection of human rights and governance. In security studies, the concept of human security is one of the most important concepts of the post-Cold War era that has been scholarly disputed. Indeed, the ethnic and religious-based conflicts after the Cold War led to evolution of the concept "national security" and the increase of the concerns about individual security in international relations. Since then, there have been attempts to "deepen and widen" the concept of security from the level of states to individuals. In that sense, the concept of "human security" considers human being as the reference object of security as well as it places the threats against human beings on the agenda. On the other hand, the mentioned concept objects the monopoly of the state in ensuring security through featuring the actors like international organizations and civil society. Accordingly, the concept of security will be discussed within the scope of liberal theory in this paper. Following the historical evolution, the conceptualizations about human security will be put forward. In addition, the criticisms toward the concept of human security will be analyzed. Finally, the evaluations regarding implementation and execution of human security will be discussed.

Key words: Security Studies, Liberalism, Human Security, Globalization

LİBERAL BAKIŞ AÇISIYLA “İNSAN GÜVENLİĞİ”: KAPSAYICI BİR MODEL Mİ?

ÖZET

Klasik liberal düşünce, eşitlik, rasyonellik, özgürlük ve mülkiyet kavramları üzerinde inşa edilmiştir. 18. Yüzyılda, İngiltere’den Locke, İskoçya’da David Hume ve Adam Smith, Fransa’dan Montesqueu, Voltaire ve Almanya’dan Kant önde gelen liberal düşünürler olmuşlardır. Liberalizmin uluslararası politika ve dış politikayı açıklamaya yönelik bir uluslararası ilişkiler teorisi olarak görülmesi ise I. Dünya Savaşı sonrasında ortaya çıkmıştır. Woodrow Wilson, Hobson, David Mitrany, Karl W. Deutsch, Michael Doyle, Francis Fukuyama, Stanley Hoffmann, Robert O. Keohane gibi isimler liberal düşüncenin uluslararası ilişkilerde önemli temsilcileri arasındadır. Liberalizme göre dünya barışı; siyasi ve ekonomik liberal normların ulusal ve uluslararası düzeyde yerleşik hale gelmesi, karşılıklı bağımlılığın ve etkileşimin artması, devletlerarası teşkilatların öncülüğünde gerçekleştirilecek uluslararası iş birliği, yönetim ve insan haklarının korunmasıyla gerçekleşebilir. Güvenlik çalışmalarında insan güvenliği kavramı ise, etrafında pek çok kuramsal tartışmanın döndüğü Soğuk Savaş sonrası dönemin en önemli kavramlarından biridir. Zira, Soğuk Savaş sonrasında ortaya çıkan etnik ve dini temelli çatışmalar “ulusal egemenlik” kavramının evrim geçirmesine ve bireyin güvenliğine yönelik endişelerin, uluslararası ilişkiler gündemine yerleşmesine neden olmuşlardır. Söz konusu dönemden itibaren, güvenlik çalışmaları hem “genişlemeye” hem “derinleşme” ye uğramıştır. İnsan güvenliği, hem güvenliğin referans nesnesi olarak insanı kabul etmiş, hem de insana yönelik tehditleri gündeme taşımıştır. Öte yandan kavram, güvenliğin sağlanmasında uluslararası örgütler ve sivil toplum kuruluşları gibi aktörlere de çeşitli roller biçerek devletin bu alandaki tekeline karşı çıkmaktadır. Bu bilgiler ışığında, bu çalışmada liberal teori kapsamında güvenlik kavramı ele alınacak ve “insan güvenliği” kavramının genişleyen ve derinleşen güvenlik anlayışı ile beraber söz konusu teorik çerçevede nasıl yorumlandığı incelenecektir. Ortaya konulan tarihsel gelişimin ardından, insan güvenliğine yönelik belirsizliğin giderilmesi için yapılan kavramsallaştırmalar ortaya konulacaktır. Bununla beraber, insan güvenliği kavramına yönelik eleştiriler de analiz edilecektir. Son olarak, insan güvenliğinin hayata geçirilmesi ve yürütülmesine yönelik değerlendirmeler ortaya konulacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Güvenlik Çalışmaları, Liberalizm, İnsan Güvenliği, Küreselleşme

INTRODUCTION

Security is an ambiguous concept and it is very open to different comments which include different dimensions. The actors in international relations usually consider the capabilities and the intentions of a possible rivals while making threat assessments, but it is also difficult for them to qualify and articulate the level of security. It can be argued that security consists of multiple elements some of which are shared by all actors and some of which are specific to a particular actor at a particular time.

The actors in international environment such as states, individuals, international organizations and many others have a number of values. These values may include physical safety, economic welfare, autonomy, psychological well-being, and so on.¹ It is argued that security points to some degree of protection of values acquired, and it has much in common with power or wealth. However, while wealth measures the amount of a nation's material possessions and power is regarded as the ability to control the actions of others, security, in an objective sense, measures the absence of threats to acquired values, in a subjective sense, the absence of fear that such values will be attacked.²

It can be claimed that the end of the Cold War has created an opportunity that the concept of security will be broadened, redefined or reconstituted. In that era, the definition of security as “the absence of existential threats to one state emanating from another” has been criticized by many reasons. First of all, the state is no accepted as the sole subject of security. Social, ethnic, religious minorities, individuals or humankind have been considered as objects that have security needs. Secondly, it has been argued that the attention devoted to the physical, territorial or political dimension of security is misplaced under conditions of complex interdependence. Other aspects are seen as significant in security terms which include economic resources, stability and institutions.³ Therefore, the narrowness of the military state-centric agenda was considered as politically and normatively problematic for those seeking to expand the concept of security.

The rise of intra-state conflicts, societies' fear of immigration, environmental problems and the acceleration of the HIV/AIDS epidemic demonstrated that traditional understanding of security was unable to meet the challenges of the post-Cold War era.⁴ In that sense, the concept of “human security” is one of the most

¹ David A. Baldwin, “The Concept of Security”, *Review of International Studies*, 23, (1997): 13.

² Arnold Wolfers, “National Security as an Ambiguous Symbol”, *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 67, No. 4 (Dec., 1952): 484-485.

³ Horald Müller, “Security Cooperation”, in *Handbook of International Relations*, Walter Carlsneas and others (ed.), (London: SAGE Publications, 2013), 607.

⁴ Barro Buzan and Lene Hansen, *The Evolution of Security*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 187.

important concepts of the post-Cold War era that has been scholarly disputed. Indeed, the ethnic and religious-based conflicts after the Cold War led to evolution of the concept “national security” and the increase of the concerns about individual security in international relations. Since then, there have been attempts to “deepen and widen” the concept of security from the level of states to individuals. In that sense, the concept of “human security” considers human being as the reference object of security as well as it places the threats against human beings on the agenda. On the other hand, the mentioned concept objects the monopoly of the state in ensuring security through featuring the actors like international organizations and civil society.

Accordingly, the concept of security will be discussed within the scope of liberal theory in this paper. Following the historical evolution, the conceptualizations about human security will be put forward. In addition, the criticisms toward the concept of human security will be analyzed. Finally, the evaluations regarding implementation and execution of human security will be discussed.

THE LIBERALIST PERSPECTIVE OF SECURITY

The Liberalist perspective has its roots from the 18th century enlightenment, and as a tradition in political theory, it takes individuals as its units of analysis. In early 20th century, especially after the WWI, liberalism reached prominence in international politics. On the other hand, there emerged periods when liberalism was under its most severe attack particularly in the 1930s. The dominant narrative in International Relations field was that Realism routed liberalism after World War II and liberalism had little to say about security. Nevertheless, liberal scholars continued to challenge realism in the 1950s and 1960s. Some continued to argue for conceiving the units of world politics as individuals rather than states. In 20th century, liberalism’s focus on increasing security by international law and organizations continued as well.

Names like Woodrow Wilson, Hobson, David Mitrany Karl W. Deutsch, Michael Doyle, Francis Fukuyama, Stanley Hoffmann, Robert O. Keohane are among the most important representatives of liberal thought in international relations. According to Liberalism, world peace might occur with the residence of political and economic liberal norms at both national and international levels; the increase of interdependence and interaction; the international cooperation that carried out under the leadership of intergovernmental organizations; and the protection of human rights and governance.

The theoretical point of origin for liberalism is the individual rather than as state. Liberal theory has paid particular attention to the state as the institution defined by its ability to make individuals secure. By treating state action as a function of individual beliefs and interests, the state is seen as instrumental to the purposes of individuals. Individual influence on states and on security is mediated through groups and institutions within and across states. Individuals can create, sustain, and destroy

institutions and thereby enhance or degrade national and international security.⁵ Beside the individuals, a number of collectivities are the focus of analysis. Firstly states, but also corporations, organizations and associations are examples of these actors. Individual influence on states and on security is mediated through groups and institutions within and across states. Individuals can create and sustain institutions that may create conditions under which states will be more cooperative to their mutual benefit.⁶

Liberals regards international institutions as actors that have feedback effects by deepening cooperation among states. The institutions whose global development policy discourse and programmes are analyzed in order to advance the arguments made about liberal perspective of security and development debate. The Western based institutional actors such as United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the European Commission (EC), the World Bank and the are emphasized as being at the core of global governance networks linking conflict and security.⁷ Accordingly, the security is regarded as an interdependent issue in which economic interactions provide greater gains for the countries. Moreover, international institutions take a global stance on the environment, terrorism, epidemics, disasters as the only practical basis for coping with those problems.⁸

One area of liberalism has developed arguments about democracies bearing on security cooperation. Beginning with Immanuel Kant, there has been a claim that democracies can behave differently than non-democracies in world affairs. Today, the emphasis on “democratic peace theory”, the notion that democracies are naturally peaceful among themselves. Accordingly, while democratic governments readily go to war with undemocratic ones, they do not plan for possible wars with each other since they do not see each other as threatening.⁹ Some analysts claim that combining democracy and an open economy and society produces this result. Others believe that democracies are more transparent in policies and policy making than non-democracies which makes for less suspicion, rivalry and conflict among them. According to another claim, democratic politics assumes compromise and the peaceful resolution of disputes through discussion. This brings dealings with other democracies in turn.¹⁰

⁵ John M. Owen IV, “Liberalism and Security”, <https://oxfordre.com/internationalstudies/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190846626.001.0001/acrefore-9780190846626-e-33?result=1&rskey=033iMn> (2010).

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Melita Lazell, “Liberalism(s) and the Critical Securitization of Development Debate”, *Globalizations*, 13:4

⁸ Patrick Morgan, “Security in International Politics: Traditional Approaches”, in *Contemporary security studies*, Alan Collins (ed.), (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 27.

⁹ Morgan, “Security in International Politics: Traditional Approaches”, 28.

¹⁰ Ibid.

As it can be understood from these various forms of liberal understanding, the notion of security as a basic concept is applied in analysis of policy decisions via putting multiple dimensions. In sum, the main descriptors might be used for making assumptions from different perspectives of realist and liberal traditions.

Table 1. Different Security Concepts

Tradition	Form of Security	Focus	What is at risk?	Threats to Security
Realist-based	National	State	Sovereignty, territorial integrity	Other states and non-state actors
Liberal -based	Human	Individuals, mankind, human rights, rule of law	Survival, human development and governance	State itself, natural catastrophe and change

Source: P. H. Liotta, “Boomerang Effect: The Convergence of National and Human Security”, *Security Dialogue* vol. 33, no. 4, (December 2002): 475.

Although there are many counter arguments and criticisms against it, liberalism as a tradition in security studies continues to make contributions since its emergence during the Enlightenment. Liberalism seeks to guide to international security insofar as individuals and the groups they organize affect or, at a maximum, erode states.¹¹ One of its branches concerns the democratic peace and related research on democratic advantages in international cooperation. In addition, through globalization, societal needs for security transcend the traditional realm of territorial integrity and extend to transnational issues, from organized crime to migration, all of which lead to demands for enhanced security. Responses require contributions from non-state actors if effective regulation is to be achieved. They are partially based on the normative commitment to “human security” with the individual as core subject of entitlements to security – an offspring of liberal normative theory.¹² The concept of human security

¹¹ Owen IV, “Liberalism and Security”.

¹² Horald Müller, “Security Cooperation”, 619.

represents deepening and widening of the traditional notion of national security which is regarded as protection of state sovereignty and territorial integrity from external military threats.

THE CONCEPT OF HUMAN SECURITY

In traditional understanding, the concept of security is defined as protection of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of states from external military threats. This is a realistic approach that based on national security. Accordingly, states are viewed as the only referent object of security, which needs to be protected. This approach dominated security understanding especially during the Cold War period.¹³ Nevertheless, the Realist School of security thought has been challenged by many thoughts after the end of the Cold War on the ground that it does not provide sufficient understanding to the contemporary changes and challenges.

Particularly, since the end of the Cold War, the subject matter of security studies has undergone both a “widening” and a “deepening.” The “widening” aspect of security has included consideration of non-military security threats, such as environmental scarcity and degradation, the spread of disease, overpopulation, migration, mass refugee movements, nationalism, economic and financial crises. The “deepening” aspect of security included the consideration of the security of individuals and groups, rather than focusing narrowly on external threats to states.¹⁴ In that framework, “human security” is containing common security, global security, cooperative security, and comprehensive security. The discussion of this concept encourages policymakers and scholars to think about international security as something more than the military defense of state interests and territory.¹⁵

Even though the concept of Human Security does not have a universally agreed upon definition, there are some elements shared by all definitions of Human Security. These include a shift to the individual as the referent object of security. In addition, the definition of a security threat has been regarded as a threat to the quality of life of individuals. In other words, human security is about security for the people rather than of states.¹⁶ Also, the role of non-state actors has been recognized as agents for the assure of security. Finally, the importance of security has been shifted away from the traditional and exclusive concern with military and armed conflict. In that sense,

¹³ Amitav Acharya, “Human Security”, in *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens (eds.), (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014): 449.

¹⁴ Rolad Paris, “Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?”, *International Security*, Vol. 26, No. 2 (Fall 2001): 97.

¹⁵ Ibid., 87.

¹⁶ Amitav Acharya, “Human Security”,449.

traditional, and Realist conceptions and practices of security has started to be criticized.¹⁷

Although Human Security is treated as contested concept, the original formulation is conducted by UNDP with the publication of the Human Development Report of 1994. According to the UNDP, the potential threats to Human Security can be classified under seven central categories: economic, food, health, environmental, personal, community, and political security.

- Economic security requires an assured basic income-usually from productive and remunerative work, or in the last resort from some publicly financed safety net.

- Food security means that all people at all times have both physical and economic access to basic food. This requires not just enough food to go round. It requires that people have ready access to food-that they have an “entitlement” to food, by growing it for themselves, by buying it or by taking advantage of a public food distribution system.

- Health security means guaranteeing a minimum protection from diseases and unhealthy lifestyles.

- Environmental security means protecting people from the short-term and long-term ravages of nature, man-made threats in nature and deterioration of the natural environment.

- Personal security requires protecting people from physical violence, whether from the state or external states, from violent individuals or sub-state actors, from domestic abuse and from predatory adults.

- Community security means protecting people from the loss of traditional relationships and values and from sectarian and ethnic violence.

- Political Security means ensuring people live in a society that honours their basic human rights, and ensuring the freedom of individuals and groups from government attempts to exercise control over ideas and information.¹⁸

¹⁷ Matt McDonald, “Human Security and the Construction of Security”, *Global Society, Vol. 16, No. 3*, (2002): 279.

¹⁸ UN Human Development Report 1994, 24-32.

Table 2. Types of Human Security and Root Causes

TYPE OF INSECURITY	ROOT CAUSES
Economic insecurity	Persistent poverty, unemployment, lack of access to credit and other economic opportunities
Food insecurity	Hunger, famine, sudden rise in food prices
Health insecurity	Epidemics, malnutrition, poor sanitation, lack of access to basic health care
Environmental insecurity	Environmental degradation, resource depletion, natural disasters
Personal insecurity	Physical violence in all its forms, human trafficking, child labour
Community insecurity	Inter-ethnic, religious and other identity-based tensions, crime, terrorism
Political insecurity	Political repression, human rights violations, lack of rule of law and justice

Source: UN Human Development Report 1994, 24-25.

UNDP proposed a concept of “human development” which focuses on building human capabilities to confront and overcome poverty, illiteracy, diseases, discrimination, restrictions on political freedom, and the threat of violent conflict. Accordingly, “every human being counts, and every human life is equally valuable. That universalism is at the core of the human development concept.”¹⁹

The 1994 Human Development Report highlighted two major components of human security. One is “freedom from fear” and the other one is “freedom from want”. “Freedom from fear” focuses on reducing the human costs of violent conflicts through measures such as a ban on landmines, using women and children in armed conflict, child soldiers, child labor, and small arms proliferation, the formation of an International Criminal Court, and promulgating human rights and international humanitarian law. From this perspective, the UN Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the Geneva Conventions are the ‘core elements’ of the doctrine of human security. “Freedom from want” view is closer to the original UNDP formulation. It underlines the ability of individuals and societies to be free from a broad range of non-military threats, such as poverty, disease, and environmental degradation. On the other hand, both components agree that human security is about security of the individuals rather than states and protecting people requires going beyond traditional principles of state sovereignty.²⁰

Furthermore, the Human Security is considered as an inter-disciplinary concept that has some important features: “people-centered, multi-sectoral, comprehensive, context-specific, and prevention-oriented”.

- As a people-centered concept, human security places the individual at the center of analysis,

- As a multi-sectoral concept, it includes causes of insecurity relating for instance to economic, food, health, environmental, personal, community and political security.

- As a comprehensive concept, it stresses the need for cooperative and multi-sectoral responses that bring together the agendas of those dealing with security, development and human rights.

- As a context-specific concept, human security acknowledges that insecurities vary considerably across different settings and as such advances contextualized solutions that are responsive to the particular situations they seek to address.

¹⁹ Human Development Indices and Indicators 2018 Statistical Update, 7.

²⁰ Amitav Acharya, “Human Security”, 495-496.

- As a prevention-oriented concept, it introduces a dual focus on protection and empowerment. Protection includes strategies, set up by states, international agencies, NGOs and the private sector. It recognizes that people face threats that are beyond their control (such as natural disasters, financial crises and conflicts). Thus, human security requires protecting people in a systematic, comprehensive and preventative way. Empowerment, on the other hand, aims at developing the capabilities of individuals and communities to make informed choices and to act on their own behalf. Empowering people enables them to find ways and to participate in solutions to ensure human security for themselves and others.²¹

The concept of Human security also points out the difference between “threat” and “vulnerability”. Firstly, a threat is considered as identifiable, often immediate, and requires an understandable response. For instance, military force has traditionally been sized against threats in order to defend a state against external aggression, to protect national interests and to enhance state security. Secondly, a threat is either clearly visible or commonly acknowledged. On the other hand, a vulnerability is often only an indicator, often not clearly identifiable, often linked to a complex interdependence among related issues, and does not always suggest a correct or even adequate response. Liotta states that “while disease, hunger, unemployment, crime, social conflict, terrorism, narco-trafficking, political repression, and environmental hazards are at least somewhat related issues and affect the security of states and individuals, the best response to these related issues, in terms of security, is not at all clear. Even though Canada emphasized the relevance of human and environmental security to ‘high politics’ and attempted to restructure its armed forces to meet these challenges, the relevance of state-centered military forces for addressing or ‘solving’ non- state-centered issues is questionable.”²²

Moreover, a vulnerability is not clearly perceived, understood, and almost a source of debate. According to Liotta “...as a result of the 11 September 2001 attacks it is correct to suggest that the USA is vulnerable to terrorism in ways never previously understood or commonly acknowledged. Despite the USA’s isolated physical geography in relation to Europe, Asia, and the Greater Near East, its citizens are now vulnerable in ways never directly experienced before. Terrorism has become both a driving force and a critical uncertainty in security decisions.”²³

It is argued that with the rise of new issues around the world which encompass both widening and broadening aspects of security, a threat-based security dilemma is going along with the rise of various vulnerability-based survival dilemmas in contemporary

²¹ Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs United Nations, *Human Security in Theory and Practice Application of The Human Security Concept And The United Nations Trust Fund For Human Security*, (2009): 7-8.

²² Liotta, “Boomerang Effect: The Convergence of National and Human Security”, 478-479.

²³ Ibid.

world.²⁴ These shifts in the balance of threats and vulnerabilities require new strategies with more inclusive structures, missions, and budgets.

THE DEBATE ABOUT HUMAN SECURITY

Although Human Security has brought new actors and issues to the security agenda, it has also seen as problematic for a number of reasons. Most of these criticisms treat Human Security as a policy agenda, while many others are more critical of the main assumptions which Human Security is founded upon. For critics of human security, the concept is too broad to be analytically meaningful or useful as a tool of policy-making.

Accordingly, there are two problems that limit the usefulness of the human security concept for practitioners of international politics. Firstly, the concept lacks a precise definition. Existing definitions of human security encompass everything from physical security to psychological well-being, which provides policymakers with little guidance in the prioritization of competing policy goals. Second, the idea of human security holds together a coalition of states, development agencies, and NGOs. As a unifying concept for this coalition, human security lacks precision, and thus encompasses the diverse perspectives and objectives of all the members of the coalition. This ambiguity diminishes the concept's usefulness as a guide for policymaking.²⁵

Another criticism is concerned with Human Security as a security policy agenda. According to this critique, it is difficult to see how the Human Security approach could be "operationalized" particularly within present configurations of power and decision-making processes. In that sense, the work and implementation of Human Security are being questioned. Accordingly, setting the individual as the referent object of security causes some problems which Human Security sought in part to address. In that framework, the problem is the inability of Human Security to address adequately issues of identity if individuals constitute the set referent object of security. Accordingly, considering individuals as the referent object of security does not always represent the best means of understanding a particular situation of insecurity or redressing it. Issues of identity and ethnic difference may be ignored by a Human Security approach that effectively abstracts individuals, particularly if founded upon broadly universalized Western principles. For these critics, the reference object of

²⁴ Ibid., 481.

²⁵ Roland Paris, "Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?", *International Security*, Vol. 26, No. 2 (Fall 2001): 88.

security should be determined by the context in which a number of actors come to be threatened.²⁶

Another area of concern related to Human Security is around the question “how it would allow for the adjudication between competing claims and objectives”. For example, much of the deforestation in the Brazilian Amazon is caused by shifted cultivators and landless peasants, who cut down virgin tropical forest in order to sustain their families in the short term. In cases such as this, where different components of Human Security, such as environmental and economic, appear in opposition, whose security is to be addressed, and which types of concerns have priority? While the solution to both problems in this case may be related, judging between competing security claims may allow for an inability to create security.²⁷

Furthermore, the fact that Human Security is concerned with its universalism and its foundation on Western values is also being questioned. The link between Human Security and universalism is made explicitly in the UNDP’s Human Development Report of 1994. In that report, Human Security is described as a “universal concern”. Thus, the general description of security in the Human Development Report regard security as the same for people everywhere. This universalism is related with the question of identity, particularly collective identity and difference. Additionally, Human Security is predicated upon a Western conception of the importance of democracy and, of greater concern, a commitment to free market economics, which potentially underestimate the questions of identity and difference.²⁸

Buzan also remains skeptical about human security, because it does not differentiate its agenda from that of human rights as regarding the referent object as the individual or humankind as a whole. According to him, this causes the danger that security is taken to be the desired end.²⁹

Newman claims that human security is normatively attractive, but analytically weak concept. For him, human security brings questions about the relationship between the individual and the state and about state sovereignty. Traditionally, state sovereignty and sovereign legitimacy rest upon a government’s control of territory, state independence and recognition by other states. The international legitimacy of state sovereignty rests not only on control of territory, but also upon fulfilling certain standards of human rights and welfare for citizens. As a result, the sovereignty of states that are unwilling or unable to fulfil certain basic standards may be at risk. The

²⁶ Matt McDonald, “Human Security and the Construction of Security”, *Global Society*, Vol. 16, No. 3, (2002): 280-81.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid., 283.

²⁹ Barry Buzan, “A Reductionist, Idealistic Notion that Adds Little Analytical Value”, *Security Dialogue*, 35(3), (2004): 369–370.

use of military force for human protection purposes is the powerful example of this concept.³⁰

According to some arguments, human security discourses are used as a justification to intervene other states. For example, the USA invaded Iraq through adopting human security discourse. Therefore, some perception of human security might be a tool to intervene in internal affairs of developing countries and impose Western values. Finally, human security is intertwined with the responsibility to protect and humanitarian intervention. For example, the international community intervened in Libya, but not Syria, Yemen, and Bahrain. According to this critics, human security promotes national security and power politics because the discourse to fulfill human security and human rights mainly depends on great powers.³¹

CONCLUSION

In the first half of the 20th century, world wars killed thousands of people, and left whole continents in devastation. During the Cold War, proxy wars killed thousands of people, and the world feared that a nuclear war would cause complete annihilation of the world. In the early 21st century, wars in Iraq, Afghanistan and Syria have killed thousands of people again. Although there was no major war after 1945, minor wars and terrorist attacks may continue to kill thousands of people.³² Under these circumstances, there emerged a number of intellectual debates regarding the security in International Relations, its scope and dimensions as well.

It can be argued that human security is distinguished by three elements: its focus on the individual and human being as the referent object of security; its multidimensional nature; its universal or global scope, applying to states and societies of the North as well as the South. In addition, the concept of human security has been influenced by some developments: the rejection of economic growth as the main indicator of development and the accompanying notion of ‘human development’ as empowerment of people; the rising incidence of civil wars and intra-state conflicts involving huge loss of life, ethnic cleansing, displacement of people within and across borders, and disease out-breaks; the impact of globalization in spreading transnational dangers such as terrorism and pandemics; and the Post-Cold War emphasis on human rights and humanitarian intervention. The latter involves the principle that the international community is justified in intervening in the internal affairs of states accused of gross violation of human rights. This has led to the realization that while the concept of national security has not been rendered irrelevant, it no longer sufficiently accounts

³⁰ Edward Newman, “A Normatively Attractive but Analytically Weak Concept”, *Security Dialogue*, 35(3), (2004): 358-359.

³¹ Hawre Hasan Hama, “State Security, Societal Security, and Human Security”, *Jadavpur Journal of International Relations* 21(1), (2017): 16-17.

³² Joshua S. Goldstein and Jon C. Pevehouse, *International Relations (10th Edition)*, (Pelgrave, 2014), 85.

for the kinds of danger that threaten the societies, states, and the international community.³³

In conclusion, human security needs opportunities for creative synthesis and theoretical eclecticism. Liberal perspective might help the understanding of how human security can be promoted through interdependence, democracy and international institutions with its emphasis on non-state actors like international institutions and multinational corporations. However, it is also essential to put some insights about how human security notions are promoted by global power channels. Furthermore, the shifts in the global relations can help prospects for human security understanding. Otherwise, the concept will continue to be criticized by academics who carry out security studies due to the uncertainties regarding the definition and scope of human security.

³³Amitav Acharya, "Human Security",451.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Acharya, Amitav. "Human Security", in *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens (eds.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Baldwin, David A. "The Concept of Security", *Review of International Studies*, 23, (1997): 5-26.

Buzan, Barry. "A Reductionist, Idealistic Notion that Adds Little Analytical Value", *Security Dialogue*, 35(3), (2004): 369–370.

Buzan, Barry and Lene Hansen, *The Evolution of Security*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Goldstein, Joshua S. and Jon C. Pevehouse, *International Relations (10th Edition)*. Pelgrave, 2014.

Hama, Hawre Hasan. "State Security, Societal Security, and Human Security", *Jadavpur Journal of International Relations* 21(1), (2017): 1-19.

Human Development Indices and Indicators 2018 Statistical Update.

Lazell, Melita. "Liberalism(s) and the Critical Securitization of Development Debate", *Globalizations*, 13:4 (2016): 361-376.

Liotta, P. H. "Boomerang Effect: The Convergence of National and Human Security", *Security Dialogue*, 33(4), (2002): 473–488.

McDonald, Matt. "Human Security and the Construction of Security", *Global Society*, Vol. 16, No. 3, (2002): 277-295.

Morgan, Patrick. "Security in International Politics: Traditional Approaches", in *Contemporary security studies*, Alan Collins (ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Müller, Horald. "Security Cooperation", in *Handbook of International Relations*, Walter Carlsneas and others (eds.). London: SAGE Publications, 2013.

Newman, Edward. "A Normatively Attractive but Analytically Weak Concept", *Security Dialogue*, 35(3), (2004): 358-359.

Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs United Nations, Human Security in Theory and Practice Application of The Human Security Concept and The United Nations Trust Fund For Human Security, 2009.

Owen IV, John M. “Liberalism and Security”,
<https://oxfordre.com/internationalstudies/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190846626.001.0001/acrefore-9780190846626-e-33?result=1&rskey=033iMn> . 2010.

Paris, Rolad “Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?”, *International Security*, Vol. 26, No. 2 (Fall 2001): 87-102.

UN Human Development Report 1994.

Wolfers, Arnold. “National Security as an Ambiguous Symbol”, *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 67, No. 4 (Dec., 1952): 481-502.