T.C.
MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ
AB ENSTİTÜSÜ

AB SİYASETİ VE ULUSLARARASI İLİŞKİLER ANABİLİM DALI

EU AND HUMAN SECURITY

Yüksek Lisans Tezi

BURCU ŞAHİNER

İstanbul 2009

T.C.
MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ
AB ENSTİTÜSÜ

AB SİYASETİ VE ULUSLARARASI İLİŞKİLER ANABİLİM DALI

EU AND HUMAN SECURITY

Yüksek Lisans Tezi

Danışman
Yrd. Doç. Dr. RANA İZCİ

İstanbul 2009

T.C.
MARMARA ÜNİVERSİTESİ
AVRUPA BİRLİĞİ ENSTİTÜSÜ

ONAY SAYFASI

Ensitümüz AB Siyaseti ve Uluslararası İlişkiler Anabilim Dalı Yüksek Lisans öğrencisi Burcu ŞAHİNER'in "EU AND HUMAN SECURITY" konulu tez çalışması 27.02.2009 tarihinde yapılan tez savunma sınavında aşağıda isimleri yazılı jüri üyeleri tarafından oybirliği/ oyçokluğu ile başarılı bulunmuştur.

Onaylayan:

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Rana İZCİ   Danışman

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Münevver CEBECİ   Jüri Üyesi

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Armağan E. ÇAKIR   Jüri Üyesi

Onay Tarihi

.10./.04./2009. tarih ve 2009/.IV.sayılı Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu kararı ile onaylanmıştır.

Prof. Dr. Muzaffer DARTAN
Müdür

OZET

İnsan güvenliği, oldukça tartışmalı ve son zamanlarda uluslararası güvenlik alanında yeniden önem kazanmış bir kavramdır. Kavramın kendisi yeni olmamasına rağmen uluslararası çevrede meydana gelen değişiklikler kavramı hem akademik düzeyde hem de siyasal düzeyde yeniden tartışmaya açmıştır. Kavram, genel olarak BM'nin yapmış olduğu insanların temel özgürlükleri ve korunmaları ekseninde tanımlanmıştır. Buna göre, yokluktan arî olmak ve korkudan arî olmak gibi iki temel özgürlük ekseninde beliren kavram, birinci tanımlamada kalkınma ekseninde ikinci tanımlamada ise saldırı ve tehdit unsurlarından korunma olarak ifade edilmiştir.

Bu tezin temel argümanı, öncelik insan güvenliği kavramının 'yokluktan arî olma' kısmına verildiğinde- ki bu insan onuru, insan yaşamının devamı ve insan potansiyelinin geliştirilmesi anlamına gelmektedir- Avrupa Birliği (AB) kalkınma ekseninde gerçekleştirdiği çalışmalar neticesinde uluslararası arenada insan güvenliği konusunda uluslararası işbirliğini sağlayabilecek küresel bir lider konumundadır. Kısaca söylemek gerekirse, AB'nin insani kalkınma konusunda yıllarca gösterdiği çabalar, özellikle insan haklarına saygı, demokratikleşme, liberalizasyon, hukukun üstünlüğü, iyi yönetişim ve çevresel koruma gibi alanlarda başarılı bir örnek olarak görülmektedir. Ancak, insan hayatına yönelik ani ve tahmin edilemez tehditler karşısında bir başka deyişle insan güvenliğinin 'korkudan ari olma' kısmında ise AB nispeten zayıf ve daha az aktif bir aktör olarak değerlendirilmektedir. Bu nedenle özellikle kriz yönetimi ve kriz anlarında anında müdahale gibi konularda AB'nin Avrupa Güvenlik ve Savunma Politikası (AGSP) ve Ortak Güvenlik ve Savunma Politikası (OGSP) alanlarında kapasitesini iyileştirmesi gerekmektedir.

ABSTRACT

Human security is a highly debated concept which has recently regained attention in the international security agenda. The concept itself is not a new one; however the changes in the international environment made the concept to be re-interpreted and discussed thoroughly both at the academic and the political level. The concept is mainly identified through the UN definition of the basic freedoms for the protection and empowerment of individuals. There are two main components of the human security; the freedom from want and freedom from fear. While the first one mainly deals with the development aspect of human beings and the latter is all about the protection of individuals from vital and pervasive threats.

The main argument of this thesis is that when the prior attention is given mostly to the 'freedom from want' part of human security, the support of human dignity, human survival and increasing of human potential and human betterment, the EU in the field of development can be a leading actor in order to stimulate international support. Thus, it is argued that for many years that the EU has shown a great endeavour to sustain and spread the values that it appreciates the most for human development, such as the respect for human rights, democracy, liberalisation, good governance, the rule of law and environmental protection. However, it can also be argued that the EU is rather less active in the field of 'freedom from fear' which is mostly related with the sudden and pervasive threats to the human lives. There are many efforts are needed under the CFSP and ESDP pillars to improve the EU's role in the 'freedom from fear' aspect of human security.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ACP	African-Caribbean and Pacific Countries
AIDS	Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome
CFSP	Common Foreign and Security Policy
CHS	Commission on Human Security
EC	European Commission
ECHO	Commission's Department for Humanitarian Aid
EIDHR	European Initiative for Human Rights and Democracy
ENP	European Neighbourhood Policy
ESDP	European Security and Defence Policy
ESS	European Security Strategy
EU	European Union
HDI	Human Development Index
HDR	Human Development Report
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
ICC	International Criminal Court
ICISS	International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty
IDP	Internally Displaced Persons
LICS	Low-Income Countries
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MICS	Middle-Income Countries
OECD	Organisation for Economic Development and Cooperation
PCD	Policy Coherence for Development
SARS	Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome
SIPRI	Stockholm International Peace Research Institute

UN	United Nations
UNAIDS	United Nations Joint Programme on HIV/ AIDS
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
US	United States of America
WB	World Bank
WTO	World Trade Organisation

INTRODUCTION

Human security is a highly debated concept which has recently gained attention in the international security agenda. The concept itself is not a new one; however the changes in the international environment made the concept to be re-interpreted and discussed thoroughly both at the academic and the political level.

When the history of the liberal nation state traced back to its early foundations, it can be seen that the very idea of the establishment of a state like structure is to safeguard the individuals- later become the citizens of the state- from each other and from the outsiders. The territorial integrity and the survival of the state have served as the mere reason for the existence of the state, therefore the security of the state. However, for so long the citizens who are in fact the main resources and the main objects of security have been disregarded from the security debate. In some cases, they are even left to fulfil their own destiny even inside the territorial boundaries of the state. This situation has become evident when the effects of the globalisation began to be noticeable.

In 1994, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) has outlined a report 'Human Development Report' addressing these new security threats to human life with creating a new security paradigm in human development studies. The report illustrates that the object of security shall not be the state for itself no more, but it should be the human beings as the core objects of security and to be protected from various devastating and hurtful threats that they pursue in their daily lives. The aim of the document is to contribute to the development and security literature with a way to open to accelerate the human potential by achieving human betterment and fulfilment through freeing them from the pervasive threats and poverty, inequality and social injustice. The report has henceforth created the concept of human security in international security debate. Since then various criticisms have been raised against the concept of human security. Yet human security has gained increasing attention due to the current environmental hazards demonstrating the inexorable link between development and security in severe ways at most cases.

The perception of the European Union (EU) with regard to the development-security relationship is one of the main reasons why the EU is considered to be one of the most important actors that centre the protection of the individual first rather than the state at the heart of the security debate. It is widely acknowledged that the EU is the world's biggest trader which supports economic liberalization world wide but also is the biggest provider of aid to developing countries through its development policy. Thus it is argued that for many years, the EU has shown a great endeavour to sustain and spread the values that it appreciates the most for human development, such as the respect for human rights, democracy, liberalisation, good governance, the rule of law and environmental protection. Through its development policy, for example, the EU gives its support to the third world countries on their way for development in many fields. Recently, the EU has made several initiatives in new policy areas to enhance the EU development cooperation for the developing countries and the countries that are in need of emergent recovery.

Against this background, the EU in the field of human security can be considered as one of the most interested actors through the policies it pursues. By doing this it both enlarges its economic market but at the same time with the bilateral and multilateral trade agreements it encourages third countries to take part in economic liberalization which may hopefully result in political liberalization.

The main argument of this thesis is that when the priority is given mostly to the 'freedom from want' part of human security; the support of human dignity, human survival and increasing of human potential and human betterment, the EU can be seen a leading actor triggering international support for human security. However, it can also be argued that the EU is rather less active in the field of 'freedom from fear' which is mostly related with the sudden and pervasive threats to the human lives. Relying on the latter part the EU needs to establish a more powerful and capable foreign policy under the CFSP and ESDP for the crises situations.

Henceforth, the European Union can be regarded as the most influential actor in human security due to its efforts to the achievement of sustainable human development, of poverty eradication and to tackle global climate change and other

environmental problems, as well as to prevent and control epidemics that are in most cases are the root causes for serious tension and conflicts. Human rights and promotion of democracy and social and economic development together with the human development and effective ways of crisis management in most extreme conflict situations are the targets that the EU tries to accomplish. Through different policies such as the European Neighbourhood Policy, energy and environmental policy the EU tries to achieve the security of human beings. By these attempts the EU may lead the other international actors to correspond to the human security debate and save the concept from its ambiguity and help create a policy template to be followed in international security politics.

Consequently this thesis first tries to examine the concept of human security despite the ambiguity surrounding and the criticisms raised against it and to analyze its direct linkages with human development, human rights and human fulfilment ideas. All in all this thesis aims to highlight the changes in the traditional state-centric security paradigm which seems unable to protect the individuals from sudden and severe disruptions of their lives, let them be in the form of economic crises, internal conflicts or even natural disasters. Certainly there is a requirement to make a change at the national political level for the nation sates to reformulate their security perspectives corresponding to the human security elements. However to save the concept from its historical ambiguity is a precondition to reach a solid ground for the implementation of the human security.

Therefore, the first chapter begins with the concept of human security. However, the section is divided into two headings with identifying the altered security environment of the contemporary world from Cold War since now, and therefore the rise of a new security understanding. In the human security concept and its recent interpretation part, the context of the concept is to be identified through the United Nations, World Bank and other international organisations' related documents. In this chapter the basic two freedoms, 'freedom from want and fear' are outlined in detail in order to show at which points the EU is more converging with the human security studies. Basically the 'freedom from want' aspect of human security which focuses on

the economic development, extending human choices and human betterment is one of the most important fields that the Union is active for many years. However, when the debate comes to the 'freedom from fear' aspect of human security which supports the idea to free people from sudden and hurtful threats, it can be said that the Union is rather weak due to its incapability in its foreign policy to respond to the emergency situations.

The second chapter is about the elements of human security. In this part, the critical and pervasive threats and the vital core of human life which have been mentioned in the United Nations reports are examined and some examples are given through discussion. Such an examination is necessary to understand the complex web of relations between the elements of human (in) security. Criticisms on the human security concept are also explored in this chapter. And the third chapter further proceeds with the interaction of human security between sustainable development, human development, human rights and state security. It should be noted that there is a growing interaction between different dimensions of development all over the world. Therefore it is necessary to have a closer look at the development and security link from different perspectives. It is important to explore this link to estimate the EU's contribution in combining development and security issues in its development policy. To illustrate the EU Development Policy is basically depending on the UN Millennium Development Goals and it addresses the same issues as vital to achieve as the UN conveys.

The last section- after identifying the concept of human security- explores the EU's response to the human security both as a concept and as a practice. Within this framework the Union's incorporation with the concept of human security and its contribution to the concept is analyzed in detail. Over the years it can be seen that there is a tendency of the EU to converge its development policy with the aspirations of the human security field. It can be assumed that the European Union, by being the world's largest development aid donor, and a consistent supporter of human rights, democratic governance, international law and multilateralism instead of military use of persuasion with other states, and a living example of 'peace model', still has the characteristics of its soft power character. Nevertheless, the question is whether the EU could become an

influential actor in the world affairs even in dealing with the crises situations. The EU has the ambition to establish a security force in dealing with the humanitarian emergencies under the CFSP pillar. However, the most important value that the EU advances is the normative principles, such as the human dignity and human life in international relations and it appears that it does not willing to lose its soft power character.

That's why, in order to understand the EU's efforts it is necessary to analyse some relevant documents convened for the enhancement of the idea of human security in the EU's foreign policy. European Security Strategy: A Secure Europe in Better World and A Human Security Doctrine for Europe will be the primary documents to be analysed.. European Security Strategy is important because it re-identifies Europe's foreign policy personality in a way that it helps to develop both civilian and military instruments under the same framework. Further, it is also important because it makes the EU rethink its ability to convene an affordable response to take the lead in humanitarian interventions specifically in the violent conflicts and the violations of human rights, and human rights abuses. A Human Security Doctrine for Europe is another important document with regard to the EU's role in the human security issue. The report encompasses three components which show the Union's ambition to be more influential in humanitarian emergencies.

There have been various developments in the EU's external affairs agenda within both the Council of Ministers and the European Commission which touch on human security issues, including crisis management, the promotion of human rights and democracy, humanitarian and development aid, the anti-landmine campaign, combating global climate change and tackling other global and regional environmental problems. However, it is still very much depending on the EU's further efforts to make the human security elements addressed both in its foreign and domestic policy tools.

All in all, it can be said that human security as a concept is still rather vague and ambiguous in character. However, some of the international documents and academic debates on the issue have shifted its general spectrum. Obviously, the human security is about the human-beings and it is a way put forward by the UNDP to extend

the state-centric security understanding of realist argument. For this reason, the human security concept supports the idea of human development with all its aspects, sustainable development and growth, environmental sustainability, economic equality, other social development aspirations and a world without human suffering in armed conflicts. The EU with its *sui-generis* structure is a unique actor in the international political system and can play a significant role to enhance and promote human security all over the world if development-security link is well designed and integrated in all policy areas. Above and beyond to the extend the EU increases its capability to respond emergency situations, it can even make a greater contribution to human security.

I. THE CONCEPT OF HUMAN SECURITY

Over the almost three decades, the world has witnessed a number of economic crises, fall of the states and blocks, division of ideologies and countries, massacres, widespread and sudden natural disasters. All these challenges has forced to change the ways the concept of the security itself and security related issues were defined and that how they were becoming more and more related with the development literature across the world. Since then it is widely accepted that there is an inclination to broaden the security studies as a whole,. As the traditional military-political security and military establishments are often mostly associated with the Cold War era, with the end of it the changing nature of the conflicts have created a space to rethink on the hard security issues. Today's conflicts and threats to the security of individuals can no longer be confined only to the state security and to military aspects that the realist security arguments. Security studies now also focus on the intra-state conflicts particularly in the developing world, and this 'world' unfortunately more generally faces with the insecurity dilemmas rather than security dilemmas. Therefore, in order to deal with these issues, other dimensions of security; such as economic, social and environmental spheres of security are also acknowledged as security matters for the individuals and started to be debated to understand what is to be secured and how? Further, it can be emphasized that the efforts to broaden the concept of security is to some extent related with the desire to increase the international literature more depended on ethical and normative concerns of security with the prior attention given to the human condition.

This chapter will, hence, examine first, the ideological change in the security environment during the post- Cold war period and will explore the emerging concepts in the classical security literature. As the human security being one of them, and until very recently one of the most influential ones in the security literature, the chapter further proceeds with the concept of human security, its historical background and the recent interpretations with a view to underline the link between security and development.

2.1. The Altered Security Environment

Most of the academicians have welcomed the post 1989 world order as a string of good news. Because from a conventional point of view, the present area appears to contain lesser security threats compared to the ideological confrontation of the Cold-war.

After all, the end of the East—West conflict meant that the possibilities of a nuclear holocaust have all but disappeared. The disintegration of the Soviet Union and the demise of communism could be seen as the global victory of political and economic liberalism. Some have even more optimistically asserted that 'life for the majority of the world's citizens is getting steadily better in almost every category' (Gee, 1994:78). In fact, the modern era, with its incredible and rapid development of technology, as well as the increasing democratization of society, have strengthened and made societies more productive and independent.

The past few decades have seen an improvement in human health, education, nutrition and longevity. The rapid expansion of the world economy, which has grown nearly fivefold since 1950, has raised living standards in all countries, but the observable changes can be seen specifically in the poorest countries. Food production has easily become raised over the population growth. And democracy has advanced in almost every corner of the globe and international security has improved.

However, together with these improvements in the international scene, unexpectedly the world has also witnessed most dramatic and prevalent threats to civilians arise in internal armed conflicts from the military activities of non-state actors. Of the 27 armed conflicts that took place in 1999, and 25 of them were internal in character, engaging one or more non-state actors (SIPRI Yearbook, 2000). Threats to civilians are mostly increased with the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, especially small arms and landmines, and as a result of the organized crime and random violence that occurs in these chaotic conditions. Most of them have resulted in the violation of international humanitarian and human rights with lots of civilian casualties, sometimes even genocide or ethnical cleansing operations (Bruderline, 2000).

In the most extreme situations like Rwanda - 1994, Bosnia-Herzegovina (1992-1994) and Kosovo (1998-99), entire segments of the civilian population are considered as a primary military target on political, racial or ethnic grounds, forcing these populations to flee or face extermination. And some others, which are, in some respects the most effective political situations to be exemplified in the Historical International human rights, such as those in Somalia, Zaire/Democratic Republic of Congo, Angola, Burundi, Sudan, Sierra Leone, and Afghanistan (Bruderline, 2000).

Hence, there are new and unprecedented sources of threats come up to the international arena "like the energy and resource depletion, environmental problems and population displacements together with new military and territorial rivalries, it can be said that progress in the security of people can no longer be achieved only through the traditional security agenda" (Keohane and Nye, 1989:26).

There is a growing recognition that there is a great deal of scholarly reflection in International Relations (IR) studies that security thinking and practice in the post-Cold War environment has created a need to redefine security challenges which the states presumably cope in today's uncertain security environment. Therefore, in today's uncertain security environment the concepts such as common security, comprehensive security and recently human security have emerged as a realistical policy advisory in the global diplomatic agenda to address new the new security challenges to all(Baldwin, 1997: 5-26).

After the end of the cold-war and the bipolar world an era of international cooperation was expected to come to the centre stage more powerfully. to build new collaborations in order to tackle these new challenges. In this context, the traditional notion of security began to evolve to encompass concerns which more directly touched the lives of people and broader security approaches emerged to address the diseases, hunger, environmental degradation, poverty and illiteracy. There is also a growing recognition about the idea that today's security challenges are so complex and unprecedented in nature that security in the long run can no longer simply be referred to the protection of the nation-state, the defence of territories and boundaries and the preservation of political sovereignty (Nef, 1999:110).

In some cases, the state opposed to its previous role in international relations, understood as a liberal and objective set of institutions. And gradually some even argue that its traditional role has seemed to be dissolved leaving paradoxical gaps on the political map of the world. Even borders have lost their national geo-strategic significance in countries such as the Democratic Republic of Congo where the war since 1998 has involved the armed forces of nine states and at least nine rebel groups (Bruderlein, 2000).

Security, in the new era is also now concerned with the personal well-being of individuals. Rather than menacing ballistic missiles, to feel secure in the basic needs of ordinary people that affect their existence such as food, health, employment, population, human rights, environment, education have become the focal point of this new security understanding (Newman, 2005). as Accordingly, as the concept of nation state with its self-defence identity seems to lose its significance to a great extent, the international security politics have became more focused on the issues directly related to the social dimensions of security like the eradication of poverty, political and community security, environmental security, human rights, and increasing human potential and choices in their daily lives. For example, in today's world the nature of conflict has for the most part shifted from inter state wars to intra-state conflicts with higher civilian casualties. And the population pressures together with consumerism resulted in environmental insecurity; most of them caused larger immigrations. Not to mention about the growing poverty, the spread of infectious diseases like HIV/AIDS or the terrorist attacks globally. The urgency of the rightly produces a search for insights that can be leverage to safeguard all human lives (Newman, 2005).

As a result, the configuration of security threats in the post-Cold War and in the period of globalisation and technological advance is clearly different than it was until recently. Some threats are ancient and persistent; others are unprecedented (Brown, 1995). Besides in the new world system, it is clear that the safeguard mechanisms to address certain security threats do not exist threats and structures existing institutions to address new challenges prove to be inefficient in most cases (Brown, 1995).It was in this spirit that several successive world conferences were

convened to focus specifically on some of these more pressing global concerns: environment, human rights, population, social development and gender issues.

Yet for many people in the world much of greatest threats to security come from internal conflicts, disease, hunger, environmental contamination or domestic violence. And for others, a greater threat may come from their own country itself, rather than from an 'external' aggressor.

Therefore, it can be said that the changes in threats that the world is experiencing shifted the international ideological matrix of security literature in the search of new security definitions. With growing attention to the identification of critical and pervasive threats to human life, there is an emerging need to refocus on the prevention, mitigation and the response to the threats that cause victims, chronic poverty and other humanitarian catastrophes in the ideational level. Both of which cannot be tackled directly with the national security policies (Nef, 1999).

It can be assumed that the traditional concept of security despite their role in preserving the security of the state along with its citizens as a whole, is necessary but they are insufficient in sustaining the human welfare and human betterment. In the new security framework the security of human beings ideal is driven by the need of preventing all human lives given its most precious objective to the idea of long term human fulfilment. And it is designed to be achieved through the universal and non-discriminatory rules respectively in the international arena.

Within this security debate human security has made a remarkable contribution by its people centred security approach to the changing security literature. Human security is a concept relying heavily on the older arguments of security, including 'societal' and 'comprehensive' security (Newman, 2005: 26). And by its very nature its roots are in the traditional liberal political thought which enhances the freedom and security of individuals.

2.2. Historical Background and Recent Interpretations

When dealing with the theory and with the pre-theory at the conceptual level, it is better to look at the aftermath of the Cold-War. Since the end of the cold-war, the world has changed dramatically in many ways. The world is now a global economic market without borders, money and the goods which are produced in one place flow all around the world with no externalities have made to them. Today, money, goods, information and people move rapidly across borders. Diseases, weapons, pollution, financial crises and terrorist attacks know no man-made boundaries and threaten people not only in one country, but also quickly affect those in neighbouring countries and far beyond (Ogata, 2001a).

The free economic flow and the elimination of the borders have both caused the surveillance of the very thought of the evolution of the western economic philosophy, the freeing of the market and the political liberal thought. But at the same time, the idea of globalisation has resulted in a way that the modern nation state has lost its importance both in political and economic life since different actors have involved in international political scene. The nuclear threat of balance between the states during the cold-war has ended up with the victory of the western ideal; with the opening of the markets the states have become much more bounded to each other as ever. Thus, it seems that in most cases the classic idea of the state security is no longer playing the vital element for the protection of the individuals.

As long as the very idea of the global insecurity is not merely examined or either defined by the state's security by only preserving or the protection of its borders from an external aggressive state, because of the rising interdependency between the states, there is a need to re-identify the security claims of the civilians and the very causes of the global insecurity. Traditionally, security threats are assumed to be endangered by other states with aggressive or adversarial designs. Thus, the protection of the state -its boundaries, people, institutions and values- is in the responsibility and the objective of the state. States, for their survival build powerful military structures to defend themselves and the People are presumably assured of their security by the shield of the state (Ogata, 2001b). However, the increasing levels of global interdependence

has resulted in the growing consensus that today's security threats go beyond our traditional understanding of defence threats (attack from another state) to include poverty, economic inequality, diseases, human rights abuses, environmental pollution, and natural disasters (EU, 2003).

Even though, most of the security challenges to individuals today remain unchanged, and familiar with the ones they used to be in the past, the world that we live in today created new challenges that we cannot even address. For example, the threats of famine, war, drought, flood, wild animals, plague, and enslavement appear to be the very causes of the insecurity that mostly the individuals face in ancient writings across the world. Not even to be mentioned about the wars that the world has experienced since from its very existence, but the world has evolved not into a better place for the individuals even further.

In the contemporary world, the borderless financial and economic flow through globalisation has created an economic growth but has also made most drastic changes in environment, created the divisions between the least and most developed countries, the living standards of the least developed countries and the living conditions of the ordinary citizens even in the most developed ones.

> Our conceptualization about a secure world, in this regard, has changed drastically because of the changing nature of the daily life which has evolved into a new direction, after creating its own new subjects because of the circulation and spreading of every belief in a world without borders (Commission on Global Governance 1995:14).

In the absence of threat of nuclear holocaust, most of the academic thinkers thought that with the end of the ideological division of the cold-war, the world would be bloomed with the absence of inter-state conflicts. Since the territorial divisions have lost their preliminary importance, it was said that there will be no badly conflicts between the states. Despite this thinking, current events demonstrate that inter-state conflicts never disappear but changes and conflicts prevail in different forms at different levels Sometimes the nature of conflict has shifted to intra-state conflict, with higher incidence of civilian casualties. In other times population pressures together with consumerism

contribute to environmental insecurity, increase immigration, and heighten the importance of water and energy resources (Alkire, 2003: 11).

Between 1990 and 2001, there were 57 major armed conflicts in 45 countries. The highest number of conflicts occurred in 1990-93 and the lowest 1996-97. In 2001 there were 24 major armed conflicts, most in Africa. Of these, 11 had lasted for eight or more years. Of the 20 countries with the lowest scores on the human development index in 2002, 16 are in conflict or just out of it. And most ardently the large majority of these conflicts have been internal (SIPRI Yearbook 2000).

The consequences of these violent internal conflicts are devastating, not only because they are the very reasons of the collapse of states but also because they make the subjected states fall into surging poverty. Another consequence is the high proportion of civilian casualties. This led to massive forced population movements in the 1990s and to the mass killing, even genocide of civilians (Sen: 1981).

The economic crisis in East Asia in 1997 not only caused the loss of financial and productive assets but dropped large populations roughly into unanticipated poverty. The spread of HIV/AIDS and the increased rate of inequality between the nations make the world more like an insecure place for all (Bruderline, 2000).

Globalization has clearly affected in a major way how security should be perceived. The effects of violent conflicts can no longer be isolated. These conflicts affect large majority of populations to illegal migrations, regional ecosystems, financial markets, commodities market, debt servicing, and the drugs and arms trafficking (Bruderline, 2000). All in all it is evident that the world is turning into a place that is more insecure in most of the times even for the conflict free regions and/or states all around the world.

Security in the modern era, therefore, shall not be considered apart from development since the two concepts go hand in hand with each other in every sphere of life, especially considering the most damaging affects of the global insecurity on the civilians. Therefore, in order to understand the security as a whole it is vital to examine

first the growing convergence between the security and development nexus which the newly emerging concept human security also heavily rests upon.

2.2.1. Development and Security

Traditionally development was largely defined in economic growth terms and much of the definition of security was rooted in military-political thinking and practices. However, when the disciplines face with a little interaction with each other the ideas evolve.

"Development was initially concerned with and defined as the ability of an economy to generate and sustain an annual increase in its gross national product (GNP) in real terms, for instance in excess of its population growth rate"(Shoeman, 1998:2).

In this regard, development was measured in terms of real growth in per capita income of a nation, which is disregarding the actual distribution of economic gains and the non-material aspects of human life. By the 1970s, development was also concerned with the distribution of economic growth and with social indicators of development, such as the increase in literacy, better health conditions and the provision of housing; all of them considered to make a health economy. This broadening in the literature of development has resulted in the way that economic growth and development should be taken into account separately (Shoeman, 1998).

There is the growing consensus that development shall better include economic development instead of just merely economic growth since the economic growth couldn't achieve the expected spill-over in preserving the economic development. With this distinction given privilege it can be said that the discipline of Development studies changed its conceptualization of the term 'development' over time (Todaro, 1997:150) accepting that development extends beyond the material well-being and the wealth of a nation, it is rather mostly related with the issue of how it is distributed.

According to Todaro, for example, development is;

> ...a multidimensional process involving major changes in social structures, popular attitudes, and national institutions, as well as the acceleration of economic growth, the reduction of inequality, and the eradication of poverty (Todaro, 1997:151).

Therefore, the inner meaning of development becomes sustaining the basic needs of human life by supporting the major changes in a society in order to preserve its well-being of its citizens in every aspect of life. Without having no doubt such major changes clearly involve the political, economic, social and cultural domains of society, constituting human development which is defined by the UNDP as a process of widening the range of people's choices.

At the point where the earth has evolved into, the well-being of human life and the concerns about people changed thinking regarding the security and development to include the 'human security' and 'human development' at their centre. In the 1994 Human Development Report human development is described as follows:

> Human development is a process of widening the range of people's choices. Human security means that people can exercise these choices safely and freely ... There is a link between human security and human development: progress in one area enhances the chances of progress in the other. But failure in one area also heightens the risk of failure in the other. Failed or limited human development leads to a backlog of human deprivation ... This backlog in access to power and economic opportunities can lead to violence (UNDP 1994a: 23).

The report is also the very first attempt to include human development aspect of development literature as the widening of the traditional notion of security concept. By going further, the report defined human security as including "…safety from such chronic threats as hunger, disease and repression, and protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the patterns of daily lives, whether in homes, jobs or communities." which is also has its drives from the human development concept merely(UNDP; 1994a: 22).

The above link between security and development may perhaps be better understood as it is widely accepted that security is a precondition for development, thus

far security is always conceived as a prerequisite for development, let it be in the terms of stability or largely in economic means. However, as Boutros Ghali stated that:

> Development, on the other hand, especially in human development literature is a complementary tool for the security of individuals. It can be clearly estimated that the link between security and development may seem to indicate that maintaining security is further be reinforced by the development indicators and vice versa (Boutros Ghali, 1995:20).

Therefore it is also vital to explore the linkages between the human development and economic growth before going into the details of the term human security, since human development is still considered to be the ultimate goal of development process and human security pays much of its attention to the fulfilment of human potential and raising the choices of individuals (UNDP, 1994a). Ever since the economic deprivations are in most of the occasions are considered to be the very causes of internal violent upheavals, economic development or economic growth rate of a country may preserve also a country's human development index because the economic dynamics of a country identify its people's choices and capabilities for a better and self-esteemed life. It can be said that to the extent that greater freedoms and capabilities improve economic performance and human development will have an important effect on growth. Similarly, increased incomes will increase the range of choices and capabilities of a nation, therefore economic growth will enhance the human development (Rani, 2004: 4).

Human development has played a vital role in identifying what the human security is because as Amartya Sen describes it with its capabilities approach:

> Human development is a person's capability to have various functioning vectors and to enjoy the corresponding well-being achievements" to be the best indicator of welfare (Sen, 1999:42).

This perspective shifts the analysis of development into a more genuine and broader aspect other than just focusing on the basic needs of human welfare but it also includes the income, education, health variables and the possible opportunities that shall be available for all individuals in a particular state (Sen, 1999).

The first major attempt to translate the capabilities approach into the agendas was the 1990 UNDP Human Development Report. The HDR's objective was to capture better the complexity of human life by providing a quantitave approach to the socio-economic indicators into human development (UNDP, 1990). This attempt was important because it has ranked the previous works in the development economics, ever since it has given the share to some other socio-economic indicators such as life expectancy, literacy, health care, political freedom and income inequality as the development indicators. By so doing, the income growth or economic growth of a country even tough it is one of the main contributor in enriching a country's human development ratio, it is no longer be considered the only determinant since the human development supports the economic growth but it is mainly about the income equality, distribution of wealth and eradication of poverty.

Since the 1990 first Human Development Report, the concept has evolved in the following years with the inclusion of almost every aspect of socio-economic and environmental matters by the international institutions great efforts who work for the development literature. United Nation's Millennium Summit on Development released the Millennium Development Goals report which has made a remarkable contribution by encapsulating the development aspirations of the world as a whole. According to the UN Millennium Development Goals the highest targets till 2015 to be reached are as follows:

1) Eradicating extreme poverty and hunger

2) Achieving universal primary education

3) Promoting gender equality and empowering women

4) Reducing child mortality

5) Improving maternal health

6) Combating HIV & AIDS, malaria and other diseases

7) Ensuring environmental sustainability

8) Developing a global partnership for development (UN, 2000).

Subsequent UNDP reports have, hence given increasing attention to those areas while creating certain themes and objectives to highlight the link between development and security. The 2006 UNDP Human Development Report, for instance, gives its priority to the poverty and the global water crises. The report emphasizes that environmental problems may have dramatic socio-economic results, and vice versa, the report also goes further and highlights that environmental problems, like water scarcity, may cause economic deprivation, increased poverty, raising health costs, and lack of education, gender problems, human indignity and in the worst scenario intra-state or inter-state conflicts. Henceforth, the 2006 Human Development Report makes the human development description as follows:

> Human development is first and foremost about allowing people to lead a life that they value and enabling them to realize their potential as human beings. The normative framework for human development is today reflected in the broad vision set out in the Millennium Development Goals, the internationally agreed set of time bound goals for reducing extreme poverty, extending gender equality and advancing opportunities for health and education (UNDP, 2006: 5).

The 2007 and 2008 Human Development Report is again equally in the same footage with the previous report and gives priority to the environmental issues and their adverse and irreparable affects on human development and human betterment. The report was about fighting with the Climate Change, very simply the report identifies why the climate change is given the prior attention as follows:

> In the long run climate change is a massive threat to human development and in some places it is already undermining the international community's efforts to reduce extreme poverty. Violent conflicts, insufficient resources, lack of coordination and weak policies continue to slow down development progress, particularly in Africa (UNDP, 2007: 6).

Considering the abject poverty and often the extreme levels of deprivation let them be economic or environmentally driven it can be clearly noted that 2006 Millennium Development Goals of the UN has reshaped the development. Thus, human

development reports further focused on the issues addressed in the Millennium Development goals respectively those issues are considered to be the highest priority areas to be solved in the first place which causes insecurity in people's lives and development in these areas shall be taken under the human development area as possible as it can. Those 8 areas that are given the highest priority by the UN highly represent how the human development literature will evolve in the very new future. Those 8 primary areas are also the parts of human security at least it can be said that they are representing the human development aspect of human development in the human security literature. Because it is a fact that human security was in the first place born inside the human development literature and the way while looking for a new human development aspect for the security of people. Therefore we can begin with the evolution of the concept of human security and its very foundations.

2.2.2. The Milestone for Human Security: 1994 UNDP Human Development Report

The concept of human security and its presence in security studies has evolved with the 1994 UNDP Human development report. The report basically indicates human security as "protecting the vital core of all human lives in ways that enhance human freedoms and human fulfilment" (UNDP Human Development Unit, 1994: 3).

> This meant 'protecting fundamental freedoms,' 'protecting people from critical (severe) and pervasive (widespread) threats and situations' and empowering individuals and communities to develop the capabilities for making in-formed choices and determining their own well-being (Ogata, 2005:14).

The intent of the report was to bridge the freedoms lie at the heart of the UN and extend the security concept that as the traditional security concept is no longer able to cover all the threats that the human-beings are facing in the contemporary world. And also making the security notion covering mostly the individual and community centric views.

In order to address the growing challenge of human security, the report suggests that a new development paradigm is needed that puts people at the centre of development and regards economic growth as a means and not an end, protects the life opportunities of future generations as well as the present generations and respects the natural systems on which all life depends (UNDP, 1994a).

In a more general way of understanding the report identifies its core concerns as follows:

- Human security is a *universal* concern. It is relevant to people everywhere, in rich nations and poor.
- The components of human security are *interdependent*.24
- Human security is *easier to ensure through early prevention* than later intervention. It is less costly to meet these threats upstream than downstream.
- Human security is people-centred. It is concerned with how people live and breathe in a society, how freely they exercise their many choices, how much access they have to market and social opportunities – and whether they live in conflict or in peace (UNDP 1994a: 23).

The key premises of the 1994 UNDP report are (i) its joint focus on freedom from fear and freedom from want, and (ii) its four emphases on universality, interdependence, prevention, and people-centeredness. These formed, and continue to shape, human security discussions. For example, Kofi Annan, in his 2000 Report to the United Nations, *We the People*, gave the following broad description of human security:

> Human security in its broadest sense embraces far more than the absence of violent conflict. It encompasses human rights, good governance, access to education and health care and ensuring that each individual has opportunities and choices to fulfil his or her own potential. Every step in this direction is also a step towards reducing poverty, achieving economic growth and preventing conflict. Freedom from want, freedom from fear and the freedom of future generations to inherit a healthy natural environment – these are the interrelated building blocks of human – and therefore national security (Annan, 2000: 46).

The 1994 Human Development Report of UNDP defines human security by arguing that the scope of global security should be expanded to include "threats in seven areas" (UNDP, 1994a: 23-25). Those seven areas will be described as follows:

1. Economic security basically requires an assured basic income for individuals, not only in developing countries but the concern should also be given to the developed countries (UNDP, 1994a:25).

2. Food Security requires that all people at all times have both physical and economic access to basic food (UNDP, 1994a:26-27).

3. Health Security can basically be defined as a guarantee of a minimum level of protection from diseases and unhealthy lifestyles (UNDP, 1994a:27-28).

4. Environmental Security: aims to protect people from the short and long-term ravages of nature, man-made threats in nature, and deterioration of the natural environment (UNDP, 1994a:29).

5. Personal Security aims to protect people from physical violence whether it is coming from the state or external states, from violent individuals and sub-state actors, from domestic abuse or from predatory adults (UNDP, 1994a:30).

6. Community Security aims to protect people from the loss of traditional, interpersonal relationships and values and from the fear of ethnic violence (UNDP, 1994a:31-32).

7. Political Security is basically concerned with whether people live in a society that honours their basic human rights (UNDP, 1994a:25).

As the discussion suggests, the UNDP report of 1994 has made the most explicit re-definition of security concept by widening the human development issues under a security framework including the human betterment and human dignity ideas as a means for security objectives.

After the launch of the human security concept within the international relations rhetoric, the debates around the concept was embodied with several other reports, and most of them has paved the way for the debates going on in the academic world. However, one of the most important initiatives was the launch of the Commission on Human Security (CHS) in May 2003 and the final report of the

Commission, Human Security Now, has made a remarkable contribution to the discussions of human security (CHS, 2003).

Concerning the definition of this concept, the report argues that human security means protecting vital freedoms. It means protecting people from critical and pervasive threats and situations, building on their strengths and aspirations. It also means giving people the building blocks of survival, dignity and livelihood. Therefore, the report estimates that human security connects different types of freedoms- freedom form fear, freedom from want and freedom to take action on their on behalf. The vital freedoms that are set out in the Commission's report further enlarged and described more in a detailed manner in the Larger Freedom report of the UN in 2005.

2.2.3. Freedom from Fear

In the Larger Freedom Report 'freedom from fear' indicates the freedom from violence, safety from chronic threats as hunger, disease, repression and pervasive threats which causes violent internal conflicts (UN, 2005: 44-45). The report suggests that security begins with prevention; "and every step taken towards reducing poverty and achieving broad-based economic activity is a step towards conflict prevention" (UN, 2005: 45). It can clearly be seen that the real risks such as resource depletion, especially freshwater scarcity, as well as severe forms of environmental degradation, may increase social and political tensions in unpredictable but potentially dangerous ways which may cause the real causes for badly conflicts. For this reason, the report continues with putting key assumptions order to prevent the lives of individuals as follows. These may be the very points for the individual life at stake and should be solved in the first place.

• Preventing deadly conflicts; is one of the most crucial ones and it is crucial to offer new strategies of prevention to address the root causes of conflicts, and the way to tackle with them internationally. There are some certain covenants to strengthen protection; the international community must reassert the centrality of international humanitarian and human rights law (UN, 2003).

Another important issue for the security of individuals would be the commitment to protecting vulnerable people.

● Protecting the vulnerable: The report suggests that protecting the vulnerable is one of the most important elements in preserving the success of peace initiatives because without its absence all the efforts will be both fragile and illusory (UN, 2003).

However, even in the most extreme situations the problem rests out becomes the dilemma of intervention; which should also be addressed when considering the peace operations for the international community to respond to the places where there is a humanitarian catastrophe without violating the right of sovereignty of the subject country (UN, 2003: 47).

● Strengthening peace operations: Strengthening peace operations is another tool to be addressed in order to fully achieve the protection of individuals from hurtful and pervasive threats. Because over the past decades post-conflict peace-building helped to prevent the breakdown of numerous peace agreements, and to build the foundations for sustainable peace (UN, 2003: 47-48).

Therefore, it can be clearly estimated that the very purpose of the goal of strengthening human security is creating a more humane world, relying on their own aspirations and the real freedoms, where people can live in security and dignity, preserving freedom from want and fear together with equal opportunities to develop their human potential in order to achieve the full human betterment (UN, 2003).

As mentioned earlier the freedom from fear aspect is only meaningful and comprehensive in the idea of human security only together with the idea of freedom from want aspect is achieved, also.

2.2.4. Freedom from Want

The freedom from want is more generally related with the development aspect of human security and it is basically creating a world without the fear of economic poverty, reducing the economic inequalities and economic insecurities of people.

Afterwards, it has been more clarified with its correlation with the Millennium Development Goals by saying that: Eradicating extreme poverty and hunger, universal primary education, promoting gender equality, improving maternal health, combating HIV/ AIDS, malaria and other epidemic diseases and ensuring environmental sustainability are the core development points set out in front of human betterment and fulfilment (UN, 2000).

It has been stated in the UN, in Larger Freedom, Freedom from Want report that

> Nearly half the world's population has to do make less than $2 per day and approximately 1.2 billion people- 500 million in South Asia and 300 million in Africa- struggle on less than $1. People living in Africa south of the Sahara are almost poor as they were 20 years ago. With that kind of deprivation comes pain, powerlessness, despair and lack of fundamental freedom- all of which in turn perpetuate poverty (UN, 2005: 19).

In the contemporary world extreme poverty is an affront to our common humanity, and it makes many other problems get even worse. For instance, poor countries especially those living with significant inequality between ethnic and religious communities are more likely to be embroiled in conflicts than rich ones. Most of these conflicts are internal in nature; however they cause problems for the neighbouring countries, as well or generate a need for humanitarian assistance (UN, 2005).

Together with the increasing poverty rate as the population expands, the poor countries moreover often lack the capacity and resources to implement environmentally sound policies, which in many occasions undermine the sustainability of their people's mere existence and compound the effects of their poverty (UN, 2003: 20).

If the human security literature is here to underline the basic causes of human insecurity in their material well-being, there can be some points to be addressed in the first place to pave the way for a successful economic development in order to eradicate global poverty and economic inequalities.

Achieving Sustained Growth indicates that the only way in reducing poverty is to achieve sustained and broad-based income growth. Recent studies have shown that there is a significant correlation between growth and poverty reduction in poor countries, one percent increase in GDP brings a corresponding increase in the incomes of the poorest 20 per cent of the population (UN, 2005: 21). Therefore, it is critical to address the critical ingredients of the situation regarding human economic potential. However, as discussed earlier economic growth is just a means for the economic development and when the overall development objectives are considered the economic growth will not be sufficient enough to support the idea that the human potential is fully covered.

Even so, it is a fact that human development and economic growth are mutually reinforcing concepts and have to be considered in the equal footage. And the only possible route to growth is through successfully engaging in global economy, together with effective social policies, advances in education for all, health for all and gender equality. As mentioned both in the 2006 Millennium development goals and other Human Development reports, development can only be meaningful if it is taken together with other social aspects with life which afterwards these major areas will be all considered to be the insecurity issues for human life in the human security literature, therefore they are all important to be set forward.

In order to achieve these goals, there are some points that are drafted in the UN report of Larger Freedom, which are listed as follows:

- Education; it is central to development, social progress and human freedom. Poverty cannot be overcome without specific, immediate and sustained attention to girl's education. Investments in girl's education is specifically important because better nutrition for the whole family, better health care, declining fertility, poverty reduction and better overall economic performance are all up to them (UN, 2005:13).

- Employment**;** if education is one of the core points of economic growth, conveying young educated people at work is another important point (UN, 2005: 15).

- Promoting health and combating HIV/AIDS**;** lack of success to basic health care is one of the main reasons poor people stay poor. Although more than \$56 billion a year is spent globally on health research, less than 10 percent is aimed at the health problems affecting 90 percent of the world's population. Pneumonia, diarrhoea, tuberculosis and malaria- all of great concern to developing countries- receives less than 1 percent of global health research budgets (UN, 2005: 16).

- Demonstrating global solidarity: Creating an inclusive global market is one of humanity's central challenges in the 21st century. We are all impoverished if the poor are denied opportunities o make a living. The rich countries play a crucial role in this place by further opening their markets, by providing deeper and faster debt relief and by giving more and better-focused development assistance (UN, 2005: 17).

- Trade access: tariffs and barriers to trade remain still heavily on the agricultural products which is causing a great deal to the developing countries on their access to the global market. UNCTAD on its 10th conference highlighted the need for better market access for the agricultural and industrial products exported by the least developed countries (UNCTAD, 2006).

- Debt Relief: Debt relief for heavily indebted poor countries must be an integral part of the int. community's contribution to development. Because high levels of external debt is a crushing burden on economic growth in many of the poorest countries. Those huge amounts of debt levels prevent them from making adequate investments in education and health care and from responding effectively to natural disasters and other emergencies (UNCTAD, 2006).

- Official development assistance: development assistance is the third pillar of support by the international community.

    - Programmes encourage growth and help the poor.

    - Aid should also promote domestic and foreign investment opportunities.

    - Pre-investment assistance together with the partnership between UNCTAD and the Int. Chamber of Commerce to produce investments guides to the least developed countries (UNCTAD, 2006).

In order to understand what the two aspects of human security: freedom from want and freedom from fear phrases complement and comprehend for, there is a need to re-consider the necessary changes both in the development concept and the assumptions that the security matters for individuals. Therefore, it can be assumed that there is a need for a new security paradigm, rather differs from the traditional security concept by its inclusion of the individuals security at the centre of the debate.

Nonetheless, the answer for these questions cannot be simplified only to the idea that the state is no longer the main denominator or purveyor of the security rather because it often fails to fulfil its security obligations and at times has ever become a source of threat to its own people. As the security of individuals goes well beyond the security of state, more attention is now given to the security of people not by differentiating it from the states' survival and security since the security of individuals comprehends a great deal of development, human rights and seeks to empower them on their on behalf (Ogata, 2005).

This understanding of human security does not replace the security of the state with the security of people. In fact, it sees the two aspects as mutually dependent. Security between states remains a necessary condition for the security of people, but national security is not sufficient to guarantee peoples' security. For that, the state must provide various protections to its citizens. But individuals also require protection from

the arbitrary power of the state, through the rule of law and emphasis on civil and political rights as well as socio-economic rights (Ogata, 2005).

Human security, in this regard, even the concept is lack of a clear and distinctive definition reinforces the protection of individuals, on the one hand, but at the same time gives the prior attention to the pursue of human development. As The Commission on Human Security together with the 1994 Human development Report pointed out; the protection of the vital core of all human lives in ways that enhance human freedoms and human fulfilment is the main objective of the human security. Put it the simplest way, the protection of the individuals means protecting people from 'critical' (severe) and 'pervasive' (widespread) threats and situations (UNDP,1994a).

2.3. A Controversial Issue: State Sovereignty and Human Security

In December 2001, an International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS, 2001) released their report entitled 'The Responsibility to Protect'. The focus of the report was clearly on the contentious issues of the state's responsibilities to their own citizens and the citizens of the international community which in this regard repeatedly refer to human security. The report identifies the relationship between the rights of the sovereign states which the international relations has been built upon and the so-called 'rights of humanitarian intervention' which has been exercised several times in most of the conflict torn or war torn countries such as-in Somalia, Bosnia and Kosovo but not in Rwanda- despite their failures and international controversy (Paris, 2001).

The report emphasizes human security, as an emerging concept and defines it as the security of people – their physical safety, their economic and social well-being, respect for their dignity and worth as human beings, and the protection of their human rights and fundamental freedoms (ICISS, 2001).

The proposed working definition here pays attention to the mostly concentrated issues such as the on the human needs of those seeking protection or assistance human

needs that include food, employment, and environmental protection (Paris, 2001:23). However, the biggest challenge that the international society currently is facing with is the 'humanitarian intervention' dilemma and the just cause argument, whether there is an urgency to respond or to prevent in situations where there is a human catastrophe occurs. The report thus addresses the main issue with regard to the responsibility to protect as the question of when, if ever, it is appropriate for states to take coercive – and in particular military – action, against another state for the purpose of protecting people at risk in that other state (Paris 2001).

The Commission accordingly sets out the guiding principles for the places to intervene as by defining where the states sovereignty ends up and the international responsibility to protect begins (ICISS, 2001).

A) State sovereignty implies responsibility, and the primary responsibility for the protection of its people lies with the state itself.

B) Where a population is suffering serious harm, as a result of internal war, insurgency, repression or state failure, and the state in question is unwilling or unable to halt or avert it, the principle of non-intervention yields to the international responsibility to protect (ICISS, 2001:2).

Following the above statements respectfully the foundations of the responsibility to protect, as a guiding principle for the international community of states shall be:

1. Obligations inherent in the concept of sovereignty;

2. The responsibility of the Security Council, under Article 24 of the UN Charter, for the maintenance of international peace and security;

3. specific legal obligations under human rights and human protection declarations, covenants and treaties, international humanitarian law and national law; the developing practice of states, regional organizations and the Security Council itself (ICISS, 2001:3).

Thus the report argues- in the context of outlining the responsibility states have to protect the human security of their own citizens- for a reorienting of national security priorities to include not only military expenditures but also internal social security:

The fundamental components of human security – the security of people against threats to life, health, livelihood, personal safety and human dignity – can be put at risk by external aggression, but also by factors within a country, including "security" forces. Being wedded still to too narrow a concept of "national security" may be one reason why many governments spend more to protect their citizens against undefined external military attack than to guard them against the omnipresent enemies of good health and other real threats to human security on a daily basis (Paris, 2001:15).

The report highlights the prevention, the intervention dilemma and the precautionary principles before the conflicts arise, relying on the changing international environment and the new actors inside of it. The report argues that international institutions do have a role in safeguarding human security:

 The concept of human security – including concern for human rights, but broader than that in its scope – has also become an increasingly important element in international law and international relations, increasingly providing a conceptual framework for international action. Although the issue is far from uncontroversial, the concept of security is now increasingly recognized to extend to people as well as to states. It is certainly becoming increasingly clear that the human impact of international actions cannot be regarded as collateral to other actions, but must be a central pre-occupation for all concerned. Whether universally popular or not, there is growing recognition worldwide that the protection of human security, including human rights and human dignity, must be one of the fundamental objectives of modern international institutions (Paris 2001: 6).

It can be said that the intervention dilemma has long-lasted critical points to be addressed. However, it can be overcome with the consensus in the international society, even if the main object is to secure people caught up in violent conflict. It is obviously a fact that those who are under fire, fall into the most urgent human catastrophic conflicts or even genocides need to be protected under the international humanitarian law and rights. Otherwise, preserving a much more secure place for world citizens will be an illusion, if intervention dilemma thus far becomes an obstacle to operate.

2.4. Poverty, Unsustainable Development and Human Security

The World Bank has made a very distinctive contribution to the human security debate, although they have preferred to use the security instead of human security. The World Bank's World Development Report 2000/1 on poverty has extended the security framework including the eradication of poverty by identifying it with three pillars: facilitating empowerment, enhancing security and promoting opportunity for all the people, especially the ones in need. Security in this regard described as not only emphasizing the security of the peoples living in conflict zones but also paying attention to the ones who are most vulnerable to fall under such riskiness of everyday life (World Bank, 2000/1).

As the report suggests; reducing vulnerability which would be the point mostly referred to should also be including economic shocks, natural disasters, ill health, disability, and personal violence. If the very idea of security will be the increase in human potential, then the most intrinsic part would be enhancing human well-being and encouraging investment in human capital (World Bank, 2000/1).

In its essence, the report uses security to refer not narrowly to economic security for vulnerable populations, but also to refer conflict prevention and/or resolution. It estimates the priority areas for the most vulnerable and the risks to be highlighted in order to achieve co-operation in the international realm which include not only international financial stability, HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria, agricultural advances, and environmental protection, but also a reduction in arms trade, and post-conflict reconstruction (World Bank, 2000/1).

The very contribution of this report from the human security perspective is its very attempt to combine the separated studies in different fields such as the assessment of the risks and vulnerabilities (including natural disasters, health threats, violence, safety nets, economic, political, and environmental risks), risk management strategies (prevention, mitigation, coping), and studies that recognize very different strategies about the empowerment of human betterment in different perspectives which are

affecting the individuals, the international community as a whole and the globe (Alkire; 2003:19).

Thus, the Voices of the poor report as it has been written to make the poor people being heard and reduce the insecurity in life conditions given the priority to the economic inequalities at first, but mostly to different interpretations of security, security is a distinct phenomenon.

In the World Bank 2000/1, for most of the people insecurity meant malaria; it meant poor health and sanitation; it meant police violence; it meant the fear of disability or chronic illness; it meant domestic violence; it meant the unemployment and it meant inflation (World Bank, 2000/1).

These attempts to define security reveal that security cannot be described in one way or the reasons for insecurity cannot be reduced down to the material means, such as the growth of economy, quality of life, income rates, balancing payments, or development indicators as a whole but it is also about respecting how the people express themselves, the right to education, health-care, water sanitation, land use, environmental surveillance, fighting with deforestation and natural disasters and most importantly how the people manage their own lives according to their own behalf.

The World Bank has also undertaken to work on conflict which in many respects hinders the development and security of the people. In the 1990s, 24% of IDA commitments (excluding those for China and India) went to countries that had experienced significant civil conflicts, and the Bank works in 37 post-conflict countries (World Bank, 1998:23).

The Bank thus defined its rules of engagement for the countries which asked for assistance at various stages of their internal violence, and also developed a post-conflict unit and fund which has granted in 27 countries, and programs such as de-mining and reintegration of displaced persons (World Bank, 2001b:1). In January 2001, it issued an Operational Policy 2.30 'Development Cooperation and Conflict' that opens with the sentence, "The Bank recognizes that economic and social stability and human security are preconditions for sustainable development" (World Bank, 2001b:1).

The idea of sustainable development begins with the economic and social development on the one hand and the environmental protection on the other. Nevertheless, the biggest challenges of sustainability simply overwhelm the adequacy of the international actors' responses in environment and development. For the most part, not only coping with the global warming and the climate change or sustaining the environmental resources as they were, post-conflict and conflict situations are the greatest obstacles for the human development which again has the greatest potential to link them with the human security, as they are also the means for human security.

Finally, the Bank's understanding of the term 'human security' was defined in the Post Conflict's 1999 paper, 'Security, Poverty Reduction & Sustainable Development: Challenges for the New Millennium' as:

> The traditional notions of security (threats to the state, military defence, and nuclear disarmament) are giving way to contemporary understandings of the term ("human" or personal, security; freedom from crime, violence, and oppression). Today, security comprises two interrelated concepts: the state's role in protecting its borders from external threats and its role in ensuring 'human security' for its citizens under the broader umbrella of human rights – meaning that every person is entitled to be free of oppression, violence, hunger, poverty, and disease and to live in an clean and healthy environment (World Bank, 1999:7).

This definition simply links human freedom and human rights from any type of oppression and physical violence, on the one hand and hunger, poverty, disease, and the environment for the human betterment, on the other.

2.5. Human Security: Conceptual Discussions

Many studies about the human security and its necessity in the field of international relations describe the concept as a quite new, genuinely broad and like sustainable development, despite the attention it has created, quite vague.

Accordingly many scholars have pointed out that the changing environment in the international scene after the Cold war; have led the re-emergence of new security

debates with the extension of the traditional concept of security which is highly based on the state to one that incorporates the security of individual human beings (Ogata, 2001). Yet for many of them, the UNDP's 1994 Human Development Report made rather a broader approach to security by inventing the human security concept, and henceforth security in the new era became directly interlinked with the human development and with the idea of human dignity ever more.

The extended security which the UN reports address as including the security of individuals rather than the security of the state with its borders alone necessitates the re-definition of security.

> The Commission on Human Security's definition of human security: to protect the vital core of all human lives in ways that enhances human freedoms and human fulfilment. Human security means protecting fundamental freedoms— freedoms that are the essence of life. It means protecting people from critical (severe) and pervasive (widespread) threats and situations. It means using processes that build on people's strengths and aspirations. It means creating political, social, environmental, economic, military and cultural systems that together give people the building blocks of survival, livelihood and dignity (UN, 2005:4).

Despite the brief definition of UN, the concept still lacks an appropriate and definitive explanation for further development because it is unclear that what is meant by the critical and pervasive threats for every individual if the concept is to be universal in character and how the human fulfilment or human betterment will be achieved.

In order to determine what is to be addressed, most of the scholars have taken the concept from its different dimensions/aspects. And most of them begin with asking the very question that lays at the heart of the concept; security from what and security for whom?

Besides the question of what are the threats that lead to human insecurity complicates the definition of the concept since it can transfer from physical threats to socio-economic threats or even to environmental threats (Amouyel, 2006:13). Even if we were to define human security as protection against violent threats, the question remains open, as how do we define violence? The UN model rests upon a number of

propositions, such as that human security is people-centred and it is a universal concern (UNDP, 1994:22-23).

Edward Newman claims that although the intensity of some threats varies according to the affects they cause–such as unemployment, drugs, crime, pollution and human rights violations–they are a threat to all living things. However, components of human security are interdependent severe threats to human security and most of them are not confined to single communities, and by early prevention human security is easier to ensure (Newman, 2005: 28).

Despite most of its critiques, it has been stated that the emphasis of the human needs model is upon safety and freedom, specifically in critical situations. This kind of an elaboration further differentiates the concept from the human development. Infect, the human security framework broadens it from the human development respectively which is concerned with widening people's choices. And this is the broader approach to analyze the human security concept which is basically depending on its core assumptions as the development objectives together with other the freedom from fear aspect of the vital freedoms. Therefore it also links the concept with ending up the severe threats as violent conflicts to human survival (Newman, 2005).

The second approach is narrower and focuses more on conflict. It focuses on trends in modern conflict, which reflect a high level of civil war and state collapse, which result in a proportionately high rate of victimisation and displacement of civilians, especially women and children (Newman, 2005: 24-36).

According to human security reasoning, the inescapable conclusion is that action must be taken to alleviate gross human suffering, even if this sometimes encroaches upon sovereign prerogatives. Thus, 'humanitarian intervention' and other forms of coercion are inevitably part of the human security debates (UN, 2003:10).

Finally, according to Newman human security can be set out as an umbrella concept for approaching a range of 'non-traditional' security issues, such as aids, trans-national organized crime, terrorism, inhumane weapons such as anti-personnel landmines and trafficking in human beings (Newman, 2005: 31). Emma Rothschild, in

this manner, would be one of the most deliberating authors because she roots the current understanding of the extended security by positing that the new concept of security debates has altered the national security in four distinct dimensions:

> 1) From the security of nations to the security of groups and individuals: it is extended downwards from nations to individuals.
>
> 2) From the security of nations to the security of the international system, or of a supranational physical environment: it is extended upwards, from the nation to the biosphere. The extension, in both cases, is in the sorts of entities whose security is to be ensured.
>
> 3) Extended horizontally, or to the sorts of security that are in question. Different entities (such as individuals, nations, and 'systems') cannot be expected to be secure or insecure in the same way; the concept of security is extended, therefore, from military to political, economic, social, environmental, or 'human' security.
>
> 4) Political responsibility for ensuring security (or for invigilating all these 'concepts of security') is itself extended: it is diffused in all directions from national states, including upwards to international institutions, downwards to regional or local government, and sideways to nongovernmental organizations, to public opinion and the press, and to the abstract forces of nature or of the market (Rothschild, 1995:73).

There is no single or one definitive argument supporting the idea of 'human security' in one way. The concept's definitions may vary, some of them respect the concept because of its linkage with the development studies, and some of them honour the concept because of its linkage with the international human rights and humanitarian law. However, it is certainly evident that the concept still lacks a clear definition to be agreed upon, so that despite the supporters the debate still continues.

Therefore, it is rather uneasy to draw decidedly a real scope of the concept or a policy template due to its varying definitions. However, we may be able to draw the scope of the concept according to the authors approach towards the concept.

2.5.1. The Scope of the Concept

A number of authors have focused mostly on the freedom from need and vulnerability aspect of human security discussing whether the human insecurity is

driven from the environmental deprivation, or resulted due to severe internal conflicts or wars or poverty that is driven by the economic deprivation. King and Murray, as an example to the latter, define human security as an individual's "expectation of a life without experiencing the state of generalized poverty" (King and Murray, 2002:8).

They proposed an index of human security that includes "only those domains of well-being that have been important enough for human beings to fight over or to put their lives or property at great risk" (King and Murray, 2002:8). These domains are identified as health, education, income, political freedom, and democracy. Their approach is genuinely representing some sort of absoluteness regarding the situations considered as thresholds for individuals to make them feel insecure (King and Murray, 2002) In fact, the very core point that they have pointed out is not the physical violence individuals do face but rather focuses on issues associated with the 'freedom from want' aspect of human security that the 1994 Human Development Report suggests.

Caroline Thomas, another author who outlines the increasing inequality brought by globalisation, claims that human security is mostly related with the development aspect of the human existence and the human betterment can only be pursued by addressing the inefficiencies of the current international economic system which itself determines the basic inequalities and restricts the basic life expectancies of the individuals (Thomas, 2000).

Human security, in this regard entails basic material needs, human dignity, and democracy:

> Human security describes a condition of existence in which basic material needs are met and in which human dignity, including meaningful participation in the life of the community, can be met. Thus, while material sufficiency lies at the core of human security, in addition the concept encompasses non-material dimensions to form a qualitative whole. Human security is oriented towards an active and substantive notion of democracy, and is directly engaged with discussions of democracy at all levels, from the local to the global (Thomas, 2000: 11).

King and Murray, and Thomas, recognise conflict-related threats, but, like UNDP 1994, they also emphasize the need to address poverty as a root cause of

conflict. In other words, they assume that security can only be achieved when all items of security can be placed and the individual human security can be sustained which are all supported with the idea of human development and human fulfilment.

According to Hampson and colleagues, "the concept of 'security' can be defined as the absence of threat to core human values, including the most basic human value, the physical safety of the individual" (Hampson, 2002:4). They further identify other core human values as physical security, and the protection of basic liberties, economic needs and interests. Thus in his book 'Madness in the Multitude', Fen Osler Hampson outlines three origins of human security which all have the individual as the referent: "rights and the rule of law, the safety of peoples, and sustainable human development" (Hampson, 2002: 60). He mainly argues that:

> [t]he concept of human security is not just an argument about securing human rights. It is a conception that goes much further in its understanding, both about the potential sources of threat (or privation) to these rights and about the conditions and kinds of institutions and governance arrangements (domestic as well as international) required to sustain human rights (Hampson, 2002: 59).

While the notion of human rights cannot be perfectly collapsed onto that of human security, Hampson does argue that both are founded on similar precepts of universality, interdependence, dignity, and individual-focused. Hampson's definition of human security is also quite relevant with 1994 UNDP definition by embracing the security of individuals far more than the absence of violent conflict. Just like the UN reports do suggest, at its broadest concept, it encompasses human rights, good governance, access to education and health care and ensuring that each individual has opportunities and choices to fulfil his or her potential.

> Freedom from want, freedom from fear, and the freedom of future generations to inherit a healthy natural environment—these are the interrelated building blocks of human—and therefore national security…(Annan, 2000: 8)

Just like Hampson, Leaning and Errie have also adapted a broader approach for the pursuing of the concept human security and they refer the concept as the "sustainable human development conception of human security" (Leaning and Arie,

2000:22). Also for Robert Bedeski, human security includes "the totality of knowledge, technology, institutions and activities that protect, defend and preserve the biological existence of human life; and the processes which protect and perfect collective peace and prosperity to enhance human freedom" (Bedeski, 1998: 25).

Leaning and Arie develop a proposal for human security measurement with special attention to Africa. Their definition and exposition of human security is based in the human development and capability approach, yet emphasizes the psychological and the non-material aspects of security. They describe human security as a precondition for human development. According to their understanding human security is:

> ..an underlying condition for sustainable human development. It results from the social, psychological, economic, and political aspects of human life that in times of acute crisis or chronic deprivation protect the survival of individuals, support individual and group capacities to attain minimally adequate standards of living, and promote constructive group attachment and continuity through time (Leaning and Arie, 2000: 23).

They propose three key measurable components of human security: 1) a sustainable sense of home; 2) constructive social and family networks; and 3) an acceptance of the past and a positive grasp of the future (Leaning and Arie, 2000:24).

Leaning and Arie combine the psychological needs and the social needs of the human being because they suggest that for a human being to have human security, he or she must have a packet of resources, human and material, which constitute an indivisible set of necessary inputs and conditions. These necessary inputs and conditions are the necessities for a human being to be receptive to or capable of participating in any development strategy (Leaning and Arie, 2000).

Therefore, in their understanding human security is being emphasized as a state of being that must be attained prior to and as a pre-condition for the launching of human development efforts. The human security concept they further work on is also linked with the human development efforts since they identify the basic psychosocial needs with defining and providing basic human survival needs of food, water, and shelter

which has been extensively explored and developed in the work of development (Leaning and Arie: 2000).

The development component here makes reassessments about the provision of material supports by providing human rights and cultural competences in the literature, as well as in closing the gaps in our understanding of how to provide these inputs without aggravating communal or group hostilities (Leaning and Arie: 2000).

Those engaged in the work of human development and economic development, however, have long been concerned with how people behave and how their behaviour can be influenced in ways that enhance individual well being. In order to convey the psychosocial needs of human beings as the referent object of the security of individuals, the insights of psychology must be addressed. It would seem to understand that human behaviour in any context, including periods of crisis and transition, it is necessary to look at whether certain basic human needs, psychological and social, are being met.

Their work, in this regard, has made the prior contribution to the overlap of the human and economic development with the need to address psychological and social needs of the human beings. The fact that is the proposed overlapping between the concepts does not detract from their usefulness as independent categories of understanding and assessing the human condition, or the condition of human security.

2.5.2. Critical Voices on Human Security

The critics against the human security are largely driven in their search for the security 'from what?' question. And the debate is largely centred on the narrow and broad definitions of human security. The narrow 'freedom from fear' proponents which include the government of Canada and academics such as Krause, Mack and MacFarlane, see human security as "freedom from pervasive threats to people's rights, safety or lives" (MacFarlane 2004: 350).

The broader definition which Fen Olsen Hampson refers as the sustainable human development conception of human security is the most controversial and

problematic interpretation of the human security concept. And mostly criticised by the proponents of the narrow conception who sees the broader definition as an unpractical utopianism, the possible lack of analytical clarity and uneasy to make a relevant policy tool (Hampson, 2002).

Further the narrow conception suggests that the "conceptual added value" that such a broad approach may have over human development or human rights (Amouyel, 2005, 14-16).At this point, it is necessary to analyse what the conceptual added value is and what it means for policy. For MacFarlane, the two visions, broad and narrow, should be judged on two criteria, their "conceptual added value and policy consequences" The broad definition, simply is a "shopping list" of "bad things that can happen", of "a wide range of issues that have no necessary link (MacFarlane 2004: 350).

For Krause, if we draw the human security concept relying on the broader definition the real descriptive power of the concept will be lost. Rather he continues; "If one wishes to examine the interconnections between war, poverty and governance, then each must be treated separately for the purpose of analysis (Krause: 2001). More generally, in terms of analysis and policy, the narrow proponents are not arguing that 'freedom from want' should not be addressed, but that it is better addressed under the banner of human development (Amouyel, 2005: 13).

Therefore, narrow definition supporters argue that translating human security into policy for governments and international organisations require being able to prioritise the common and pervasive threats into more open and understandable framework, so that it can be set out policy in action.

The most definitive answer came as such; 'security conveys urgency, but listing all harms on the security agenda equates to giving a priority tag to everyone's luggage' (Foong Khong, 2001: 231). However, even the debate around the broad and narrow definitions of the human security still continue the most detailed critique came from Roland Paris who used the Human Security paradigm as a tool to identify the recent international relations and the security threats.

Roland Paris argues that the human security concept requires a broad category of research on military and/or non-military threats to societies, groups and individuals. Going further, Roland Paris uses the ambiguity and the debate surrounding the definition of human security to reject the concept almost entirely: "The ambiguity of the concept renders human security a useless tool for academic research or policymaking" (Paris, 2001: 96).

For him, human security is "so vague that it verges on meaninglessness. If no one agrees on common definitions, then it cannot be studied or used. Human security is therefore only a "rallying cry" around which a "jumbled coalition" of actors aggregate to promote their own differing interests (Paris, 2001: 92). To put it simply, human security "is too broad and vague a concept to be meaningful for policymakers, as it has come to entail such a wide range of different threats on one hand, while prescribing a diverse and sometimes incompatible set of policy solutions to resolve them on the other" (Owens and Arneil, 1999:2).

In order to make the concept create an illusion and transfer the idea of human security into a useful analytical tool for scholarly research, the objectives and the principles of it should be addressed clearly. However, the definitions vary and some of them even the most widely cited and authoritative ones like the UNDP's make the concept even harder to understand and prevent the term to be addressed comprehensively. For most of the academics, the new concept of security defined by the UNDP 1994 report is the most inclusive and the most widely accepted definition ever. The report made its biggest contribution to the human security concept by paying attention to the legitimate concerns of ordinary people who sought security in their daily lives (Owens and Arneil, 1999).

With the extension of the concept, security will no longer be interpreted as the security of territory from external aggression, or as protection of national interests in foreign policy or as global security from the threat of nuclear holocaust. It is now far beyond the security of territorial integrity or the protection of the external frontiers of the nation states. Further, as it is suggested in the report the term human security has two main aspects which are correspondingly represents the security at the individual

level by making the security referent as the individuals themselves, not the nation states they live in (UNDP, 1994: 22).

At this point, Paris argues the report's definition by being "lack of precision", because of the scope of the definition (Paris, 2001: 89). The report has its own part, prompts the security of individuals in two ways which is said to be forceful. It means, first, safety from such chronic threats as hunger, disease and repression. And second, it means protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the patterns of daily life— whether in homes, in jobs or in communities (UNDP, 1994a:23). However, according to Paris' interpretation of this identification rather constitutes an irregular discomfort, because depending upon this argument no one can points out the threats to one's human security (Paris, 2001: 90-92). And if the causes of human insecurity are lack of a precise definition how we can ever formulate international consensus and put the varying definitions of human security into practice.

In fact, this is a difficult task to make complementation about what actually comprises the ethics, the goals and the principals of the security needs of the people. This is not only because of the concept's "inclusiveness" or "holism" as in the case that it takes every aspect of daily life matters and the national security components in its vary area. But also because it is rather uneasy to differentiate the overlapping categories in a hierarchy of security needs from personal to national, international, and environmental rights (Paris, 2001: 92). Indeed, each realm corresponds with each other, impinges upon the others and further is intrinsically connected to wider political and economic considerations (Tehranian, 1999: 53).

Paris agrees with the observation that all human and natural realms are interrelated and shall be examined altogether. However, in order to make scholarly research and create an examination area which would be more useful to concentrate upon for the policymakers, there must be a concrete analytical tool and category of research. Following his above statements Paris suggests that human security may serve as a new field for security studies that is primarily concerned with non-military threats to the safety of societies, groups, and individuals, in contrast to the more traditional approaches to security studies which are mainly concerned with the external threats to

the national security and survival (Paris, 2001: 96). In other words, human security, despite its vagueness to illustrate specific questions about its inclusiveness, can be useful to classify different type of security threats and particularly create a new understanding of security by its emphasis on non-military sources of conflict.

Using human security, in this regard will be helpful to identify the changing nature of the security studies with the end of the Cold War and the ways that the traditional security studies have changed their focus beyond the threat, use and control of military force primarily by states (Walt, 1991: 212). Since the end of the Cold War, in particular, the subject matter of security studies has undergone both a broadening and a deepening (Wyn Jones, 1999).

With the broadening of the security realm, it is now more inclusive with the idea of non-military security threats inside the security agenda. Non-military security threats, such as environmental scarcity and degradation, the spread of disease, overpopulation, mass refugee movements, nationalism, terrorism, and nuclear catastrophe (Ullmann, 1983: 140).

By deepening, it means that the field is now more willing to consider the security of individuals and groups, rather than focusing narrowly on external threats to states (Rothstein, 1999). Most of these efforts have been prompted and evolved by the contributions of the critical theorists-feminists authors, post-modernists, and constructivists- who have mostly interested with the political implications and the assumptions of the security realm itself (Rothstein, 1999). Using the notions of broadening and deepening, it is possible to construct a matrix of the security studies field, as illustrated in the figure below. Roland Paris argues that human Security can be identified as a broad category of research on military and/or non-military threats to societies, groups and individuals. In order to support his ideas around this specification he classifies security studies in a two by two matrix (Table 2.1), with one axis that distinguishes studies concerned exclusively with military threats from studies of non-military security threats such as economic deprivation or environmental crises. The other axis distinguishes studies that are conceived by the state as mostly the unit

analysis for the low politics issue areas such as the security studies for societies, groups, and individuals.

Table 2.1. The Source of the Security Threat?

Military	Military, Non-military or both
National security (conventional realist approach to security studies)	Redefined security (e.g., environmental and economic [cooperative or comprehensive] security)
Intrastate security (e.g., civil war, ethnic Conflict, and democide)???	Human security (e.g., environmental and economic threats to the survival of societies, groups, and individuals)

Source (Paris, 2001: 98)

According to Alkire, this partition seems a sensible division of studies that helps to orient human security in relation to the traditional security studies as well as to the wider "comprehensive," "common," and "global" security agendas which are still state focused (Alkire, 2003: 16). In his focus of analysis the four cells are not mutually exclusive: rather they are complementary in ways that they all help to differentiate the field of security studies and the threats they complement.

Also, Paris's approach claims that there will be significant overlap between threats that affect states and those that affect individuals and groups. In this regards, Paris' work is useful, specifically to understand the multiple definitions of human security, its differences from other sources of security fields and the threats that it comprehends.

Another criticism is the vagueness of the concept. When identifying the pervasive and critical threats so wider to differentiate only a small set of consideration can be made. And sometimes relying on a particular human security threat, it is argued that it becomes an isolation from other sources of threats or those threats appear to be

chosen arbitrarily. Therefore, the threats can be differentiated according to their selection and those may include a wide range of considerations without making a definitive security threat (Alkire, 2003).

As Lawrence Freedman wrote: "Once anything that generates anxiety or threatens the quality of life, in some respects, becomes labelled a 'security problem' the field risks losing all focus" (Freedman, 1998:53).

Other influential criticism is coming from the feminists who are basically depending their arguments on the gender equality issue. The feminist argument assumes that women's empowerment is essential to human development and poverty eradication. Human security is a promising platform and framework for the United Nations to promote peace, human rights and human development, however in order to make it translated into a more useful policy network, there is a need to improve the situation of women in their families and communities in world politics (Social Watch, 2004:17).

They say that a people centred security approach is in fact a gender-neutral approach. Human security with its premises brings about the people centred security dimensions thus far differentiating the traditional security aspects of international relations theory which has been understood in relation to the State, with a focus on security of territory from external aggression, or as global security from those aggressions. However, even tough the human security concept is a new born baby to criticize the traditional International Relations theory in security framework, therefore it can be considered as new paradigm but it leaves the gender equality and women rights box empty inside the human rights paradigm of the concept. Therefore, from the feminist perspective human security does not bring much of a change other than the traditional security literature does, previously.

Another influential criticism is coming from the Copenhagen School about the securitisation of the threats relatively considered under the law politics area of international relations. They mainly argue that the concept of security belongs to the state because it has the capability to make it work, therefore the other referent object which is being the individual in human security study, does not really matter. According

to Weaver, this is the case because human security is harder to operate on the international politics due to its lack of precision to persuade actors to make the issue enter into force to cooperate (Weaver, 1995).

By emphasizing the criticisms against the concept, the following chapters will further proceed with the elements of the concept in order to understand it better and whether there can be a useful policy framework can be established around the concept in order to evaluate it for the political leaders.

III. THE ELEMENTS OF HUMAN SECURITY

In order to address the causes of the threats to human security, and the root causes of human insecurity the elements of human security should be examined in detail. Despite the conceptual ambiguity of the concept some measurements can be taken against the various threats by creating consensus on the real threats that cause human suffering. Therefore, identifying the elements of human security will be the basic source to create more attention on the human security concept both at the national level and the analytical studies at the international level.

3.1. The Focal Point: Consensus or Threats?

Concerns about the human security have their most immediate results in the complex incidents of the early 1990s at which point where the international community seemed especially ill-equipped to respond war-induced famine incidents in Somalia, ethnical cleansing in Bosnia and Herzegovina, genocide in Rwanda, and complex exits from civil war in places such as Cambodia, Mozambique or El Salvador. The 'Hard' security concerns of 1990s have continued even after the Cold-war is ended. Such as the demobilization of armed forces, came face to face with the humanitarian concerns such as mobilizing for the mass distribution of food, health supplies and shelter. As a consequence of the security threats of the 1990s and early 2000s, new norms, such as the protection of civilians in wars, and institutions such as the International Criminal Court are designed to enhance international cooperation in protecting whole populations or social groups (Suhrke 1999: 266).

In the longer term, the keys to the 21st century security lie both in a system of states committed to the resolution of international disputes through universal institutions such as the UN or regional organizations, and in the democratization and development of the political institutions and societies to achieve peace within these states.

However, catastrophic events that the world has witnessed reshaped the international security literature in a different way. Those are the events which have also

resulted in the human security literature to design a new security framework for human security crises for the entire globe, the list below may help to show the incidents starting from the end of the cold-war.

Table 3.1. Examples of Human Security Crises: Natural and Human-Induced Catastrophic Events[3]

The Horn of Africa crisis, late 1980s
The Chernobyl explosion, 1986
The global refugee/internally displaced persons (IDP) crisis, early 1990s
The emergence of HIV/AIDS as a security threat, early 1990s
'Non-consensual humanitarian intervention', beginning with the US-led operations in Somalia, 1991–6
Ethnic cleansing in Bosnia, 1992–5
The Rwandan genocide, 1994
Global climate change: expected impact on island states
The East Asian financial crisis, 1997
Targeted political violence and transnational bombings
Severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS), 2003
The Darfur atrocities, 2003–2005
The South-East Asian tsunami, 2004
The South Asian/Hindu Kush earthquake, 2005

UNDP in its 1994 report stated that the principal future sources of human security threats will come from deep-seated 'root causes of conflicts' such as unchecked population growth, disparities in economic opportunities, excessive international migration, environmental degradation, drug production and trafficking, and international terrorism (UNDP 1994: 22–46). Human Security Now, issued in 2003, carefully lays out two essential components of human security that give meaning to its overall definitional statement, as such:

---

[3] The Helsinki Process Report of the Track on Human Security, 2005
Available at: http://www.helsinkiprocess.fi/netcomm/ImgLib/53/164/hp_track3_report.pdf

Human security: to protect the vital core of all human lives in ways that enhances human freedoms and human fulfilment. Human security means protecting fundamental freedoms—freedoms that are the essence of life. It means protecting people from critical (severe) and pervasive (widespread) threats and situations. It means using processes that build on people's strengths and aspirations. It means creating political, social, environmental, economic, military and cultural systems that together give people the building blocks of survival, livelihood, and dignity (UN, 2003: 4).

United Nations Commission on Human Security (CHS) is working on the basis of these two components of human security as:

.. .protection, which seeks to ensure safety from events and forces that are beyond the individual's control, such as a 'financial crisis, a violent conflict, chronic destitution, a terrorist attack, HIV/AIDS, under investment in health care, water shortages, pollution from a distant land' (UN, 2003) and empowerment, or the capacity of people to develop and pursue their aspirations as individuals and communities; empowerment equally refers to the strength and ability of people (men and women) to understand and advocate for their rights and interests in democratic processes of elections and in direct participation in decision making (UN, 2003: 11).

Consequently, the world citizens are facing now, and have faced earlier, like hurricanes, civil wars, holocausts, genocides, environmental and economic deprivations it has been perfectly known that the concept of security has been stretched into a new direction. The very point that should be addressed is the element used to identify and determine the causes and the respective bodies for the human insecurity (UN, 2003).

Ramesh Thakur identifies that the new security dimension would be to embrace issues beyond just the military means but they should also move up to embrace regional and global structures as a whole (Thakur, 2006).

In brief, it can be said that in the traditional security framework, the individual is not at the centre of the security debate of the state, since the security claims are only considered to include the collective security matters, such as an external aggression or national interest. The human security paradigm, by contrast, puts the individuals at the centre of the debate and reshapes the state policy and analysis accordingly. Therefore, the fundamental components of human security by complementing the state security and

by addressing the root causes for human insecurity links with the strengthening of human development (Glasius and Kaldor, 2005: 66).

At this point, it is critical to establish the common understanding and consensus around the ideas on threats to human life by identifying the vital and focal points that causes human insecurity. Human security concept does not compete with the national security, but rather it complements it. However, placing the individual at the centre of the security debate requires the national security ingredients lose its centrality and shares its dominance with the idea of human development or human rights. Therefore, it will be rather uneasy to reshape the world politics since this process will have profound consequences on how we see the world, how we organise our political affairs, how we make choices in public and foreign policy, and how we relate to fellow-human beings from many different countries and civilisations (Thakur, 2006).

The 2005 Human Development Report has some comparative statistics for drawing attention to the human insecurity elements for most of the fellow human beings. The report suggests that the reality of human insecurity cannot simply be wished away. To many poor people in the world's poorest countries today, the risk of being attacked by terrorists or with weapons of mass destruction is far removed from the pervasive reality of the so-called soft threats – hunger, lack of safe drinking water and sanitation and endemic diseases – that kill millions every year, far more than the so-called 'hard' or 'real' threats to security (UNDP, 2005).

Further, the problem in reshaping the agenda is not simply trying to make a change in the ideas but also it is an endeavour to change in how to establish a base to make consensus and cooperate. 2005 Human Development Report draws the table by giving India as a field of study and the picture seems to be more interrogating about the real elements of human insecurity. The report indicates that for all of India's economic successes in the past decade, its child mortality reduction rates have not matched those of its poorer neighbour Bangladesh. In 2005, 732,000 fewer Indian children would have died. And among those the children aged 1-5; girls are 50 percent more likely to die than boys. That is, 130,000 girls are discriminated to death every year (UNDP, 2005:

55-57). Some global indicators from the Millennium Development goals have shown the picture even in a more drastic way.

> Globally, on 2005 trends, the shortfall in the Millennium Development Goal target for reducing child mortality will lead to 4.4 million avoidable deaths in 2015. Some 2.3 million children could be kept alive through preventive and curative neonatal interventions at a cost of $4 billion – just two days of military spending in the developed countries. More than one billion people in the world lack access to clean water and 2.6 billion to sanitation. These deficits could only be overcome through an annual investment of $7 billion annually, which is less than what Europeans spend on perfume – which would save 4,000 lives each day from the resulting reduced exposure to infectious diseases (UN, 2006: 45).

Therefore, it can be said that the drastic menaces to human lives are varying and most of them have been underlined in many reports of United Nations Development Programme reports, World Bank and United Nations several times. The destitutions whether of refugee populations or of poor communities have included food security, economic and environmental degradation, lack of basic health care, and pandemics, epidemics with high rates of transposition necessitates, the concept of security to be redefined in order to help create a consensus on the term.

Because the human security is a concept developed to embrace the new challenges, it still remains an unsettled concept in the international community. There are debates about the boundaries of the term, its utility as a guideline for action, and its relationship to other concepts such as human rights, human development and state sovereignty.

Nevertheless, there are some reasonable efforts that have been to operationalise the concept so far. To illustrate, a high level of focus has been given to the link between human rights convention and international development targets; representing the possibilities of reaching some overarching consensus. As Amartya Sen writes, "Some functionings are very elementary, such as being adequately nourished, being in good health, etc., and these may be strongly valued by all, for obvious reasons" (Sen, 1999:20).

However, universal consensuses on the issues like human rights remain unsolved as the debate on the issue continues within and among nations despite various ratified documents. Another way to conceptualise the human security is to 'name the threats' for which responses shall be developed. In this view, the elements of human security would be itemised as threats of recession, of aggression, of soil degradation, of pollution, of terrorism, and others that were of considered as security threats. In fact, it is precisely this endeavour played a significant role in broadening of the state security agenda (Sen, 1999).

Ullman's influential article, 'Redefining Security' began by defining a threat to national security as:

> An action or sequence of events that (1) threatens drastically and over a relatively brief span of time to degrade the quality of life for the inhabitants of a state, or (2) threatens significantly to narrow the range of policy choices available to the government of a state or to private, nongovernmental entities (persons, groups, corporations) within the state (Ullman, 1983:33).

Ullman argued that in addition to military threats, events such as population growth, urbanization, and migration should be considered as new security threats because they fit the definition. Most of the authors are in favour of this way and they prefer to proceed with defining the threats posed in real life. However, the focus on threats, even tough it is a sufficient basis for human security remains some points unspecified. Therefore, it is better to begin with the questions as follows, since the concept of 'security' is politically powerful, weakly conceptualised and intensely contested:

> 1. Who are the objects or referents of security: for whom is security intended – individuals, groups, nation, state, region, and world?
>
> 2. What are the instruments of security: by what means is security to be achieved –military, nuclear, political, diplomatic, economic, and cultural (e.g. a war over ideas or for the soul of Islam)?
>
> 3. What are the costs of security: at what price to the economy and to the social and political values can security be achieved? (Thakur 2006: 3-4).

These are the fundamental but most ambiguous questions that the human security advocates present but they are lack of making any decisive definitions. However, attempts further proceed. Amartya Sen, for instance, develops the human security concept, by making his own contributions in a more detailed way suggesting that human security is a fundamental part of broader development processes, integrally connected with securing human capabilities, i.e. "the various combinations of functionings (beings and doings) that the person can achieve (Alkire, 2002: 23). In this context, the main elements that lie at the heart of the concept and create consensus shall be as follows:

1) A clear focus on individual human lives (in contrast to state security models)
2) An appreciation of the role of society and social arrangements in making human lives more secure in a constructive way
3) A reasoned concentration on the downside risks to human lives
4) A choice to focus on the 'downside' – emphasising the more basic human rights. (Alkire, 2002:24)

At the UN Millennium Summit (September 2000), the UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan underlined that:

> There is a need for a more human- centred approach to security. Security, in this regard, should be thought of less in terms of defending territory and more in terms of protecting people. In the Millennium Report 2000, the international community is urged to take action to achieve "freedom from want" (the development agenda) and "freedom from fear" (the security agenda). Security as a precondition for lasting peace is considered as fundamental to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the full development of human capacities (Annan, 2000: 42).

The security agenda represents the overcoming of the deadly violent conflicts, complex humanitarian catastrophes and to help the people in immediate recovery even genocide with massive civilian deaths, the development agenda represents for the most part fight against economic and environmental deprivation, diseases, natural disasters, lack of shelter, food and clean water resources, human rights so on. However, unless an international consensus is achieved on decisive definition on the real causes of human insecurity, there will not be much further success to celebrate a new notion on the security agendas.

The very fact of raising questions regarding the fulfilment of human dignity, human freedom and the resources to deliberate human security, it is vital to explore the idea of securitisation. Because generally speaking, human security is understand to be the idea that the individual is lying at the very core of all security concerns, whereby security is understood as freedom from want and/or freedom from fear (Floyd, 2007: 40).

According to Ramesh Thakur the 'sociology of securitisation' situates the definition and pursuit of security within their particular but evolving and changing context. The states system and the content of security has evolved and changed dramatically with the change in the Westphalian system which has provided the system inefficient. The solution to the security dilemmas no longer sustained by the monopolisation of the state security forces to safeguard the security of individuals. (Thakur, 2006).

In the contemporary international politics, the armed conflicts has broadened with the proliferation of arms to the mass public, and like holocausts the regimes can even cause huge numbers of mass killings of their own citizens. And it is not even necessary to mention the nuclear threat of the cold war which has only recently lost its attention on policy agendas. Analysts of the security problematique recently acknowledge that the most challenging security threats of our age that should be drawn attention are internal social cohesion, regime capacity and brittleness, failed states, economic development, structural adjustment, gender relations, ethnic identity, external threats, and trans-national and global problems like AIDS, environmental degradation, drug trafficking, terrorism and so on (Floyd, 2007: 40-41).

Most of these problems are not part of the issues of high politics like the ones they used to be considered as security threats to the nation states. However, they are mainly the problems of the low politics issues that were never paid attention in the first place, and could not have been solved by only military means as the hard politics issues does (Buzan and Weaver, 1998:35-39). Even the problematique corresponds to the broadening of security agenda to cover the humanitarian spectrum of human security; it is rather difficult to decide either on the threats or the responsible for the provision of

human security. The Copenhagen School puts it by using the phrase 'security action' as such: "the human security can only be guaranteed by a larger entity such as society, the state, or some global institution which in many ways taken on behalf of, and with reference to, a collectivity" (Buzan and Weaver, 1998: 36). It is fair to say therefore that due to the concept's popularity, it is rather difficult to create consensus either on the definition and the reason to persuade people to agree on its necessity to define it under the security framework (Floyd, 2007).

Buzan and Weaver quite clearly states that in principle, securitising actors and the securitisation approach in particular, operate with a state centric reading of security that is little different from mainstream approaches to security such as realism (Buzan and Weaver, 1998: 33-34). Therefore, Ole Weaver firmly argues that the concept of security belongs to the state, no matter the other referent object becomes the individual (Weaver, 1995:46). According to Weaver, this is the case because first, securitisation is aimed at studying securitisation and desecuritisation ever since they occur in practice. And, for securitisation to work a securitising actor must have capabilities. Otherwise, this will only called to be a securitising move which will have no relevance to operate (Weaver, 1995: 48).

In the words of Copenhagen school, after the cold war there is a new world order emerged which has changed the role of the state drastically. The focus on the state is that most of the securitizations are still performed by state actors. Therefore, the idea assumes that even if the securitisation approach is not dogmatically state-centric it is often state-centric in its findings. Human security, in this regard, as a concept remains to be ambiguous and harder to operate on the international politics because it is still lack of this precision to persuade actors to make the issue enter into force to cooperate, ever since the security is still performed by states (Buzan and Weaver, 2003:71). However, the advocators of the concept rely on their discussions on the concepts willingness to identify of the vital core areas which pose threats to human life which lack in the security identification of the states, therefore the concept can still be performed and be acknowledged.

3.2. The Vital Core

The evolution of the concept 'human security' has entered into the security debate with an effort to re-conceptualize security in a fundamental manner. It is primarily an analytical tool that focuses on ensuring security for the individual, and for the state. And the exploring of new options aimed at mitigating threats to the insecurity of individuals; therefore it became the very point to consolidate new policy recommendations and policy actions.

The UNDP Human Security Guidance assume that in line with the expanded definition of human security , the causes of insecurity has broadened including the threats to socio-economic and political conditions, food, health, and environmental, community and personal safety. In this regard, the human security needs of the people would become mostly differentiated from the traditional realist arguments, by including protection from external regional conflicts, socio-economic exploitation, civil unrest stemming from ethnic identities, poverty, and public health issues such as HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis (Bajpai, 2000).

However, the security needs vary from country to country, so that each country, nation or group, even individuals generally speaking have their own security aspirations and immediate needs to be covered. The UNDP 1994 Report recommends that human security is meant by the protection of individuals against vital threats and attacking the poverty (UNDP, 1994a).

Therefore, what would be the 'vital core' for the human beings to be secured, prevented and protected is a main question to be answered. Some authors argue that the term 'vital core' is not meant to be precise. However, it has been suggested that if the well-being of human beings lie at the very heart of the debate, the concept would suggest at least a fundamental set of functions related to survival, livelihood and dignity (Baipaj, 2000: 9-12). Sabina Alkire argues as:

> the term 'vital core' here implies that the institutions that are meant to be responsible to provide and protect human security will not be able to protect every aspect of human well-being, but at very least they will protect this core (Alkire, 2003:23).

In this regard, the first step in shaping the human security agenda becomes the exploring of the 'vital core'. However, hence the essential elements of human security and the threats to human well-being are shaped by the peoples' needs and fears; it is difficult to come to a conclusion regarding what is the vital core to be protected. When this vital core is identified, the key questions will include whether this core is limited to physical survival or includes aspects of, dignity, political freedom, and livelihood. At the international level, the question is rather more complicated and it is mostly shaped by the international procedures to respond.

In order to determine the key threats to human insecurity, first, the questions below should be answered:

1. What is the nature of the causes for insecurity?

2. What are the possibilities and how we can possibly measure them,

3. How can the way to cooperate on the issues be defined to establish human security agendas, and how the way for international institutions to protect human security be pursued with which policy tools or is it possible to do so in a globalised world.

4. How would be how should these threats and agendas be evaluated and reviewed?

Consequently, it should be better to start working with focusing on the human centred focus of human security rather than a threat based concept of security. In order to achieve this, the vital core of the human security must be addressed in detail in the rights and capabilities of the national and international actors.

3.3. Specifying the Vital Core: Capabilities and Rights

Human security concept, for most of the academicians, is mean to be a 'human-centred' approach to security. This approach should draw attention to problems such as conflicts, human rights violations, poverty, infectious diseases, crime and environmental destruction that threaten the existence of each and every person.

However, there are many differences in academic research on what constitutes human security, let alone how it should be achieved. Taylor Owen classifies the academic debate on human security within two categories — broad versus narrow conceptualizations, both about the components of the concept and the threats corresponds to a wide range of insecurity areas for all (Owens, 2004: 375–6).

Astri Suhrke (1999), Sverre Lodgaard (2002) and Andrew Mack (2004) underscore the need for violence-based human security initiatives and strongly argue for the inclusion of violence and vulnerability in traditional security thinking. The focus on violence and vulnerability, according to them, brings pragmatism, conceptual clarity and analytic rigour to the concept of human security.

Sabina Alkire (2001), Kanti Bajpai (2000), Jennifer Leaning and Sam Arie (2000), Osler Hampson and J. Hay (2002), and others argue that the shift in favour of individual human security obviously demands actions on a wide range of complex issues, including poverty, diseases, health and environmental disasters.

According to Muhammad Nuruzaman,

> those academicians recognize that broadening the concept of human security points to some analytical difficulties, like the failure for international action but inclusion of all categories of threats and vulnerabilities is necessary if comprehensive security for the individuals in different societies is to be achieved (Nuruzaman, 2006: 9-10).

Even though, there is no efficient and decisive definition of the complex insecurity components of the human beings, it is been cited in many academic writings that just like sustainable development, human security is all people-centred. And regarding the security umbrella, the human security relates back to the post-cold war

discovery of the importance of internal wars, and conflicts instead of the wars between the states.

This is also the reason why the interference by the international actors has reshaped since its foundation and aid has gained another meaning in the terms of development assistance. Because by prioritising the security of people rather than the states, human security brings together development and security concepts to be understood under the same framework. Further, it embraces the optimism of sustainable development by emphasising the expansion of life-choices while, at the same time, urging action on the conditions that threaten human survival and dignity (Duffield, 2004).

Within the literature, the rise of human security is usually portrayed as a result of growing humanism within the international system by accepted norms and conventions associated with the UN Declaration of Human Rights, the Geneva Conventions, the founding of the International Criminal Court, and so on (Duffield, 2004).

Human security, in this framework, considered to be as an enlightenment that broadens security beyond states to include other threats to human life and existence, for instance, poverty, environmental pollution, population displacement and infectious diseases such as HIV/AIDS. Importantly, it involves, since the states mostly have failed to sustain the security of their own citizens "...a growing recognition of the role of people – of individuals and communities – in ensuring their own security" (CHS 2003: 5). In the words of Astri Suhrke, human security "…evokes 'progressive values'" (Suhrke, 1999: 270).

3.4. Critical and Pervasive Threats

Since the human security concept has first established and further developed despite its varying criticisms, it is meant to be the protection of human beings from critical and pervasive threats in order to achieve the protection of vital freedoms of the human beings. The term 'vital freedoms' was first set out by the UNDP 1994 Report by further stating that protecting people from critical and pervasive threats and situations,

building on their strengths and aspirations. It also means establishing new systems that pave the way for people in building blocks of their survival, dignity and livelihood (UNDP, 1994: 4-5).

In line with most of the UN reports which have given the mostly widened definition and aspects of human security, the three basic freedoms which are meant to be the freedom from fear, emancipating the threats to the bodily integrity and survival, freedom from want, and freedom to take action on their own behalf are the vital core areas to be secured (UN, 2003). Thus, the idea for the protection of human beings from severe and endangered threats becomes almost everything that every single individual face in their daily lives, such as the economic deprivation, poverty, environmental degradation or pollution, health and food insecurities which are caused due to the lack of resources and human rights violations

All the UN reports further suggest that the core idea behind the human security discourse is to find the ways to enhance 'protection' and 'empowerment' of people in every aspect of their lives. Because human security itself complements the state security, furthers human development and enhances human rights since it puts the individual as the subject of security matters (Ogata, 2001). The protection-empowerment framework has found its most precise meaning in the definition of human security made by the Human Security Commission of UN. Human security is defined as "protecting the vital core of all human lives in ways that enhance human freedoms and human fulfilment" (UN, 2003:2-3). Relying on this statement, the Commission further developed three approaches in order to reinforce the concept as an operational tool and to make the mostly cites threats examined This meant 'protecting fundamental freedoms,' 'protecting people from critical (severe) and pervasive (widespread) threats and situations' and empowering individuals and communities to develop the capabilities for making in-formed choices and determining their own well-being (UN, 2003: 4).

Sadako Ogata developed a two approach way in order to differentiate human security and state security. The first approach is the protection of people's security and their basic rights and freedoms. Therefore, human security is not meant to be a competitive idea to state security, rather it complements it. In the traditional security

rhetoric, the state security tends to concentrate on protecting borders, institutions and people from external aggression or adversarial designs. Human security focuses on ensuring the safety of individuals and communities against a wider range of threats, including deadly infectious diseases, human rights violations, financial crises, violent conflict, and famine or water shortage, among others (Ogata, 2001).

The second approach underlines the centrality of empowering individuals and communities in order to overcome a wide range of deprivations through devising and implementing solutions. The people's ability to act on their own behalf is crucial in achieving the human security (Ogata, 2001). Supporting people's abilities to act on their own behalf means providing education and information, access to health care and social safety nets to prepare them for economic or political downturns.

Equally relevant point would be the building of public spaces that will encourage discussions among people and the development of local leadership, on the one hand, as well as the toleration of opposition on the other. Further, reinforces democratic principles to be furnished (Ogata, 2001).

The Commission was concerned that the empowerment of people should move forward in an environment of freedom of the press, freedom of information and freedom of conscience and belief, and be accompanied by policies of inclusion. Empowerment, here plays a vital role because the Commission notes afterwards that while protection may cause people to exercise most of their choices , people who are empowered may make better choices and may result in new suggestion of them for improvements of the system (UN, 2003).

By looking at 'downside risks', it broadens the human development focus beyond 'growth with equity'. Respecting human rights are at the core of protecting human security (UN, 2003: 12). However, the threats may vary according to the impacts they have made on individuals, for this reason it may be difficult to address the most severe and badly ones.

Matthew Weisberg suggests that the most critical point in the current human security debate is the principal point of the theory, that a wide range of threats

endangers individuals and must be considered in security policy (Weisberg, 2006:7). And strikingly, the criticisms are not only coming from the national security advocates but also from inside the human security advocates, too. In this regard, it can be assumed that the attempts to narrow the list of possible threats will continue. UNDP's Redefining Security report, for instance focuses upon six clusters of security threats: economic and social threats, including poverty, infectious disease and environmental degradation; inter-state conflict; internal conflict, including civil war, genocide and other large-scale atrocities; nuclear, radiological, chemical and biological weapons; terrorism; and transnational organised crime. Clearly, the first and third of these clusters emphasise areas of concern that are central to the human security argument (UNDP, 1994b).

The UN Millennium Development goals in parallel with the UNDP reports links the security and threats mostly with the idea of human development and gives it's most prior attention to 8 main policy areas. The Millennium Development goals consider these policy areas as the root causes of human insecurity, such as underdevelopment, epidemics and environmental problems. These attempts/goals also reveal that due to the vagueness of the concept there are varying elements of human insecurity and the priority areas for policy in action. All in all, security in the new era is no longer only the case for defence and international actors. In the aftermath of the post-cold war because of the change in the ideological matrix and the end of the East-West confrontation, the security debate has yet come to be retreated as its linkage with the development agenda.

3.4.1. Violent Conflicts

The new type of security is a much more complex varied and nuanced concept. Ethnic conflict, cultural diversity, national disintegration, civil war, systemic and subsystemic restructuring have become paramount. Issues of poverty, trade, finance, health, environment, gender, communications, resource depletion, population, migration, technology, drugs, human rights, and refugees are also part of the equation; and the list could go on (Nef, 1999).Yet, human security studies have made the greatest contribution to the newly defined insecurity and threats to the individual's lives together with its development aspects. The current debates around the security of individuals have moved beyond the traditional hard power issues and the military activities rather focusing on the softer side of security including governance of security institutions, the links between security and insecurity, access to resources, well-being, poverty, environmental risk and security (Nef, 1999).

Many of these issues have been gradually incorporated into work undertaken during the '90s by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and the OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC) (Hussein *et al*, 2004). The European Union is another good example with its attempts to contribute to world development, such as the European Union Development Cooperation, Neighbourhood Policy and Mediterranean Partnership. However, the changing environment in international relations since the fall of the Berlin wall did not alter into a much safer, or a peaceful world for individuals as expected. Rather, most of the wars transposed into internal wars since 1990s and they have brutal consequences claiming 5 million deaths with mostly civilian casualties of women and children (UN, 2003)[4].

---

[4] Although there was a dropping the number of majo*r* armed conflicts (defined by the Uppsala University researchers as more than 1,000 battlefield deaths in a year) between 1992, when there were the highest number of such wars, and the present, new wars erupted in 2003—notably the Iraq intervention, the fighting in Darfur in Sudan, and the renewal of a violent conflict in Senegal—which temper any nascent enthusiasm that war is becoming obsolete (Nef, 1999)
Widespread continuing violence in relatively newer conflicts such as those in Indonesia (Timor, West Papua, Aceh) or the renewal of conflict in Russia (Chechnya) suggests that conflicts are continuing or emerging as fast as old ones wind down. There were five major wars (more than 1,000 dead per year in battle-related deaths) in 2003—in India (Kashmir), Iraq, Liberia, Nepal and Sudan. (Hussein *et al*, 2004: 25)

Most ardently, in the case of internal conflicts, the civilian populations often caught in the crossfire between insurgents and state forces, and bear the majority of casualties. In the most extreme situations such as Rwanda - 1994, Bosnia-Herzegovina (1992-1994) and Kosovo (1998-99), entire segments of the civilian population became the primary military target on political, racial or ethnic grounds, sometimes forced to live their native countries as being refugees in the neighbouring countries or face extermination (Bruderline, 2000: 4) .

In Somalia, Zaire/Democratic Republic of Congo, Angola, Burundi, Sudan, Sierra Leone, and Afghanistan and Chechnya, inter state conflicts still on the way, despite the international actors' endeavours to prevent violence. Even more dramatically, most of these conflicts have resulted in biggest human catastrophes such as refugee flows, economic, political or social instability, the spread of infectious diseases, and even in the worst cases as failed states and the of state institutions to abolish (Annan, 2000 :46).

In the academic literature, there is a growing consensus that the deadly violent conflicts and the development issues like are directly interlinked, and their affects on human lives are devastating. Forced migration and population displacement both from within countries and across borders are largely reinforced by political and economic disruptions (Nef, 1999). Demographic pressures like forceful discrimination, persecutions, 'ethnic cleansing' and genocide, become likely in worst scenarios, together with growing economic disparities are the main causes for population movements. In some cases they become the threat of violence themselves (UNDP 1993).

In addition to the dislocations brought about by the present economic restructuring, social demographic, and steady migratory trends, there are sudden population displacements caused by violent upheavals. These involuntary and traumatic displacements are driven less by natural catastrophes and economic collapse but by bloody political conflicts (Nef, 1999).

66

The figure for refugees living outside their national borders for 1989 was about 15 million (Heffernan, 1990: 10-11). A 1991 UNHCR report placed the total of world refugees at 17 million. In addition to the abovementioned "external" refugees, there were nearly 4 million individuals in 1993 living in refugee-like situations and other 27 million displaced within their own borders (UNHCR, 1991).The refugee issue does not only have destructive affects on the population on the move, but also on the countries who open their borders, as well. In short, both parties become potentially expanded zones for social vulnerability (Nef, 1999).

3.4.2. Poverty and Economic Inequality

Poverty is the common denominator of economic insecurity. It is seen by many as the outstanding economic and social problem in the world. Poverty and economic inequality are seemed to be the root causes of global insecurity and hence receive much attention within the human security approach (UN, 1994a).

Currently, one fifth of the world's population (equivalent to 1.2 billion) experiences extreme poverty with an income of less than $1 a day. A significant portion of this population resides in Africa and Asia. An addition of 1.6 billion to this population lives on less than $2 a day, totalling 2.8 billion out of 6 billion of world's people live in poverty and daily insecurity (World Bank, 2000/1:45-47).

And it has been estimated that "in this decade average per capita incomes fell by about 3% per year in sub-Saharan Africa and by about 1.3% in the highly indebted countries" The cumulative figures of economic decline for the decade are 25% for Africans and 10% for Latin Americans. World economic growth per capita for 1990–92 declined 1.1% per year on average (World Bank 2000/1: 48)The dept crises are also another part of the problem which even fails to indicate the differential impact upon the poor, who are the most grievously hurt. However, it is a fact the debt crisis affects employment, consumption, and credit capability in the less-affluent countries (Nef, 1999).

Besides, chronic poverty like other obstacles to human security creates unfavourable economic conditions, which raises the social impact of economic crises, and natural disasters. According to the WB Voices of the Poor Report; poverty has the same destructive affects on education, health, land use and agricultural productivity, water use, deforestation and protected areas, energy use and emissions as it has on economic growth, quality of life and global inequality (World Bank, 2000/1).

There is a growing consensus on the facts that poverty and economic deprivation comes with the lack of sanitation and poor health conditions at the same time. Therefore, as stated in the 2006 Human Development Report of UNDP, poverty is the main denominator of the spread of infectious diseases with many other socio-economic factors together with the violent upheavals. There are certain evidences that all the issues that are part of human development currently are also the reasons for human insecurity and they are all mutually reinforcing their affects on human lives (UNDP, 2006).

3.4.3. Infectious Diseases

There is a rich history regarding the interactions between disease and war. And history has demonstrated repeatedly how health and disease go hand in hand with military security. Epidemics have changed the course of battles; under-appreciated is that medical progress was often accelerated by research undertaken in response to war, for example the use of disinfectants or the rapid development of antibiotics or vaccines (Chen, 2004).However, unfortunately the most immediate health and security connection is seen in the conflict casualties, which are mostly civilian particularly of women and children. There are many cases of 'state failure' leading to health failure and vice versa.

Failed states and the domestic violence driven through either by local, national or transnational actors resulted in catastrophic events like migration, epidemics of communicable diseases, under nutrition and malnutrition, and rape and unsafe sex. According to the World Health Organisation (WHO)'s report in 2001; 'The World

Health Report 2001' it has been estimated that conflicts accounted for over 310,000 deaths during 2000. On the other hand, the indirect effects of collective violence and conflict are felt on a more long-term. And far-reaching scale, and include health conditions arising from population displacement, and destruction of health facility infrastructure among other factors (WHO, 2001). As opposed to direct effects, which much more frequently involve combatants, indirect health effects of collective violence disproportionately affect non-combatant populations.

Empowering people to secure their own lives is a necessity of life, therefore goes hand in hand with protection. The global increasing health problems, like the spread of HIV/AIDS and other epidemics are no longer be excluded from being the major threats to human survival. Because there is certain evidence support the idea that every threat to international security today enlarges the security of others (Newman, 2005).

The United Nations High Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change 2004 report suggests that the states which are most vulnerable to malnutrition and disease are also the ones who are caught up in violent conflict and extreme poverty. In fact, poverty and inequality, especially in divided societies can well be associated with the outbreak of civil war. The civil wars and the ethnical tensions sometimes become the reasons for state failures and thus become the very reasons for the outbreak of epidemics and diseases (UN, 2004).

According to the UNDP 1994 Human Development report, the world is now facing with drastical health problems which will no longer be isolated from the security debate just as a health issue any more since the spread of epidemics has resulted in large amounts of mass killings. The statistics show that in developing countries, the major causes of death are infectious and parasitic diseases which kill 17 million people annually, including 6.5 million from acute respiratory infections, 4.5 million from diarrheal diseases and 3.5 million from tuberculosis (HIV/AIDS Report, 2005:8).

Even tough the industrial countries also do have health issues and related deaths; it is mostly the poorest nations who are faced most dramatic results and forced

to live under more profound affects in their daily lives. In African case, for instance, the growing number of HIV/AIDS pandemic is one of the most challenging human security priorities in the continent. While Africa has faced several epidemics in the past, none has had an equivalent impact in terms of the productive sectors of the society (HIV/AIDS Report, 2005: 8-10).

In 2004, the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) estimated that

> 25.4 million African adults and children were living with HIV/AIDS epidemic; 3.1 million more infections occurred and 2.3 million Africans died because of HIV/AIDS in the same year. Sub-Saharan Africa is currently home to two-thirds of those living with HIV/AIDS and nearly 74 percent of all AIDS-related deaths in the world. The continent is the only region in the world where more women than men are infected with HIV: 57 percent of all HIV-positive people in Africa are women and, most worrying, women constitute 76 percent of those between the ages of 15 and 24 who are infected with the disease (UNAIDS/WHO, 2005: 45).

According to the UNAIDS annual report on 2005, the number of deaths from AIDS in Africa by 2020 will approach the combined number of military and civilian deaths in the two World Wars of the 20th century (UNAIDS/WHO, 2005). The numbers are far enough to prove that the situation in Africa regarding the AIDS pandemic is a 'security-issue' for the continent as a whole. Because at the centre of human security it is indeed the idea of protecting the human life, preserving human choice, freedom and development. When the core of human life is weakened or threatened either by illness, disability or avoidable death, poor health becomes a critical threat to human security.

The fact that they are displaced brings with it the very real potential of lack of access to food, clean water, proper sanitation, and possibilities of providing economic security for themselves. Malnutrition, overcrowding, and lack of sanitation frequently combine to facilitate the emergence of epidemics of transmissible disease in such populations, and children and the elderly are the ones most susceptible to death from such causes. Diarrheal diseases, acute respiratory infections, measles, and other

infectious diseases are the most common causes of death among refugee and displaced populations (Toole and Waldman, 1993: 600-605).

In fact, the concept of human security quite interlinked with the pursuit of health conditions ever since the idea of human security is to protect individuals from physical violence and to provide basic freedoms. Moreover, there are certain evidences, like in the African case, that poor health can be as devastating within a society. And in the most extreme cases, like war, it is taking away from people their ability to exercise choice, take advantage of social opportunities and plan for their future.

Human security, in this regard is mainly comprised of three challenges in which health and the security of good health are inextricably linked: violence and conflict, global infectious disease, and poverty and inequity. Together with these environmental issues are another issue which may be both resulted by poverty, global infectious disease and violent conflicts, the above section will further try to elaborate the environmental issues direct linkage with the human security.

3.4.4. Environmental Change and Environmental Security

Population growth, water scarcity, degraded ecosystems, resource depletion, forced migration, food scarcity and pandemic diseases…The world has suffered enough to include these humanitarian catastrophes as threats to human survival and make the correlation between the human insecurity, environment, conflicts and foreign policy.

In the post-cold war years, environmental concerns became linked to security debates. The Cold war's security debate has changed drastically and moved beyond the nuclear horror of state surveillance into the idea that 'security clearly matters to human beings, not the states. Themes of poverty and misery that had been important in the early days of the United Nations, but which had been swept aside in the cold war, were shackled up and reintegrated into discussions of what has become 'human security' (Dalby, 2002: 75).

The Brandt-Report (1980) noted that "few threats to peace and survival of the human community are greater than those posed by the prospects of cumulative and irreversible degradation of the biosphere on which human life depends". The Brundtland Commission argued that the security concept "must be expanded to include the growing impacts of environmental stress – locally, nationally, regionally, and globally" (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987: 19).

The Commission on Global Governance (1995) called for a broader concept of global security for states, people, and the planet. It claimed a linkage between environmental deterioration, poverty, and underdevelopment as causes of conflict. These reports put the linkage between environmental stress, conflicts and conflict resolution on the political agenda of international organisations (Commission on Global Governance, 1995: 15-17). Environmental change and resource depletion due to their affects on human life have become the integral part of the discussions. In the Global Environmental Change report of University of California Homer- Dixon argues that:

> From a human security perspective, environmental change is important in two ways. First, it can be a direct source of insecurity. Even if the state does not register a given form of environmental change as a threat to its core values or national interests, fragments of its citizenry may feel otherwise. On the other hand, if the state does appreciate the security relevance of environmental change, it may still be constrained in terms of its response insofar as the problem has diacritical transnational dimensions.
>
> Second, modes of environmental change can exacerbate other real or potential forms of insecurity, such as poverty, discrimination, or terrorism (Homer-Dixon 1999: 73).

Therefore, the studies on environmental change which became prominent in the 1970s, regarding their impacts on human existence have evolved in the literature in two other studies. The first is 'environmental security' that reflects a common concern about the implications of environmental change, and mainly focuses on the environmental threats and their linkage with the violent conflicts and security issues. The other field is 'sustainable development' which is mainly concerned with the environmental change such as land degradation, deforestation, global warming, air pollution and biodiversity loss (Matthew, 2000: 35).

In the case of human security discourse both the two aspects are important ever since the human security starting from its earliest thoughts suggests the human development, human survival, dignity and well-being of human beings all together. The environmental security approach however, draws its attention mostly on the securitisation discourse, thus it further complements the freedom from fear aspect of human security by giving its prior attention to the environmental threats and violent conflicts.[5]

Efforts to examine the relations between the environmental changes, war and violent conflict still continues. However, cases investigated included the misuse of natural resources, migration to and over-use of fragile lands, and other adverse environmental effects that occur as a result of violent conflict and militarization (Khagram, *et al*, 2003).

The Millennium Report of the Secretary General mentioned several international organisations that have addressed the linkages between environmental stress and conflicts (Annan, 2000). The World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg (2002) in its political declaration and plan of implementation referred to 'food security' but 'human security' was not mentioned explicitly. UN Secretary General Kofi Annan (2003) pointed to the potential threats posed by environmental problems and he suggested that the UN system should build additional capacity to analyse and address potential threats of conflicts emanating from international natural resource disparities (Annan, 2003). Therefore, although the urgency of environmental matters does not leave any space to be disregarded in policy areas when the total human

---

[5] There is growing evidence in the literature that a great deal of environmental change is directly or indirectly affected by human activities and today's most conflicts are resulted in many of environmentally driven. The debate, therefore, shifted into the analysis of the environmental effects of war and violent conflict, as well as to the conflict refugees.

Major issues examined through this lens include water wars, access to energy (which became an issue of state security in the aftermath of the oil crises), environmental migration and violent conflict (see Gleick, 1993: 18; Homer-Dixon, 1999).

However, evidence to support this perspective remains quite weak. Looking at water scarcity, for example, of over 400 cases of inter-state conflicts between 1918 and 1994 where there was an occurrence or threat of armed violence, only seven were found to involve water. On the other hand, between 1814 and 2000, states have entered into 300 treaties addressing non-navigational issues of water (Wolf and Hammer, 2000). While the notion of water wars is not completely outlandish, conflicts over water are more likely to be intra-state rather than inter-state and to not involve military violence. (Khagram, *et al*, 2003: 294)

disruptions of the environmentally related threats are considered, there is no agreed definition of environmental insecurity (Khagram, *et al*, 2003).

Environmental threats, according to their impacts on human survival, well-being and productivity are linked with human security. Human security by making the individuals as the referent object of security therefore corresponds the individuals also the referent object or even subject of protection form environmental threats.[6]The death of Forests, the thinning of ozone layer, air pollution and acid rain, freshwater contamination and land degradation are one of the most widespread and visibly shocking forms of environmental degradation. They all have dramatic results on human lives together with their affects on the ecosystem**.** In some occasions their affects are so devastating that they may result in violent conflicts and inter-state wars at some circumstances.

Therefore it can be said that the environmental problems have dramatic results on human lives today, not only because they are separately affecting human life in one way or another but also because they are all interlinked and the affects of them can be seen in every aspect of life. For instance, the environmental degradation causes malnutrition or the lack of food and water resources and scarcity but at the same they cause of millions of native citizens to migrate from their home lands. The cost of living with regards to human development increases even though the increase in the GDP per capital globally do not exceed. Furthermore, it can be seen as a burden to the other

---

[6]   As the evidences show up environmental change can have direct or indirect effects on people's well-beings and livelihood.

    For example, water scarcity may not cause war but still engender insecurity by contributing to dehydration-related death, reducing food production, and undermining livelihood opportunities. The environment impacts human survival, well-being and dignity as well as all aspects of human security. But this is only one of five pathways by which the environment impacts people (Khagram, *et al,* 2003: 300-304).

    While many environmental problems are localized, others are widespread in nature (i.e. climate change). Those widespread environmental problems like environmental change can have a significant impact on the lives of people today. These changes may also extend into the future to impact the lives of generations to come. Water resources, again, provide a significant example of these different types of effects on people. For example, over two billion people live in water-stressed river basins and that figure seems to rise to 3.5 billion, or one-half of the world's population, by 2025. (Khagram, *et al*,2003: 293)

    Water scarcities, on the other hand, have multi-scale effects, for example when river basins are trans-boundary and multiple impacts (such as by undermining sectoral production in agriculture, as well as contributing to desertification in ecological areas). It would thus be a terrible mistake to focus solely on the direct effects of water scarcity on human security. (Khagram, *et al,* 2003: 294)

countries which are not directly affected by the several environmental problems. Hence, the countries may perceive this change as a matter of national security when those migrated populations become to live in their borders as foreigners. At this point, the situation becomes a threat to the nation state and it may even become the reason for an interstate war or with the most pessimistic results it can be a reason for state failure (Khagram, *et al*, 2003).

There is an existing tendency to define human security with its linkages with the other policy networks. At this point, when we do speak about environmental problems and the development is concerned, the linkage between the human security and sustainable development is crucial to be emphasised. This is due to the fact that the earlier definitions of human security starting from the 1994 UNDP Human Development report, is so widely explained to illuminate the concept to follow and make the concept as a real policy framework to address the real threats to human existence. In most of the documents, the concept is rather broad to make a policy justification and transform the concept into real politics and make a global consensus around it. As sustainable development is another contentious issue which has recently entered into the development literature, it is useful to explore how the environment and the development are interlinked with each other and since the human security both pays attention to two of the concepts the linkage will be further decisive to help understand the human insecurity when it comes to human development.

IV. HUMAN SECURITY AND OTHER POLICY FRAMEWORKS

Identifying the main sources of human insecurity is essential to provide better environment for human development. Through this analysis it would be easier to figure out in which ways human security becomes fragile. However it seems rather difficult if not impossible to decide whether the priority should be given on the attempts to create a general consensus on the threats by specifying the vital core or to the attempts to name the threats independently. Discussions on the vital core of the human security bring a set of questions worth mentioning for insightful deliberations on the meaning of security while dealing with the threats to human security in one by one gives a clearer picture about the challenges of human insecurity all over the world.

Despite the various criticisms raised against the concept, human security still paves the way for better understanding of the linkages between different aspects of human well-being and development which on the surface seem highly disparate from each other. This way of consideration about the human security can also make easy to understand how the EU puts the human security into words and deeds.

4.1. Sustainable Development and Human Security

The idea of sustainable development can be traced back to the 1980 World Conservation Strategy and to the 1972 United Nations Stockholm Conference on Human Environment. There is growing consensus starting from the early writings of sustainable development is that protecting and enhancing the environment in the equal footage with the development aspects and can have positive consequences for people's livelihoods, well-being and opportunities for human fulfilment.

While environmental degradation, soil erosion, land deprivation, natural disasters, food and water scarcities, toxic industrial pollution, loss of biodiversity, climate change and global warming increase the potential for deprivation, displacement and disempowerment of people, ecosystem integrity is more likely to reduce the

vulnerabilities (Khagram,*et al,* 2003). Hence it is necessary to protect the ecosystem integrity all over the world.

The term 'vulnerability' is defined as a combination of several factors, including hazard awareness, the condition of human settlements and infrastructure, public policy and administration, the wealth of a given society, social capital organised abilities in all fields of disaster and risk management and the lack of social adaptive capacity. However, the social vulnerability to natural disasters, the dimensions for social, economic and political vulnerabilities are all interlinked with each other and often related with the gender issues, economic patterns and ethnic or racial divisions, as well (Nef, 1999).

The attempts to reshape the development field including the environmental sustainability found its most prominent form only in the 1987 Brundtland Commission report Our Common Future. The idea of sustainable development articulated in the report was also supported by the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, was nurtured over the subsequent decade by thousands of 'Local Agenda 21' activities around the world, and celebrated its coming-of-age at the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg. (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987).

The very idea behind the 'sustainability' lies in its ability to provide 'space' in order to make correlations among societies, economics and their very natural environments, as well as their past, present and future expectations. The Brundtland Commission defined sustainable development broadly as the ability of humanity ''... to ensure that it meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs'' (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987: 8).

At this point, the questions of 'what is to be sustained' and 'what is to be developed' in accordance with the 'needs' criterion come into sight. The most common answer to the question of what is to be sustained is the 'life support systems', where the human life is to be supported in the first place. The life support systems for the human

life necessitate in the first place, the sustainable use of natural resources, the resources that are found in nature and useful for people. More recently, the focus on natural resources has expanded by including the need to sustain a healthy environment for people.

According to Khagram another variant or the life support systems shall be the need to protect 'essential ecosystem service' which is including such as the water purification and pollution prevention (Khagram, *et al,* 2003: 297). The protection and preservation of the natural environments surely will be the sustaining of nature in its own inherent value and our consequent obligation to protect it. The species, biodiversity, ecosystems and the earth entirely composes the nature entirely. Finally, there is a thread in the sustainability debate that sees not only biological species as endangered, but cultural species as well.

What is to be developed is the second question when development is discussed in the sustainable development context. It is always the economic growth and economy that are prioritised. Economic growth in production and wealth, as a consequence, are considered to be the only basis in providing opportunities for employment, thus further extends people's choices. Wealth in accordance with the incentives and the means that it creates for investment in production constructs the funds for environmental maintenance and restoration (Solow, 1991). Debates about the distribution of wealth and growth were placed at the centre, because of their linkage with the provision of basic needs and poverty alleviation to growth with equity.

Yet another answer to the 'what is to be developed' question has been the people.

> This human-centred development focuses on both the quantity as well as quality of human life disaggregated to the level of individuals. It focuses on improving the capabilities and expanding the choices available to individuals. Human development highlights the survival of children, increased life expectancy, literacy and numeracy, the expansion of political empowerment and, increasingly, access to natural resources and a healthy environment (Khagram, *et al*, 2003: 298).

Human security offers much to the field of sustainable development, some that reinforces and some that adds to the contributions of human development. Due to the fact that human security is closely related with social, economic, environmental pillars of sustainable development and sustainable development also fortifies the human betterment. These interconnections can be summarised in four points as such:

1. Human security and human development, by emphasizing people, strengthen the social pillar of sustainable development, and may have important implications for future sustainable development goals, priorities and action plans (Khagram, *et al*, 2003).

2. Human security and human development encourages the sustainable development field not only by their contribution in drawing a 'standard of living', but rather developing an idea of 'sustainable livelihoods' approach which prioritizes certain freedoms (Sen, 2002: 8).

3. Human security and human development shift the sustainable development field from a primarily needs-based focus to a rights-based focus in the quest of improving opportunities and capabilities. Therefore, civil and political rights along with economic, social and cultural rights become an integral component of the social pillar of sustainable development (Khagram, *et al*, 2003).

4. Human security more than human development prioritizes achieving freedom from want and freedom from fear urgently. Sustainable development has directed attention to inter-generational equity in the past. But the more human development-centred versions of sustainability will be focusing heavily on promoting 'freedom tos' and thus underplayed the protections that are necessary to ensure 'freedom froms' (Khagram, *et al*, 2003: 298).

4.2. Human Rights and Human Security

There is a similar complementary feature between human rights and human security, like it does with human development. Amartya Sen further suggests that in the human rights literature there is something deeply attractive in the idea that every person

anywhere in the world, irrespective of citizenship or location, has some basic rights that others should respect (Sen, 2002).

It is a fact that behind the modern states there is the very foundation of the individual rests, which is making every single citizen part of the international community and making them as equal as they are born. Therefore, human rights whether stated in the forms of declarations or Conventions; they are all defending the same things. All men born equal and they all deserve to live in the life they would like to preserve, with an equal footage with their human fellows. Together with this, the moral appeal of human rights has been used for various purposes, from resisting torture, demanding the end of ill treatment, hunger and violence against vulnerable groups and unequal treatment of women (Sen, 2002).Commitments underlying human rights generally take the form of demanding certain basic freedoms of human lives to be safeguarded, respected, aided and enhanced (UN, 2003).

The basic freedoms for human beings are the reference points where the human security concept can make a significant contribution by identifying the importance of freedom from basic insecurities. Thus, it can be estimated that considerations which make security so important in human lives can be reinforced with the ethical claims such as the recognition of certain freedoms as human rights provides (Sen, 2002).

Therefore, it can be suggested that human rights and human security can enhance each other in the area of basic freedoms. On the one hand, human rights in ethical reasoning support the fulfilment of basic freedoms, human security, in this regard, can make a decisive contribution by showing the importance of destroying the human insecurity areas (UN, 2003). On the other hand, by its further reasoning human security requires an ethical consensus and political recognition to be successful, therefore it is useful to think that considering the basic human freedoms related to human security may also be an important part of human rights (Sen, 2002). Another aspect in which human security and human rights are corresponding to each other is the issue that they both fight against violence and poverty.

The international bill of human rights includes basic needs such as work, education, food, self-determination, and healthcare. The same bill of human rights prohibits torture, slavery, persecution on religious or racial ground, and direct killing, and another Convention prohibits genocide. Therefore the identification of protection and promotion of human lives in ever aspect of their lives which is simply identified in the human security literature as the 'freedom from fear' and 'freedom from want' is the aim of human security as well as human rights (UNDP, 2000)[7].

A further relationship between human security and human rights concerns 'issues of duty or obligation'. In the theories of human rights, it is been stated that the governments and other authorities have a duty or obligation to respect human rights which are not bound legally but are expected to evoke the solidarity and common humanity (Sen, 2002).

However, in the human security framework the duty or the obligation is more like a moral one. Because the human security, itself does not oblige any authority to be responsible, be it local, national or international to protect the vital core of the population (Alkire, 2003). Therefore, it can be said that human rights provide a more basic framework for universal obligation, but even so it has been quite a fact that human security and human rights are mutually reinforcing each other. One 'leg' of human security is in the human rights tradition which sees the state mainly, although not solely, as the problem and the source of threats to individual security. The other is in the development agenda that sees the state as the necessary agent for promoting human security (Thakur, 2006).

4.3. State Security and Human Security

Human security and traditional or national security are not mutually exclusive concepts. Without human security, traditional state security cannot be attained and vice-versa (UN, 2003:2-6).

---

[7]   See UNDP 2000, Chapter 2 for an overview of the relationship between human rights and human security.

However, the term 'human security' is now widely used to convey a broader and comprehensive understanding of security than the traditional security entails. In fact, most of the academicians consider human security is not being in competition with state security as it is suggested; rather they take it as a complementary aspect for the traditional security concept.

According to the UN Human Security now report human security complements state security in four respects:

1. Its concern is the individual and the community rather than the state.
2. Menaces to people's security include threats and conditions that have not always been classified as threats to state security.
3. The range of actors is expanded beyond the state alone.
4. Achieving human security includes not just protecting people but also empowering people to fend for themselves (UN, 2003: 4).

But the point of emphasizing it is to remind policymakers that it is the security of people in their homes and communities that is the proper goal of state and international security measures (Regerh and Whelan, 2004).

In the United Nations Development Report, human security is distinguished from traditional security in five key ways. First, rather than being a concern with weapons, human security is mostly defined with the notions of human life and dignity. Second, unlike traditional security which was bounded by the borders of individual states, human security is presented as a universal concern unconstrained by territorial borders. In UN Human security now it is been said as such "human security broadens the focus from the security of borders to the lives of people and communities inside and across those borders" (UN, 2003: 12-14). Most threats, which endanger human security, are common to most people, although it is acknowledged that the intensity of the threat may differ.

Third, it is argued that all of the components of human security are interdependent. And different threats to human security are related, mutually enforcing, and likely to have global repercussions. Fourth, the provision of human security is thought to be much easier to achieve through early prevention rather than through

intervention at later stages. Finally, unlike realist security understanding, which is state-centred, human security, focuses on individuals (UNDP, 1995: 229).

All in all it can be suggested that human security is a concept which has different aspects related with the human development, human rights and sustainable development since its very premise is to enhance the human betterment and human fulfilment. And the very point of it when doing so is to put the individual at the heart of the debate. Therefore it becomes highly related with the frameworks which are carrying liberal political principals in their premises. However, the human security concept can be seen as a different concept than the human development, human rights, sustainable development and state security. But rather, it complements their essential elements in varying different aspects.

The EU as an influential actor in the world scene has to deal with increasing rates of poverty, and of natural disasters as well as violent conflicts all over the world. However the current structure and capabilities of the EU affect the ways to deal with the issues of human security. It appears that EU's perspective on development has a great impact on its view of human security. It can be argued that particularly through a wider scope of sustainable development in promoting democratic values, reducing poverty and enhancing the capabilities of developing countries for their own development the EU tries to achieve human security. Yet examining the overall human security agenda of the EU would certainly provide a significant contribution to the discussions on the human security.

V. EUROPEAN UNION AND HUMAN SECURITY

With its nearly 400 million people, European Union (EU) is the third largest geographical landscape of the world after China and India. It is considered to be one of the greatest powers of today's world. The Union's gradual size in geography, economic impact in commercial, economic and financial terms makes the EU a globally important power. And it is a fact that the Union accounts for the greatest share of world trade and generates one quarter of the global wealth (EC, 2007a).

Together with these economic facts, the Union is conscious about its global weight in economic and commercial terms and search for its own interests. Nevertheless it can also be argued that the EU tries to promote prosperity and supports democratic values around the world through different means. It tries to show its best endeavours to consolidate stability and human well-being within and outside of its borders. Not through by imposing its general principles but creating a geographical space of stability and economic welfare inside its frontiers and in the outside world it tries to influence the third countries in a way that they themselves gain the desire to change. Enlargement as a foreign policy tool for the diffusion of the European rules of governance and the style of living has reshaped the member countries of today's enlarged EU in most of the ways. And it can be assumed that with the integration of new countries into the EU, the Union's role on the international scene is strengthened.

There have been many efforts to date to conceptualise the EU as an international actor. Starting with Francois Duchêne's civilian power concept, actorness of the EU in the international arena has raised many questions about the characteristics of EU [9]. Through Manner's concept of normative power the emphasis was placed upon the ideological power of the EU and the construction of a European identity (Scheippers

---

[9] Ian Manners argues that EU is a normative power since it "promotes a series of normative principles that are generally acknowledged within the United Nations system to be universally applicable …" (Manners, 2008;66) and that there are "nine substantive normative principles which both constitute and promoted by, the EU are sustainable peace, freedom democracy, human rights, rule of law, equality, social solidarity, sustainable development and good governance" (Manners, 2008;66).

and Sicurelli; 2007: 436–438). Particularly the EU's efforts to multilateralism in the cases of institutionalism of the International Criminal Court and ratification of the Kyoto Protocol and the support for the Post Kyoto negotiations support the idea that EU is a normative power. It is argued that in each case though the EU has different opinions among the Member States, is able to accomplish its normative role by emphasizing its commitments to international law and multilateralism (Scheippers and Sicurelli; 2007:447). In brief it appears that the since the EU tries to promote certain norms and values at the international arena it is regarded as a normative power. This also fits with particularly the EU's endeavour to promote 'freedom from want' aspect of human security through different mechanisms.

The EU is the world's biggest trader; but it is also the biggest provider of aid to developing countries. It has created a more pro-active foreign and security policy with the capacity to carry out crisis-management and peace-keeping missions within Europe and far beyond. In today's complex world, the EU has added new tools to the traditional instruments of foreign policy. It has, for instance, taken the international lead in tackling the issue of global warming and climate change with the idea that global problems need to be solved globally. Therefore, it can be assumed that EU is one of the most powerful actors who has the willingness to support human development its domestic and foreign affairs. These attempts that the Union has precluded are the reason why the EU can be considered as an international organisation that pursues in the way of human security.

However, what makes the European Union a powerful global and a unique actor in the international arena can be found in the idea behind its very foundations and the role that it pursues in international relations. The early foundation of the idea for a political union rests upon the belief that a Europe of peace is possible with after so long and prolonged years of hatred between the nation states. It is possible to live together without having battles and agreeing on the same denominators to preserve peacefully not only inside its borders but also with the countries that surrounds it (Liotta and Owen, 2006). Accordingly, as some claim the European Union itself can be viewed as a perpetual peace project, according to which nation-states continue to exist but agree not

to go to war with each other and to adhere to certain standards, particularly standards of democracy and human rights (Glasius and Kaldor, 2004).

In 50 years, the EU has brought together 27 countries which have successfully pooled economic and political resources in the common interest. And for so long, the Union served as a model for cooperation and integration between countries in other regions. It is argued that the EU has acted for the global solidarity by supporting economic development and political stability in the wider world which is an investment for the EU to make life safer within its frontiers for its own citizens. Therefore, at this point it begins to be considered as an example for the rest of the world and where it begins to help the other countries who are in need of help.

When the single market was built in Europe, Europe experienced within its borders many of the pressures and tensions being recapitulated on a global scale. It has been discovered directly that economy can be preserved more efficiently without destroying social cohesion; without giving any harm to the poorest member states; and that environmental standards and social justice were enhanced not degraded as more states become EU members (Mabey and Burke, 2006). Together with the Union's strong belief in the support of humanity and the long lasted efforts to sustain or to spread human rights and democratic principles all around the world, the Union did create new policy areas for the developing countries and the countries that are in need of emergent recovery. It can clearly be seen in its development cooperation tools for the third world countries as well as its neighbourhood policy which are designed to be served as a model for the third countries to give them the initiative to be developed without enhancing insecurity or harming environment and supporting market economies.

When we choose to identify the human security literature basically regarding its strong relationship with the human development narratives, the EU has served as a useful model with its long-lasted soft-power and *sui-generis* structure for the development and security for both human and the states. The development policies of the Union are highly in line with the Millennium development goals and the EU is regarded as one of the most advocative actors of the development world wide.

Therefore it is necessary to analyse the EU's way of understanding the development and in its contribution to the literature with its way of understanding human development and how the Union perceives human betterment as stated in the human security paradigm.

5.1. EU's Perspective on Development

At the beginning of the twenty-first century, the EU stands out as an important regional organisation with its sui-generous structure and a unique entity. And all the relationships that it entertains were formalized relations with all other groups of states. Although, during these years much of its attention was paid to its internal integration, obviously Union was not willing to stay as an isolated entity from international realm. Instead it has expressed its desire and ambition to take a prominent and important role in the working of international relations (Arts and Dickson, 2004:1). In addition to establishing good relationships with potential political and economic international partners, the EU also wishes to use its place in the international arena as a vehicle to advocate and spread some of its values which it considers important. Among these values the most important ones are democracy, social and human development, human rights, the rule of law and political liberalism.

Hence, the EU perceives the Development Cooperation policy as an important way of achieving these goals. Therefore, an impressive and unique record of development cooperation policy has been built over time. Until the 1990s, the African, Caribbean and Pacific Countries (ACP) were stated as the Europe's most preferred developing country partners, and the ACP-EU relations have become one of the most influential and important part of the EU development cooperation programme. ACP-EU relations dated back to the early beginning of the European Economic Community in 1957 and were elaborated in Yaoundé and then in Lome Conventions and the 2000 Cotonou Agreement (Arts and Dickson, 2004: 2). All these efforts have indicated that with the growing number of poorest countries partnership, EU was prepared to buck up international development especially for the Third world countries. The support was given basically to the ACP countries in the field of agricultural commodities and financial composition (Arts and Dickson, 2004).

However, despite the fact that EU is the biggest collective donor in the field of development aid and the most influential actor in the field of contribution to the North-South relationships- where the development cooperation principles are relying on- the Union's attempts to make the development cooperation remained less influential when compared with the other international donors and less proportionate in the international fora. And the attempts remained as a symbolic gesture from the EU that was conveyed to the ACP countries for a long time since the beginning of the 2000s where the European Commission has made further initiatives to take the development policy of the Union a more comprehensive and definite external policy tool.

Henceforth, development with its core objectives represented to be at the heart of the EU's external action, along with its foreign, security and trade policies. And the European Commission made it perfectly clear that the primary and the very objective of EU development policy was the eradication of poverty in the context of sustainable development, including the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. This attempt has paved the way for the EU to produce much more comprehensive view with the new human development objectives recently and therefore being a supporter for the human security principals by preserving the human betterment idea. This was put straightforwardly in the April 2000 the European Commission Document 'Communication on the European Community (CEC)'s Development Policy' as such:

> Development policy is today one of the three principal components of the EU's external action, alongside the trade policy and the political dimension. In addition to the objectives specific to development policy, other factors- such as geopolitics, trade, and global environmental problems-that affect the EU's external choices. In this context, the EU's objective interests have led it to give priority to stability and development of neighbouring countries and to aid for countries in crises in the regions nearest to the EU (EC, 2000:4).

In order to achieve the goals that the EU is willing to pursue and to make the development cooperation a more efficient and coherent policy area. The EU action in the field of development is redefined and extended by the 'European Consensus on Development' which is signed on 20 December 2005, whereby EU Member States, the

Council, the European Parliament and the Commission agreed to a common EU vision on development (EC, 2008a).

The European Consensus on development is a policy statement that reflects the EU's willingness to eradicate poverty and build a more stable and equitable world. It can be said that apart from other development policies of the Union the Consensus basically represents every aspects of the field of human development in a more comprehensive way (EC, 2005). It also shows how the development cooperation and its content has evolved during these years. The Consensus identifies shared values, goals, commitments and principles which the European Commission and the Member States will further implement their development policies, in particular:

- **Reducing poverty** - particularly focusing on the Millennium Development Goals which will help meet other challenges such as sustainable development, HIV/AIDS, security, conflict prevention, forced migration, etc., to bring about equitable globalisation. It has been stated under the common objectives that the eight MDGs are to: eradicate extreme poverty and hunger; achieve universal primary education; promote gender equality and empower women; reduce the mortality rate of children; improve maternal health; combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases; ensure environmental sustainability and develop a global partnership for development and EU reaffirms its commitment to these issues (EC, 2005:5).

- **Development based on Europe's democratic values -** respect for human rights, democracy, fundamental freedoms and the rule of law, good governance, gender equality, solidarity, social justice and effective multilateral action, particularly through the UN (EC, 2008b)

- **Developing countries will be responsible for their own development** - based on national strategies developed in collaboration with non-government bodies, and mobilising domestic resources. EU aid will be aligned with these national strategies and procedures (EC, 2008b).

And finally the Consensus reaffirms that the development aid that the EU pursues for the third countries will continue to support poor people in all developing countries, including both low-income and middle-income countries (MICs).

It appears that the EU will continue to prioritise support to the least-developed and other low-income countries (LICs) to achieve more balanced global development, while recognising the value of concentrating the aid activities of each Member State in areas and regions where they have comparative advantages and can add most value to the fight against poverty (EC, 2005).

It can be clearly estimated that the Union has changed its vision into a more comprehensive network of development which is also in line with the changing human development and the major points what is stated under the human security agenda, part of which is to defend human betterment for all and enhancing the human choices in a more globalised world by reducing the inequalities.

The European Development policy in general depends on EU's partnership and dialogue with the developing countries to promote respect for human rights, fundamental freedoms, peace, democracy, good governance, and gender equality, the rule of law, solidarity and justice. European Community's contribution to this process is therefore focusing on certain areas of intervention and responding to the needs of partner countries. There are nine intervention areas that are agreed by the Community. The main features of these areas can be summarised as such:

1) **Trade and regional integration** is in general to deal with the aid for trade, private sector development and EU-Africa Business Forum for the African-Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries. The Commission stresses that trade is the most important factor for development and growth and further suggest that trade policies can provide opportunities for promoting economic development and tackling poverty reduction. Therefore, as the world's largest single market and the largest importer of products from ACP countries, the EU has a particular responsibility in helping these countries to make the most of trade for development (EC, 2008c). In October 2007, the Commission and the EU

governments adopted an EU Aid for Trade strategy to help developing better integrate into the world trading system and more effectively use trade to reduce poverty. The strategy commits the EU to channel more resources to Aid for Trade instrument and to do more for the delivery aids more effectively (Council of the EU, 2007). The strategy reconfirms the EU commitment of € 2 billion in trade-related assistance annually by 2010 and also commits to increasing total aid for trade in line with increases in EU overseas development assistance (Council of the EU, 2007: 3). The strategy shows its strong emphasis on poverty reduction, including through joint work to better understand the linkages between aid for trade and poverty and enhance EU and beneficiaries' capacity to plan and implement funding accordingly. An increased and improved EU support for regional integration is another tool which is given particular attention (Council of the EU, 2007). With regards to the ACP countries, the strategy specifies the ACP countries' needs as of the regional integration and economic partnership agreements. In this regard, the EU to allocate around 50% of the increase in trade related assistance to the needs expressed by the ACPs (Council of the EU, 2007:12). The figures below show the EU's aid for trade allocation by year.

Table 5-1: Increases in 3 key categories of Aid for Trade, 2001-06:

EC & EU Member States (€m)	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Total
Trade policy and regulation	68	194	236	146	229	484	1,358
Trade-related infrastructure	2 303	2 269	2 551	2 166	3 451	3 255	15 995
Building productive capacity	2 785	2 747	2 486	2 458	2 879	3 539	16 894

Source: (EC, 2008d).

Overall aid for trade including trade-related assistance increased from €5.1bn (2001-04 average) to€7.3bn in 2006. Total EU overseas development assistance also increased - from€34.7bn in 2004 to €47.7bn in 2006 (EC, 2008). [13]By the 2007 EC met its €1billion target for Trade Related Assistance. Total EC funded Aid for Trade also increased in 2007 to over €3.26bn (EC, 2008d).

Table 5-2: Geographical spread of EU aid for trade

EC + EU Member States Aid for Trade combined	€m - average 2001-06	%	€m 2006	%
Sub-Saharan Africa	1 718.7	39.5	1 994.5	40.7
Asia + Pacific	1 216.0	27.9	1 358.4	27.7
Mediterranean	518.2	11.9	611.4	12.5
Europe	457.6	10.5	660.7	13.5
Latin America + Caribbean	442.7	10.2	280.2	5.7
SUB-TOTAL	4 353	100	4 905	100
Regional/global	1 273		2 357	
TOTAL	5 626		7 262	
ACP	1 854	42.6	2 083	42.5

Source: (EC, 2008d).

---

[13] for detailed information see EU aid for trade regulations, European Commission development policy homepage, 9 intervention areas, aid for trade, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/development/policies/9interventionareas/trade/aid-for-trade_en.cfm#5, accessed on 12.01.2009

2) **The environment and the sustainable management of natural resources;**

Since the environmental degradation is one of the most serious threats to the developing world, EU begins to pay more attention to the use of natural resources for the livelihoods of human beings. Therefore under the environment policy EU hopes to deal with the environment integration, sustainable management of natural resources, biodiversity, climate change, forest, disaster risk reduction and sustainable land management. The Commission further states that environmental sustainability is the key to reduce poverty alleviation and sustainable development. EU supports environmental integration by its 'Environment Integration Strategy' which was adopted on 10 April 2001 by the European Commission. The Strategy outlines the way that the EC economic and development co-operation can best assist the developing country partners to respond to the environmental challenges that they are facing in the overall context of poverty reduction (EC, 2001). Therefore, it can be said that environmental integration was adapted to the EU development policy framework. Under the sustainable management of natural resources, land degradation and deforestation issues have been highlighted which both are fundamental in achieving the UN Millennium Development goals[14]. Further, the European Commission adapted an action plan on climate change and development in 2003 which is designed for the adaptation of climate change into the development cooperation area. The plan is to ensure climate change is incorporated into all aspects of EU development policy. In 2006 European Commission presented the report 'Acting together: a Common Commitment to the Global Environment' International cooperation on biodiversity, climate change and desertification (EC, 2006a). In 2007,

---

[14] EU gives its support to the related fields by contributing to international multilateral agreements and decision- making and managing a range of development tools such as dedicated funds for biodiversity, desertification and sustainable management of natural resources. About Climate Change Union has made its biggest contribution especially through the leading role it played in the international decision-making process. Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has made a strong case for early action against climate change, and the European Union has taken a leadership role by proposing far reaching measures to achieve the long-term goal of stabilising global temperature rise to 2 C degrees. This proposal spells out the EU position in the forthcoming negotiations on a post-2012 multilateral agreement on emission reductions 2012 being the end of the Kyoto Protocol under the UNFCCC - United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (EC, 2009). Available at: European Commission Development policy homepage, environment.http://ec.europa.eu/development/policies/9interventionareas/environment_en.cfm#integr ation , accessed on 21.02.2009.

Commission of the European Communities has published another report to the Council about 'Building a Global Climate Change Alliance between the European Union and poor developing countries which are most vulnerable to climate change. The report estimates that spend €60m in 2008-10 to create awareness and jointly address climate change between the EU and the most vulnerable developing countries typically least developed countries and small island developing states (EC, 2007c:9-10). About all of the other spectrums which fall under the achievement of sustainable development EU has also taken under the development cooperation policy framework.

3) **Infrastructure, communication and transport:** The primary objective is to invest on transport, energy, and water and information structure for the ACP countries. Because it is a certain fact that developing infrastructure helps sustainable economic growth, competitive trade, employment under good conditions, regional integration and poverty reduction as stated in the Millennium development goals. For this purpose, EU provides 80% of its development aid for the ACP countries, and 30 % is mostly for transport under the European Development Fund (EC, 2009a). In transport, the EU aims to provide better and cheaper services. It tries to accomplish better maintained transport assets, new trade corridors without borders, new ports including modern infrastructure and services (EC, 2009a). Meeting basic needs and improving integrated water-resources management at local, river basin/catchment, national and cross-border levels is another important variable that the Union tries to achieve in the field of sustainable use of finite resources (EC, 2009a). Better policy frameworks, more institutional capacity, better power generation, cross-border interconnections, grid extension and rural distribution. Developing broadband infrastructure and non-commercial e-services linked to regional and national networks. Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) touch all sectors of life from education (e-learning) to government (e-government) (EC, 2009a).

4) **Water and sanitation:** The major aim of the water and sanitation policy is to reach the targets that were outlined in the Millennium Summit of UN. According

to the Millennium Development goals the water target till 2015 will be to halve the proportion of people without sustainable access to drinking water. And the sanitation target is to halve the proportion of people without sustainable access to sanitation by 2015 (UN, 2000). In line with the UN goals respectively, EU decidedly works on this path to make a significant contribution. Today, the EU provides close to €1.5bn each year for water and sanitation programmes in developing countries – making it the biggest contributor. EU development policy promotes an integrated framework for water resources management, drawing on European experience with managing river basins and jointly managing trans-boundary rivers, and a whole range of European approaches to managing water and sanitation services (EC, 2008e). The EU also works to improve prosperity, stability and security in its 'neighbourhood countries' around the Mediterranean Sea and along the Eastern border of the EU.

> National and regional support programmes between 2000-07, the EU gave € 475 M to support government water and sanitation programmes in 16 countries in Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific between 2008-10, the EU will give € 100 M each year to neighbouring states along its southern and eastern borders to support water and sanitation programmes some € 440 M is being provided to 7 Mediterranean countries – for policy support and infrastructure development some € 100 M goes to support policy and technical assistance in Latin America water is the focus of the new EU environmental programme in central Asia– intended to enhance regional stability through trans-boundary water cooperation. Other important water programmes have focused on water supply and sanitation in India and river basin management in China (EC, 2008e).[17]

Water and sanitation is one of the biggest problems that the earth is facing. For this reason it is one of the priority areas that the Union also tries to find ways to tackle the issue. The European Commission suggests that access to safe drinking water remains as a distant dream and it is the main reason for most of the people to suffer from diarrhoea, tuberculosis and cholera and other water-borne diseases. Access to basic sanitation is as important as access to drinking water. But, some

---

[17]   Available at European Commission Development Policy homepage, 9 intervention areas, water and sanitation,
http://ec.europa.eu/development/policies/9interventionareas/waterenergy/water/water_sanitation_en.cfm
Accessed on 12.01.2009

2.6 billion people – nearly half of the world's population – do not have decent toilets. The consequences are disastrous: more than 4 500 children under the age of 5 years die each day from preventable diseases caused by pollution, dirty water and poor hygiene. The lack of clean water, hygiene and basic sanitation is a great human tragedy (EC, 2009b). For this reason, EU development policy promotes an integrated framework for water resources management and a whole range of European approaches to managing water and sanitation services.

5) **Energy**: Ever since the entire development policy network is designed to be in line with the Millennium Development Goals, European Energy Security has also become a form of external foreign policy tool for the EU. It is understandable that a Union that has merged the security- development nexus each other is also willing to tackle the energy security under the development framework. And this simply explains why both conflict management, climate change and energy security now operate both under the 'sustainable economic growth' axis in EU debates on attaining MDG's (Hadfield, 2008:2). The possible principles of Energy Policy for Europe were elaborated at the Commission's green paper 'A European Strategy for Sustainable, Competitive and Secure Energy' on 8 March 2006. The Commission made it clear in 2006 that tackling energy issues had to be done in a three-fold way: by prioritising the environment, adhering to various market principles that balanced competition with regulation, and integrating the various implications of energy security (EC, 2006c: 105). Like development and security, energy security is also linked to external dimensions which has clarified that there is a need for an external energy security policy for the Union. Adopting a common voice on energy issues with third parties means a start for an external dimension of the 2007-2009 Energy policy for Europe in general (Council of the EU, 2007a: 14)[19]. It also means a more country-specific approach in which broad forms of development assistance to states in sub-Saharan Africa, the Mediterranean and

---

19 Council of the EU, 2007, Presidency Conclusions of the Brussels European Council, 9 March 2007:14, Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/development/icenter/repository/conclusion_conseil_ energy_ presidence_allemande_en.pdf
 accessed on 18.01.2009

Eastern European and even Central Asian states can efficiently build strategic security relationships, and effectively underwrite a host of new energy partnerships (Hadfield, 2008: 3). However, it can be assumed that security-conscious development aid can help the EU claim leadership in the battle against climate change, as well as to benefit by transforming energy-endowed under-developed states into sustainable economies trading in energy products. The triple nexus in which energy security now features emerged as a key feature of the 2007 Africa-EU Strategic Partnership. The Partnership strives 'to bridge the development divide between Africa and Europe' in which the multiple objectives of 'peace, security, prosperity' and 'sustainable development' chime together to create a more stable African region, better political partnership and enhanced co-operation with the EU, and the achievement of the MDG's in Africa by 2015 (Council of the EU,2007b:2-4).[20]

The EU's 220 million euro Energy facility is designed to address the roots of energy poverty, with the new budget for energy infrastructure projects increase the amount of money for the poor communities to access energy networks. It can be clearly stated that the EU now considers the energy security as a key for development (Hadfield, 2008). However, it is also a societal and transformative way of affecting the countries that are both producers and partners. Therefore, energy security as a development assistance tool may result in the improvement of the respective countries' governance standards. Good governance, and underwritten by conflict management is now the binding tool between development aid and sustainable access to energy goals for the Union (Hadfield, 2008: 3).

6) **Rural development, territorial planning, agriculture and food security:** EU policy on rural development in developing countries is based on its paper

---

[20] The Africa-EU Strategic Partnership: A Joint Africa EU Strategy document, released on 2007 , Available at: European Commission Development policy homepage, 9 Intervention areas, energy, http://ec.europa.eu/development/icenter/repository/EAS2007_joint_strategy_en.pdf, accessed on 02.02.2009

'Fighting Rural Poverty' which seeks to reduce poverty, increase food security and protects natural resources. The paper identifies six policy goals as such:

> Supporting economic policies aimed at broad-based growth ensuring more equitable access to land, markets and services education and training sustainable use of natural resources managing risks and providing safety nets building more effective, accountable, decentralised and participatory institutions (EC, 2002: 14).

Since it has been recognised as a fact that rural development and food security are one of the major obstacles for the poverty elevation and economic growth, EU henceforth take rural development and food security as a development policy tool as it is also considered to be one of the goals to be achieved under the MDG's. Today, EC is the leading international player in the field of food security. Until 2007, the Food security budget line provided on average € 450 million per year to support a wide range of food security programmes, from food aid in situations of crisis, to sectoral budget support where long-term development cooperation addresses chronic malnutrition (EC, 2008f). In May 2008, the Commission has launched a Communication to respond to the high food prices crisis. After discussion in the European Parliament & Council, the Commission proposal for a 1 billion Euros facility has been approved in December (EC, 2008f).

Food security refers to the availability of food and one's access to it. A household is considered food secure when its occupants do not live in hunger or fear of starvation (UNDP, 2003:89). Addressing hunger means ensuring that people have command over the resources especially income which is needed to acquire food. Hunger is more than just a lack of available food but rather it is a problem of deficiencies in food entitlement and deprivations in related essential services such as health care, education, safe drinking water, adequate sanitation (UNDP, 2003). Therefore, food security differs from food availability in which it indicates a person's command of food entitlement with income and thus a person may consume, rather than what is available in the market.

7) **Governance, democracy, human rights and support for economic and institutional reforms:** As underlined several times by many international

institutions democratic governance processes are crucial for sustainable development, poverty reduction, stability and security. In 2006 Commission report 'Governance in the European Consensus on Development', it has been stated that poverty reduction and the Millennium Development Goals would not be achieved without significant progress in the areas of economic, social, environmental and political governance (EC 2006d: 1). For so long, it is estimated that development, human rights, peace and security are mutually reinforcing. The Union therefore clearly links peace and security issues with the rule of law, human rights, democratic governance, eradicating poverty, promoting sustainable development and reducing the inequalities that lie at the heart of main challenges that the world faces. Democratic governance is identified in the report as follows:

> The European Consensus on Development sets out the EU's approach and contribution to this approach, identifying good governance, democracy and respect for human rights as integral to the process of sustainable development and as major objectives of EU development policy. The substantial increase in the volume of aid expected over the next few years demands the establishment of governance that will guarantee the efficiency and effectiveness of this new EU aid. The MDG's cannot, however, be achieved by financial resources alone. Community policies each having an external dimension need also to contribute to good governance. Means that the EU has at its disposal are various, including political dialogue, conflict prevention measures, cooperation with regional and international organisations, thematic programmes, electoral observation, as well as national development programmes, subject to multi-annual joint programming. The political dialogue and development aid programming addressed in this communication (EC, 2006d: 3)

In fact, the European Union approaches governance in a very comprehensive framework. The debate on governance sometimes tends to focus only on corruption and ignore all other aspects in the EU policy framework. Even tough it is not only the issue of corruption, the EU takes an extremely firm stance on this matter, viewing corruption as a major obstacle to achieving development goals; it nevertheless sees it as a symptom of poor governance and of a lack of transparent, accountable management and control systems. Tackling corruption must not be addressed in isolation but integrated into development and poverty reduction strategies and into support for the processes of 'democratic governance' (EC

2006d: 6). In order to make this happen and help create a more transparent system for financing political parties, and support for parliamentary elections, and strengthening civil society and the media and for other judicial and public institutions, governance has been put at the heart of the cooperation strategies between the EU and 77 partner countries in Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific (the ACP countries). An additional amount of € 2.7 billion has been allocated, on top of the country allocation, to partner countries that have put forward a credible plan of governance reforms (EC, 2009b).

As for the human rights and democracy promotion, the Union is one of the biggest and most influential actors especially when it comes to giving support to the third world countries. In 2007, European Commission External Relations has published a report for 'Furthering Human Rights and Democracy across the Globe'. The report, in the fist place, outlines the earliest efforts that the Union has done for the promotion of human rights and democracy both for the neighbouring and the third world countries. And the report further mentions about the Union's central approach as the human security of people around the globe, therefore it can be clearly estimated that Union has a willingness to pursue the way of human security which is a dedicated effort as a comprehensive security going beyond the security of states, and encompassing both freedom form fear and want (EC, 2007b: 5)[23]. About mainstreaming it is meant to be integrating human rights and democratisation throughout the EU policies, programmes and projects. EU's work in this line is guided by the human rights guidelines that the EU is issued on the death penalty, torture, dialogue between third countries, children affected by armed conflicts, as well as by the international conventions, which translate into the founding treaties of the European Union (EC, 2007b). Through the European Instrument for Democracy and Human rights (EIDHR) which currently has an

---

[23] It is a fact the Union has been pursuing an active human rights policy with its partners for many years, through political dialogue, human rights clauses in its agreements with partner countries, in the international arena as well as through development aid programmes, in particular European Initiative for Human Rights and Democracy (EIHRD) which till 2007 stands for the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights. European Union has taken a two-way approach for the promotion of democracy and human rights. The first is; mainstreaming human rights concerns into all its policies and programmes, second; it finances specific projects to promote and protect human rights (EC, 2007: 5).

annual average budget of nearly € 140 million, the EU funds a broad range of human rights projects around the world (EC, 2007b:17-18). It can be clearly emphasized that the Union has made human rights and democracy promotion central to its external relations through its development assistance and cooperation. But it is certainly a fact that even before transforming the third parties into their way to tackle human rights and democracy, the Union is aware of the fact that it begins at home in the first place. The early foundations of the Union rest upon the belief of liberty, democracy, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the rule of law those are which the founding principles of the EU and the prerequisite for the Union's legitimacy. In order to achieve these goals, EU as a supranational entity for itself and for its member states signed up wide range of international and regional human rights treaties, by this way the member countries human rights records became subject to scrutiny of international bodies of the Council of Europe and the United Nations (EC, 2007b: 7).[24]

The EU took a considerable step in integrating human rights and democratic principles into its external policies with the entry into force of the Treaty of the European Union in 1993[25]. The EU uses its own legal system and other international documents as a way of promoting human rights and democratisation in its eternal relations. Some of these tools are traditional diplomacy and foreign policy, such as 'declarations, diplomatic representations to third countries, as well as resolutions and interventions within the UN framework' (EC, 2007b: 9).

---

[24] The Union starting from the establishment of the Council of Europe in 1949 has created a system of regulations and guidelines for the aspects of human rights through the later initiatives. Following the Council of Europe and the Protection of Human rights in 1949, the Council of Europe has adopted the European Convention for the Protection of Human rights and Fundamental Freedoms in 1950. The attempts further enhanced through the establishment of the European Court for Human rights by the European Convention of Human rights. All of these documents have created an international enforcement mechanism both for the Union itself and for the countries abroad, where the Union while after begin to use these principles as a policy tool and guidance with its relationship with the partner countries through its development cooperation and assistance (EC, 2007b).

[25] It states that EU's Common Foreign and Security policy is the development and consolidation of democracy, rule of law and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms (EC, 2007b). The Treaty of Amsterdam which entered into force in May 1999 reaffirmed EU's commitment to the respect for human rights and democracy promotion respectively. The Treaty of the EU which has established the Copenhagen Criteria for the candidate countries to enter into the Union, has decidedly underlined that the respect for human rights, rule of law and democracy and the fundamental freedoms are the very essential that the candidate countries shall pursue (EC, 2007b).

Besides, the EU tries to promote human rights and democratisation through various co-operation and assistance programmes it implements with third countries and through the political dialogues that it conducts with them. In doing so it uses a specific legal basis: a 'human rights clause' that is incorporated in nearly all EU agreements with third countries, as an essential element (EC, 2007b:9-11). The 'human rights clause' is a systematic tool which was included in European Community agreements with the third countries since the mid 1990s. The clause stipulates that respect for human rights and democratic principles are binding for both parties of the agreement. And in any case of the breach in these principles, this allows Union to take some measures against the third country. For example; 'imposing targeted restrictive measures on the third country' or even in case of the termination of essential elements, the agreement may be held to be suspended (EC, 2007b: 12).

Therefore, it can be said that the Union rather pursues a positive way of action instead of punishment. In its Common Foreign and Security policy (CFSP), for example, the Union has a wide range of policy tools which are been used to promote human rights and democracy. CFSP sets out guidelines rely on EU policy towards third countries on specific human rights themes, such as; regarding death penalty (1998), torture, other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment (2001), human rights dialogues (2001), children in armed conflict (2003), human rights defenders (2004), rights of the child (2007) (EC, 2009c).[26]

The European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) is another external policy tool which was developed in 2004 by the European Commission, with the objective of avoiding the emergence of new dividing lines between the enlarged EU and its neighbours and instead strengthening the 'prosperity, stability and security of all' concerned (EC, 2004:2). In this way, the EU offers its neighbours a privileged relationship, building upon a mutual commitment to common values (democracy

---

[26] European Commission External Relations homepage, EU Human Rights guidelines, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/human_rights/guidelines/index.htm, Accessed on 21.01.2009

and human rights, rule of law, good governance, market economy principles and sustainable development. [27]

Therefore, it can be said with these privileged relationships with the countries that are involved, EU seeks to preserve both its stability and security coming from the neighbouring countries by creating a more stabile and secure countries that are resting in its frontiers. The Union's efforts to promote democracy, the rule of law, democratic principles and the fundamental freedoms are still on the way, and it can be assumed that Union is one of the most influential actors in the international arena to affect the countries that are partnering to them, both for the security and stability of its own and the surveillance and the spread of the European model.

8) **Peace and Security:** It has been acknowledged by the EU that the long lasted wars and conflicts have devastating affects on human lives, which range from displaced people to wide-spread violence, the tragedy of refugee camps, HIV spreading, the break-down of socio-economic livelihood and state institutions. And these tragic events and their impacts last for generations not only those are affected by now (EC, 2008g). However, the Union's efforts in the field of security are more generally in the way of their linkage with the development studies. There is no doubt that European Union is one of the most advocative and influential actors regarding its support to the sustainable development field. It is estimated in most of the Commission reports and the Council conclusions that sustainable development will not be achieved unless peace and security is achieved, and without development and poverty eradication there will be no peace and security. The EU rests its efforts in the field of peace and security basically relying it on the security- development nexus and moves accordingly by making them central to the development policy of the Union. The root causes of the conflicts are generally described in the same footage as outlined in most of the United Nations

---

[27] In the ENP context the EU has also spelled out in concrete terms the progress expected from its neighbours as regards democracy and fundamental freedoms. Each ENP Country Report includes a specific chapter on the aspect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. The political chapter of each ENP Action Plan covers a wide area of human rights, governance and democratisation issues, with a varying emphasis and differentiation, aimed at attaining concrete objectives, such as to strengthen legal guarantees for freedom of speech, freedom of the press or freedom of assembly and association in accordance with international standards (EC, 2004: 15).

documents. Lack of development tools are in most cases the very reasons for violent conflicts, those of which are poverty, epidemics, lack of governance and the rule of law (EC, 2008g). Relying on this strong relationship between security and development, starting from 2003 European Security Strategy, Europe has chosen another path to follow to elaborate this linkage. The Strategy document gives prior attention to this linkage and underlines Europe's 'normative' and 'soft power' character to play a more significant role in crises management, conflict prevention and international peace as an alternative model to the US military power initiatives (EU,2003). 'Soft power' according to the founding father of the definition Prof. Joseph Nye is about non-coercive persuasion: 'getting others to want what you want' and it is also 'rests on the ability to set the political agenda in a way that shapes the preferences of others' (Nye, 2002: 9)[30].

This attempt will further lead to the report A Human security Strategy for the EU, which will be highlighting Europe's new way of understanding security based on generally individuals rather than the states and its new vision to tackle with the newly emerging security threats both towards the human and state security (Glasius and Kaldor, 2004). On this basis, the European Commission released its

---

[30] Joseph Nye coined the term "soft power" in the late 1980s. It is now used frequently--and often incorrectly--by political leaders, editorial writers, and academics around the world. So what is soft power? In his own terms "soft power lies in the ability to attract and persuade. Whereas hard power-- the ability to coerce--grows out of a country's military or economic might, soft power arises from the attractiveness of a country's culture, political ideals, and policies. Hard power remains crucial in a world of states trying to guard their independence and of non-state groups willing to turn to violence. It forms the core of the Bush administration's new national security strategy. But according to Nye, the neo-conservatives who advise the president are making a major miscalculation: They focus too heavily on using America's military power to force other nations to do our will, and they pay too little heed to our soft power. It is soft power that will help prevent terrorists from recruiting supporters from among the moderate majority. And it is soft power that will help us deal with critical global issues that require multilateral cooperation among states. That is why it is so essential that America better understands and applies our soft power. This book is our guide. Anti-Americanism has increased dramatically over the past few years. Polls show a sharp drop in the attractiveness of the United States around the world. We have lost a lot of our soft power the ability to get what we want by attracting rather than coercing others. I first developed the concept of soft power fifteen years ago to argue that the United States was not only the strongest country in military and economic power, but also in a third dimension of power. It is nice to see the concept being used by top political leaders and editorial writers around the world, but some have misunderstood it, misused it, and trivialized it as merely the influence of Coca-Cola, blue jeans, and money. Even more frustrating, some policy makers have ignored it and made us all pay the price by unnecessarily squandering our soft power. And that is why I have written this book--to explain the importance of soft power, outline a strategy for its use, and urge that we begin to take it more seriously. The United States used its soft power to win the Cold War. We can do it again to help in the war on terrorism" (Nye, 2005: 150-175).

Communication on 'Policy Coherence for Development – Accelerating progress towards attaining the Millennium Development Goals' and inviting Member States to take the work on security and development forward under the Framework of Policy Coherence for Development. It has been stated that the 'Policy Coherence for Development' (PCD) is a tool to assist in delivering effective development policies within the framework of the overall objective of improving the efficiency, coherence and visibility of the Union's external policies (EC, 2005: 2). The Policy Coherence for Development tool is in many ways important because of drawing a better coordination and interaction between development and security. Further, it gives voice to the EU Member States' concerns about the need to make better coordination between the first Community pillar and the Common Foreign and Security (CFSP) pillar. Their concerns relate both to the planning and the conduct of European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) missions which need to be better integrated within long-term, comprehensive development assistance programmes, in order for the overall EU intervention to be effective (EC, 2005).[31]

The European Commission decidedly emphasizes the direct linkage between the causes of poverty and security several times; this strong relationship is also seen in armed violence and poverty alleviation as well. Today's security challenges to development, security and stability range from energy dependence, climate changes -drought, food and water shortage, desertification, flooding-, the absence of global governance, the radicalisation of ideologies or religions, financial markets, the illegal and uncontrolled use of natural resources, the weakness of a state's structures and infrastructures. And any of these threats can no longer be tackled by only military means, but they altogether may provoke armed violence and conflicts. Therefore, making a successful peace building or to tackle with the post-conflict situations, the Union rather prefers to follow again a more comprehensive political network which is inline with the development policies.

---

[31] Commission Communication on 'Policy Coherence for Development – Accelerating progress towards attaining the Millennium Development Goals' – COM(2005)134 final of 12 April 2005 and May 2005 General Affairs and External Relations Council (GAERC) Conclusions on the Millennium Development Goals (Doc. 9266/05).

It has been a fact that CFSP/ ESDP are established to be the EU's collective response to the globalising world, and it is further developed for a unified action given by the Union against the security threats. However, it does not cover only military action, but also civilian crises management where the civilians are under threat. Because CFSP field also recognizes that security threats are going hand in hand with poverty and inequality and they may end up with violent conflicts. Therefore, CFSP, development, migration, trade other development policies must work together in a more comprehensive political tools and they must mutually reinforce each other. However, it is a fact that the EU has engaged several missions and operations, sometimes by its own initiatives and its own forces and sometimes together with the UN forces. [32]

Henceforth, it can be clearly estimated that the European Commission is increasingly working in favour of comprehensive policy networks in line with the development- security nexus. As such, it encompasses economic, social, environmental, state-building, democracy, security and human rights issues become convergent with the European Consensus on Development.

During the following years, the initiatives continued on making the foreign and security policies of the Union more converging with the development studies, especially with the environment issues. As it stands for as a fact that European Union today is the most influential actor in fighting with the global warming, climate change and sustainable development, the attempts further proceed to involve more green politics in the security approach of the Union. This is an important manevour not only because it is a new external political dimension for Europe but it is also important for the spread of the environmental problems as a

---

[32] For example, in Africa the EU supports the AU mission (AMIS) in Sudan/Darfur with financial and logistical resources. The EU also supports AU missions in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) (EUSEC, ARTEMIS, and EUPOL) as well as the creation of the African Stand-by Force. In Middle East 2006, an EU police mission was sent to Palestinian territories to support the Palestinian Authority in establishing sustainable and effective policy. In 2005, several hundred EU personnel were deployed to watch the cease-fire, the demobilisation and disarmament of rebels and the return to normal levels of police and military operations in Indonesian province Aceh (Council of the European Union).
Available at: European Union Development Cooperation homepage, Europe promotes peace and security, http://www.consilium.eu.int/showPage.aspx?id=1252 & lang=en, accessed on 11.01.2009

security issue around the globe. Also, it can be stated that Europe wants to proceed with its development goal through the security of individuals with its normative power character. A good example can be the conference report on 'Greening Foreign and Security Policy: The Role of Europe' which was held in the European Parliament in 2006. The report outlines a programme focusing on mainstreaming environmental and sustainable development factors into European foreign and security policy (European Parliament, 2006)[33]. The aim has been to promote the implementation of an integrated strategy for environment, sustainable development and security - or the better inclusion of environmental security aspects in the EU Common Foreign and Security Policy, European Security Strategy and European Sustainable Development Strategy (European Parliament, 2006:3-5). It can be said that there is an inclination of making European Security policies more integrated with the environmental issues, and it is for sure the attempts will further proceed.

9) **Human development:** The European Commission outlines human development as the heart of development and the ultimate objective of development policy. It is a broad-based issue that it covers not only social development such as health and education, but it also includes gender equality, children and youth, employment and cultural diversity. This broad based issue has been reflected in the Millennium Development Goals which the EU development policy is based upon (EC, 2008h).

It has been stated that human and social developments are key strategic elements of the 'European Consensus for Development', which clearly states the importance of investing in people to ensure that development is both viable and sustainable. It is a fact that development is about people, further it is about empowering people and their choices in their lives. Empowering people means giving them opportunities for to grow out of poverty strengthen the vulnerable and creating opportunities for all. In order to achieve these goals, apart from regional aid programmes, the Union has created a budget line for human development

---

[33] Conference held on European Parliament Conference on Greening Foreign and Security Policy: The role of Europe held on December 2006, Brussels

which is called 'Investing in People'.[35] The thematic programme 'Investing in People' was published in 2006 as a financial instrument for development cooperation. It pursues a broad approach to development, poverty reduction and social cohesion and it is been prepared in accordance with the Member countries ambition to achieve Millennium Development Goals (European Parliament and European Council, 2006: 4). Therefore, the programme outlines 4 main policy areas which are relevant with the MDG's. 1) Good health for all, 2) education, knowledge and skills, 3) gender equality, 4) other aspects of human and social development. [36]

Henceforth, it can be said the Union by identifying the human development as the end spectrum of development policies, it makes both the EU's efforts in reaching the Millennium Development goals more possible and also made all the development initiatives more relevant and mutually reinforcing with each other. Therefore, the development perspective of the Union has become in line with the security policies which includes peace building, and conflict prevention in one side and the other social aspects of development like environment, gender issues, social and economic cohesion, poverty elevation on the other, which are to end up to achieve the human development goal in the end. It is certainly a fact that the EU's perspective on development is highly interlinked with the human security literature which puts the human development, human betterment which is meant to be the fulfilment of human choices at the heart of the debate.

---

[35] For further information see Regulation (EC) No 1905/2006 of the European Parliament and the Council of 18 December 2006 establishing a financing instrument for development cooperation. 27.12.2006, p. 41

[36] Under the health pillar, the programme will focus on human crises in health care systems in EU's partner countries and the particular attention will be given to poverty-related diseases such as HIV/AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis which are severally damaging all human and social development efforts. In the area of education, knowledge and skills, main focus will be on promotion of universal access to primary education and promoting vocational education and skills. The gender equality pillar will be mainly dealing with the empowerment of women and improvement of literacy among adult women, and will supplement activities in the other three areas, where addressing gender concerns and issues should be part of the relevant thematic action. The fourth pillar, other aspects of human and social development (employment and social cohesion, children, youth and culture) – will cover advancement of employment, decent work and social cohesion in the EC's partner countries and will also create a platform to support action and initiatives on youth, children's rights and prevention of all forms of child labour, trafficking, violence and other forms of exploitation. This area will also support activities to protect and promote cultural diversity (EC Regulation, 2006:4-6)

5.2. Towards a Human Security Doctrine for Europe

In numerous governmental and international reports that focus on the human security concept, emphasize that the concept heavily relies on the UN core assumptions in defining the human security concept the 'freedom from want' that gives its priority to the economic insecurities, poverty alleviation, political and social freedoms and 'freedom from fear'- which is rigorous with the pervasive threats endangering people's lives in most critical situations.

It is a fact that we are living in a world that the contemporary security threats moved beyond national borders: in some cases, they became transnational (e.g. environmental degradation, drug trafficking, international terrorism), in other cases intra-national, and sometimes, as in the case of organised crime, both trans- and intra-national. In all these cases, the common thread was the importance of protecting vulnerable individuals regardless of their nationality.

In this regard, it is obvious that the growing interdependence between the actors makes the possibility of seeking peace and prosperity at a lesser extent possible for a particular nation or region unilaterally to defend either its own interests or the global commons. And starting from a new era like globalisation, with the abolition of the borders and the growing interrelated security threats there the need to protect individuals' security from regional conflicts or alleviate its effects, protect internally displaced people, alleviate hunger, support those who are victims of environmental disasters or protect whole races of people threatened with genocide have become one of the most challenging issues of today's world (Kotsopoulos, 2006).

This gradual transformation in the security agenda has exposed new security definitions to be searched and evaluated; in order to make a clear way of tackling with today's security threats in a more people-centred way of thinking. At this point it is noteworthy to remember that this new security definition search most ardently found its core points under the human security framework. The first non-academic attempt to define human security was probably made by the United Nations Development

Programme (UNDP) in 1994 to design a Human Development Index. It stated that: "Human security is not a concern with weapons – it is a concern with human life and dignity…human security is rather people centred" (Kotsopoulos, 2006: 8).

Therefore, the human security concept centres on the individual (rather than the state) and that individual's right to physical safety, basic freedoms, and access to sustainable prosperity. The human security is both a 'system' and a systemic practice that promotes and sustains stability, security, and progressive integration of individuals within their relationships to their states, societies, and regions (Liotta and Owen, 2006).

After inclusion of the concept in some countries into foreign policy agendas like Japan, Canada and Switzerland, the European Union has also given sort of an inclusive part in its new foreign policy dimensions, in fact it has been stated by many academicians that European Union has always had a different way of underlying security challenges than the classical realist arguments. European Union is always on the spectrum of humanity with its altered support given to the human development and human rights and their surveillance in the world as the basic commons for the humanity itself (Kaldor,*et al*, 2004).

The EU has stated in several documents that the need to protect individuals' security also provides the justification for action to prevent regional conflict or alleviate its effects, protect internally displaced people, alleviate hunger, support those who are victims of environmental disasters or protect whole races of people threatened with genocide (Kotsopoulos, 2006). It can be seen in the EU development policy that all the development issues are interlinked with each other and shall be considered as mutually reinforcing and complementing each other in order to sustain long-lasted development world-wide.

> As a result, in the sixty years since the end of the Second World War, we have built stability in Europe our grandparents could not have imagined. The crux of the challenge we now face is to expand the envelope of affluence we currently enjoy to include the billions of our fellow human beings who share our hopes and aspirations for a secure and prosperous future. But we must do this without collapsing either the environmental or social foundations on which that prosperity rests....And they are increasingly in peril. The

resource pillars of prosperity – access to secure supplies of energy, water and food and a stable climate – are being corroded at an accelerating rate as population and affluence grow....The very interconnectedness that opens opportunities also increases our vulnerabilities. The ever more complex networks of trade and communication that make our prosperity possible can be turned against us (Mabey and Burke, 2006: 4-5).

What we have learnt from earlier experiences in European history is that the EU is rather willing to act according to its 'normative' and 'soft' power character dealing with security threats in international relations. For a long time, this soft power character constructs new initiatives for the Union to become influential by its civilian methods in solving the conflicts and democracy gaps in the world. In some respects, it is considered to be a European way of security thinking which can be perceived as an alternative model to the US military approach.

European Union by being the world's largest development aid donor, and a consistent supporter of human rights, democratic governance, international law and multilateralism, instead of military use of persuasion with other states, and a living example of 'peace model', still has the characteristics of a soft power. This would obviously provide an opportunity both to 'sell' EU initiatives and, indirectly, compensate for the 'underselling' of so many of its past external actions to the developing countries that the EU is partnering (Kotsopoulos, 2006: 14). However, due to the fact that today's security challenges are so far-reaching to tackle with even with the idea of multilateral corporations, or with soft power initiatives.

The human security approach of the Union is not a unique metaphor. However, it can be considered that the human security paradigm and the policy it suggests may serve an appropriate policy template for the European Union. As today's contemporary threats become more complicated and in most extreme cases causing loss of civilian casualties in conflict regions, and the threat of environmental degradation, poverty, and economic inequality, as well as the change in the climate and other social underdevelopment issues such as gender inequality or political insecurity, the Union has started to draw new lines for the sake of the security of individuals all around by its given support to the idea of development which is heavily in line with the Millennium Development Goals of the UN.

In this regard, it can be assumed that the EU already has already a body of human security legislation which complements the international legal framework of human security that was outlined in the UN documents. As well as using this international legislation to guide its activities, particularly in the fields of humanitarian and refugee law, the EU has adopted its own humanity-security-type legislation, such as measures designed to prevent trafficking in human beings and the sexual exploitation of children (Kaldor,*et al*, 2004).

Within the EU itself, the provisions of its 'third pillar' – concerning justice, freedom and security policies – encourage Member States to develop common actions in the fields of police and judicial cooperation, criminal matters, and the fight against racism and xenophobia (EC, 2007d). The Nice Treaty states that this "objective shall be achieved by preventing and combating crime, organised or otherwise, in particular terrorism, trafficking in persons and offences against children, illicit drug trafficking and illicit arms trafficking, corruption and fraud (EC, 2007d).

The EU has also been a strong supporter of the Rome Statute and the International Criminal Court (ICC). On 11 June 2001, the Council of Ministers adopted a 'Common Position' on the ICC "to consolidate human rights issues and the rule of law, to preserve peace and strengthen security" (Council of the EU, 2003:444). Partly as a result of this, individual member states have also adopted a consistent human security approach and all 25 have ratified the Rome Statue. Some of the most crucial points of human security, such as development aid and development cooperation, the EU is already the most significant actor among other actors in the international scene. For most of its efforts to confront with today's challenges, it can be argued that from the human security perspective the European Union rather prefers to draw a human security agenda by giving its prior attention to the 'freedom from fear' paradigm. It seems more useful to focus on 'freedom from fear' aspect of human security rather than 'freedom from want' since human development is already the target of much of EU's development agenda. Therefore, focus shall be given to the 'freedom from fear' in order to benchmark EU's contribution to the field of human security concept.

Some measurable studies can be made considering EU's missions and responses to the crises situations and the humanitarian interventions. However, the Union's efforts can be quite mature in character; there are several operations that were deployed by the Union's forces itself. And even tough, EU already has had experience and capacity in this area through its work on crisis management, ESDP, humanitarian aid, etc. There has always been a tension in the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) as well as the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) between a human or global security concept and a state security concept (Martin, 2007).

This tension continues to be expressed in the most recent European documents, for example, the European Constitution. It refers to a Common Security and Defence Policy (thus bringing together CFSP and ESDP) which includes both the development of military and civilian assets for peace-keeping, conflict prevention, and strengthening international security in accordance with the principles of the United Nations (Article 40.1) and the progressive framing of a common Union defence policy (Article 40.2), presumably referring to the defence of territory (European Convention, 2003: Article 40-41).

Further, with the European Security Strategy it has been even complicated in making of Europe responsible for global security at the centre of a European Security strategy (Martin, 2007). This is so, because some argue that Europe has lost its space in the international arena, it is no longer strong as it is in the past, and the future of The Union is rather blurred. And the enlargement of the Union rather makes the member states fallen apart from each other respectively, particularly in the security field as far as the multilateral operations are concerned (Burke and Mabey, 2006).

While Europe and the European Union are perhaps no closer than anyone else to addressing how best to solve these challenges, Europe has at least acknowledged the need to think, act, and organize differently to prepare for the future. The European Security Strategy specifically stresses the necessity of 'effective multilateralism' and often acknowledges the crucial leadership roles of the United States in making this multilateralism both coherent and effective (Liotta and Owen, 2006: 97). For this reason, the EU has made a strategic manoeuvre in transforming its 'normative power'

character into a more active, involved and effective world leader. In order to achieve this realm, Union has made an attempt to redefine its security strategy in 2003. The EU has phrased its intention to adopt an 'active' foreign policy as a '(formidable) force for good' in it's the European Security Strategy (ESS) (EU, 2003).

The ESS which makes several references to components of what could be defined as a human security agenda – although, again, it does not refer to them as such. For example, it states that "security is a precondition of development", and acknowledges that "in much of the developing world, poverty and disease cause untold suffering and give rise to pressing security concerns" (EU, 2003:2).

European Security Strategy is important because it re-identifies Europe's foreign policy personality in a way that it helps to develop both civilian and military instruments, and while it continues to advance a normative discourse in which a putative EU 'interest' in foreign affairs is defined by a set of shared values, and crises and challenges to Europeans that are seen in terms of threats to those values, irrespective of their source or location (Martin, 2007: 5). From another point of view, the document is intrinsically important because it emphasizes EU's tendency to use 'norms' and 'values' in international relations unlike the US. However, the Union seeks to be more influential in the world arena also willing to risen its capabilities to cope with external crises (Liotta and Owen, 2006).

Therefore in order to be more effective particularly in the humanitarian interventions and peacekeeping operations, the drive aimed to increase the Union's capabilities particularly in the area of security and defence, including proposals for conventional military build-up expressed in the 2008 and 2010 Headline Goals for respectively civilian and military resources, and referred to in the ESS (Martin, 2007).

Referring to the civilian casualties and the eventual results of deadly conflicts such as the violations of human rights, and human rights abuses make the Union rethink its ability to convene an affordable response to take the lead in humanitarian interventions. That is where the linkage with the human security in the part of individual protection is also highlighted. Notably, however, nowhere in the EU strategy 'human

security' concept is mentioned. Yet the concept's principles, including the need to address and solve longer-term development issues that could actually sustain and resolve the security dilemma of many in nations and regions in crisis, are omnipresent.

Indeed, the strategy's full title presents the claim of A Secure Europe in a Better World thus stressing the need for the EU to "get real" and act on its responsibility and in its role as global actor:

> Since 1990, almost 4 million people have died in wars, 90 percent of them civilians. Over 18 million people world-wide have left their homes as a result of conflict. In much of the developing world, poverty and disease cause untold suffering and give rise to pressing security concerns. Almost 3 billion people, half the world's population, live on less than 2 Euros a day. Forty-five million die every year of hunger and malnutrition. AIDS is now one of the most devastating pandemics in human history and contributes to the breakdown of societies.... Security is a precondition for development....
>
> In contrast to the massive visible threat in the Cold War, none of the new threats is purely military, nor can any be tackled by purely military means. Each requires a mixture of instruments.... Regional conflicts need political solutions, but military assets and effective policing may be needed in the post conflict phase. Economic instruments serve reconstruction, and civilian crisis management helps restore civil government. The European Union is particularly well equipped to respond to such multi-faceted situation (EU, 2003: 2-3).

A more ambitious project is the proposal that the Union adopt human security as a strategic narrative. In 2004, the Study Group on Europe's Security Capabilities, convened by the High Representative, Javier Solana recommended that the Union adopt a Human Security approach to realise its ambitions to play a global security role, while also reflecting its distinctive character as a polity committed to foundational ideas of peace, democracy and human rights rather than the classic nation-state defence of territory (Solana, 2004). The Study Group, chaired by Professor Mary Kaldor, produced its report, 'A Human Security Doctrine for Europe', in September 2004. This encompassed three ambitious components:

> 1) A set of seven principles for human security, including the primacy of human rights, clear political authority, multilateralism,

a 'bottom-up' approach, regional focus, the use of legal instruments and the appropriate use of force;
2) A 'Human Security Response Force', composed of 15,000 individuals, of whom at least one-third must be civilians;
3) A new legal framework to govern decisions to intervene and to direct operations on the ground (Glasius and Kaldor, 2004:5).

The group concluded that "the most appropriate role for Europe in the twenty-first century would be to promote human security" (Glasius and Kaldor, 2004:69). The Doctrine was closely in line with the European Security Strategy core principals, such as it is in the equal footage in addressing violence and calling for the creation of a deployable 'human security force'.

It makes a difference between different types of military interventions, suggesting that the role of the human security force should be "somewhere between classic peacekeeping and classic military intervention" (Glasius and Kaldor 2004:69). For these operations, just as EU's primacy character in its every external policy tool, the supreme objective would seem to uphold human rights, support international law and order. However, the Doctrine's ambition may also have been its biggest weakness, for it remains largely unimplemented today. There are two main reasons for this. Firstly, the document suggested that the EU Constitutional Treaty should enter into force and introduce some of the structural changes to the EU's foreign policy mechanisms that the Union would need to implement a human security doctrine (Kotsopoulos, 2006). However, because of the 'no' votes to the Constitution from the Dutch and French referenda's made the draft treaty either dead or prolonged, but also destructed the chance of creating a human security doctrine for the Union.

The rejection of the constitution have also undermined and created question marks over the future of the Union, by diluting the Union's most effective way of human security: enlargement. Secondly, the Doctrine was too ambitious because it has destructed the structural and political impediments to EU-wide foreign policy-making. This is particularly true for the proposed Human Security Response Force, which would need the full support of all Member States which has become a real challenge for them since they would be obliged to accept the principle that internal and external security are inseparable (Kotsopoulos, 2006).

However, even with a limited pooling of Member States' financial, human and military resources make the EU to play a more forceful, visible role in addressing global human security issues. By paving the way for increased cooperation with other international partners, in particular the UN, a human security agenda could help the ESS to achieve its goal of 'effective multilateralism'. EU-UN cooperation is already growing in various human security-related areas, through operations such as those in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and support for countries to implement the Millennium Development Goals (Kotsopoulos, 2006: 12).

This multilateral and human rights-oriented identity of the Union is already expressed and embedded in the EC and EU treaties, the basic rights charter, and human rights clauses in the EU's bilateral agreements and common foreign policy declarations.

5.3. EU Human Security Agenda

There are many different ideas and arguments for establishing an EU Human Security agenda. In fact, for some the EU has already several points that address the human security issues in several areas. For example; its fast-evolving European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) complements the human security agenda on conflict prevention and freeing individuals from fear (Kotsopoulos, 2006). The European Union is, in fact, ideally corresponding with the human security studies when the prior attention is given mostly to the 'freedom from want' part of human security, to the support of human dignity, human survival and increasing of human potential and human betterment. However, the Union is rather less active in the 'freedom from fear' aspect which is mostly related with the sudden and pervasive threats that was convened on the human lives. The latter requires Union to establish a more powerful and capable foreign policy under the CFSP and ESDP.

It is a fact that the EU Development Policy starting from the early foundations always in favour of a comprehensive development thinking, including the social and human development aspects given its priority. And recently, the Development Policy of the Union is almost in every aspect in line with the Millennium Development Goals which are the primary objectives of the human security literature as well. The Draft Constitutional Treaty, on the other hand, also includes many important principles related to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) which assigns an important place to poverty eradication, respect for human rights which are identified as the primary goal for development assistance. It also establishes poverty eradication as one of the overarching objectives of the EU's external relations (European Convention, 2003).

> The Constitutional Treaty incorporates the principle that all policies that affect developing countries should take the development objective of poverty eradication into account. The Treaty clearly establishes independent legal bases for development co-operation and for humanitarian assistance, which cannot be subsumed as policies subordinated to EU's external relations. The Treaty establishes that the EU's development policy is the principal framework governing its co-operation with all developing countries. Recently pressure has been increasing to effectively

limit development policies to countries in Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific. With these proposed changes to the Union's Regulation for co-operation with Asian and Latin American (ALA) countries, the European Commission tried to create possibilities for using these financial resources for the fight against terrorism. (European Convention, 2003: Article 40).

In January 2004 the Council adopted conclusions on the effectiveness of EU external actions - on proposals from the Irish Presidency. These conclusions addressed three specific issues:

- EU leadership in progressing development issues multilaterally;
- Maximising effectiveness of EU external assistance EU will promote more coherence in trade and development policies between the UN, the WTO and the Bretton Woods institutions.
- Achieving the MDGs is a key objective for the EU and the wider international community. The commitments made by the EU Member States at the 2002 UN Financing for Development Conference (Council of the EU, 2004: 30).

The financial proposal suggests a 38% increase, from 2006 to 2013, in the resources allocated to external relations (Council of the EU, 2004:32). However, the increase would be for strategic security (heading "EU as a Global Player") with other components of Europe's foreign policies like development co-operation, enlargement or humanitarian aid not benefiting from additional investment (Council of the EU, 2004).

The Commission evoking the statement of Javier Solana speech in the European Security Strategy paper, and express its wish that Europe should respond to "fundamental threats: terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, failed states, internal and regional conflicts" (EU, 2003:11). There have been various developments in the Union's external affairs agenda within both the intergovernmental Council of Ministers and the European Commission which touch on human security issues, including crisis management, the promotion of human rights and democracy, humanitarian and development aid, and the anti-landmine campaign.

However, it can be assumed that the document presents a decidedly narrow definition for human security. By emphasizing "law-enforcement... with the occasional use of force," the focus on human security remains strictly limited (Liotta and Owen, 2006: 94). Generally, however, while the term 'human security' is still evolving, the EU

doctrine seems to intentionally limit itself to a focus on violence and how to stop it (EU, 2004: 5). Even so, the Human Security Doctrine points out that despite its limitations the EU should be interested in a human security agenda due the principles set out below:

Table 5.3. Legal Principles for the EU Human Security Agenda

Moral Case	*Legal case*	*'Enlightened' Self-Interest Case*
This is based on the common humanity' and the argument that all human beings have a "right to live with dignity and security, and a concomitant obligation to help each other when that security is threatened" (Glasius & Kaldor,2004: 3-4)	"Articles 55 and 56 of the UN Charter call for the promotion of universal respect for human rights, and the EU's Constitutional Treaty explicitly recognised the EU's obligation to abide by these principles.	The Doctrine argues that, as Europe cannot be secure if others around the world are not, concrete action is mutually beneficial.

Source: (Glasius and Kaldor, 2004: 3-10)

In Moral case, the principles maintain that Europe, as a rich power, is obliged to contribute to this common humanity. In addition, it states that because of some of the disastrous effects of its colonial legacy, Europe needs to redress the resulting long-term structural insecurity in some former colonies.

In Legal case; while it may be difficult to reach a consensus on when it is legitimate to breach the sovereignty of a country which is failing to fulfil its human rights obligations, bodies such as the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty have sought to set legal thresholds (Glasius and Kaldor, 2004:69).

In 'Enlightened' self-interest can be defined as:

"This approach, often termed 'securitisation', recasts security threats in a new light (for example, it highlights the risk that poverty could lead to radicalisation and,

ultimately, terrorism), so moving them up the political agenda" (Jägerskog, 2006:310). It also links insecurity abroad to possible negative repercussions at home.

The European Union has always been the main supporter in the field of international cooperation and development. For this reason it has always maintain its initiatives as a normative power with its relying cry in development cooperation and liberal democratic principals. The Union aims to spread the very foundations of its mere existing principals into the world and by doing so, it seeks to surround whole the countries both with political freedom and economic liberty efficiently working according to the free market rules. Thus far, cooperation, like the Union does in its neighbourhood policy and in most of the countries, is one of the most influential policy tools of the Union together with its support to the human rights. It is rather ironic that the Union with its prolonged support given to the development cooperation and humanitarian assistance has long been devastated in the field of humanitarian interventions and crises management. It can be said that together with the Union's growing recognition of the human security field, although it has a long history in the human rights and development issues the cases are back on the stage, but more specifically the attention has been given to the crises management and humanitarian intervention situations.

However, at the moment, a common defence is not on the horizon, and the EU does not have a common army nor is the Union creating the structures and readiness required prior to the establishment of a common defence. Therefore, the possible long-term goal of a common European defence depends on, for example, the overall integration development within the EU, and developments in the European security situation, in the trans-Atlantic relations and in NATO, and, finally, Member States' desire and political decisions. Those facts given could be reasons why the EU is rather weak in the 'freedom from fear' aspect of human security; therefore, it can be considered as a necessity for the EU to make contribution to the field of crisis management in the human security perspective of itself.

5.3.1. Crisis Management in Human Security Doctrine for Europe

A Human Security Doctrine for Europe is an attempt to make a new organization for a new security strategy for the EU. And the doctrine is intended to show that the EU "should build its security policy on a 'human security doctrine,' aimed at protecting individuals through law-enforcement, humanitarian assistance with the occasional use of force" (Glasius and Kaldor, 2004:12).

This means that Europe is made an attempt to rebuild its foreign policy and external relations more depending on the human security incentives. The EU is relatively aware of the fact that as a political unity it should be more a capable and an active international actor in dealing with the humanitarian emergencies with its foreign policy. Therefore, in order to tackle the humanitarian catastrophes the EU has the ambition to act in accordance with the United Nations articles. This can be achieved through a deliberate use of force depending on the EU's ability and capability to deploy military operations either by its own forces, or taking part in joint forces deployed by other international organisations to achieve peacekeeping operations and humanitarian intervention in emergency situations. However, the direct intervention requires huge amount of both civil and military forces to deploy. For instance, when taking into account the need for complementarities in civil and military operations for EU missions in the Balkans or South Caucasus, the document proposed the development of a civil-military force of 15,000 personnel, a third of which would be civilian professionals who would support crisis-management operations (Liotta and Owen, 2006).

In fact, the new Human Security force is quite interrelated with the earlier attempts of the Union to become more effective in international relations. For instance, a European Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) emphasize the necessity for Europe to have the ability for independent action. Especially with the 2001 'Helsinki Declaration' and the call for a 60,000-member European Rapid Reaction Force, Europe has recognized a need for independence from powerful allies (such as the United States) and from powerful alliances (such as NATO) (Liotta and Owen, 2006: 92).Also, as drawn from Article 17.2 of the Treaty of the European Union, and originally stated in the (now defunct) Western European Union Petersberg Declaration of June 1992, these

responsibilities entail 'humanitarian and rescue tasks, peacekeeping tasks, and tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peacemaking' (European Convention, 2003: Article 17.2).

However, there are some good examples both showing the Union's efforts and its weakness in the field of crises management which may be underlined as follows: The EU's first military crisis management operations were conducted in 2003: Operation Concordia involved about 300 soldiers and was conducted in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM); (Council of the European Union, 2009)[38].Operation Artemis, which involved 2200 soldiers and was led by framework nation France, was conducted in Bunia, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC).: At the end of 2004, the NATO-led Stabilisation Force (SFOR) in Bosnia and Herzegovina was replaced by an EU-led Operation EUFOR-Althea, which is the largest crisis management operation of the EU to date. In 2006, the EU conducted Operation EUFOR RD Congo, which was designed to support the UN MONUC operation during the elections in the Democratic Republic of Congo. Operation EUFOR RD Congo was launched in the run-up to the first round of the election on 30 July 2006, and it ended on 30 November 2006 (Council of the European Union, 2009)

5.3.2. Human Rights and Democracy Promotion in the Human Security Doctrine for Europe

Human rights and the promotion of democracy are the critical points in preserving the human security. The two elements are the complementary elements of both human development and human fulfilment since the very idea of the human security is increasing the human potential and human betterment. The European Union, in this very spots for so long s one of the most influential compared to the other international actors. The EU is actively promoting two areas of which may be of primary concern to any human security agenda – respect for human rights and the

---

[38] For further information see, Council of the European Union, European Security and Defence Policy operations homepage: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/showPage.aspx?id=268&lang=en, (12.02.2009).

promotion of democracy – and has also incorporated human rights clauses into its network of treaties with third countries. This policy has been most effective with EU candidate countries, where the route to Union membership has helped to transform the behaviour of governments (Kotsopoulus, 2006).

The EU is also 'mainstreaming' human rights and gender issues in economic and social reform policies, and creating human rights education programmes. In addition, it plays a highly visible and forceful role in monitoring and assessing elections beyond its borders, and provides financial assistance to support developing democracies under its European Initiative for Human Rights and Democracy (EIDHR) programme (EC, 2006b).

5.3.3. Development and Humanitarian Aid in the Human Security for Europe Doctrine

The EU constantly emphasizes its role as the world's largest donor of development and humanitarian assistance, with over half of Official Development Assistance being provided by the EU and its Member States. According to EU statistics, the European Commission provides nearly 30% of global humanitarian aid, while EU Member States are together responsible for managing 25% of all official humanitarian assistance worldwide (ECHO, 2009) [39].The remit of the Commission's Department for Humanitarian Aid (ECHO) includes addressing human security issues related to natural and man-made disasters, emergency aid and rehabilitation and disaster preparedness, and it hands out approximately € 608 million per year in humanitarian aid (EC, 2007e:24). High Representative for CFSP Javier Solana has also played an energetic role in strengthening the EU's disaster-response capacity and has identified ESDP (European Security and Defence Policy) assets and structures to support civil protection and humanitarian aid efforts, even though this is not a central part of the ESDP agenda (Solana, 2006).

---

[39] European Commission Department for Humanitarian Aid homepage, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/echo/index_en.htm, last updated February 2009, accessed on 01.02.2009

Europe's development policy indeed has the eradication of poverty as its overarching objective, but its development policy is part of a general external actions framework. The EU is also the world's biggest development aid donor, it has played a leading role in supporting the UN Millennium Development Goals, and EU Member States have committed themselves to increasing their aid budgets to 0.7% of Gross National Income by 2015 (European Union, 2005:10).

The statement on 'European Consensus on Development', approved by all Member States in December 2005, also devoted itself to strengthen the EU's approach to critical issues like democracy, good governance, human rights, the rights of children and indigenous peoples, gender equality, environmental stability and the fight against HIV/AIDS (European Union, 2005: 35). Further, it can be said that the Union with its human development and human rights aspects may also serve as a carrying device for the human security policy goals, even tough the concept is evolving it is more likely to assume that it is far more then human development and human rights, but a good collage of both concepts.

CONCLUSION

Current environmental, social and economic challenges reflect to a greater extent that human well-being is under great threat in many parts of the world though living conditions have been improved in some other parts of the world since the last three decades. Sustaining a stable world for today as well as future therefore becomes the most important priority for many people in the world. However in a world where more and more people live in the poverty line and where still violent conflicts continue, sustaining human security becomes a daunting task. In some cases national efforts seem to be futile and more international cooperation is deemed necessary. External dimensions of internal actions of the influential actors in the world scene therefore gain more importance Particularly since the last two decades**,** it has been argued that given its global weight in economic and commercial terms, the European Union uses its power which is undoubtedly different from other actors in the international arena in the interests of others as well as itself. Although it is a highly contentious argument, the EU, at various platforms, states its aim to promote prosperity, solidarity together with its support to the respect for human rights, democracy, and the rule of law, liberalism and development around the world. The EU also asserts in its several important documents that promoting worldwide stability and prosperity thereby helps to consolidate stability and peace and well-being for its citizens within its frontiers.

In fact, the establishment of a Political Union is the very premise that the European countries showed their best endeavour to make the older the Europe into a place of stable and peaceful geography without having any internal imbalances and battles between the members of the Community any longer. The EU has further developed its role in its very region with including new countries in itself which are even thought to be as outsiders of Europe some time ago. However, with its sixth enlargement wave Europe has become a huge territorial division with nearly 400 million people living its borders, ruled by the same the rules and governed by the same European principals.

The integration of new countries are still on the way and in many respects enlargement is described as the best external foreign policy tool for the EU to broaden

its sphere of influence into a wider region through its conditionality . No need to mention that with the integration of new members, the Union has strengthened its role in the international scene both in economic and political levels.

The recent statistics show that the EU is the world's biggest trader; but it is also the biggest provider of development aid to developing countries. It has created a more proactive foreign and security policy recently with the capacity to carry out crises management and peace keeping missions in Europe and far beyond. However, in the case of human security the most important thing that should be underlined is the EU's efforts to converge the development and security policy tools with each other, hence its normative character in dealing with the security matters.

The EU clearly highlights that since the end of the cold-war the world has changed dramatically and there are new security threats which are basically threatening mass populations in a dramatic way. Henceforth, dealing with them requires a change in the ideological perspectives of how the states and the international actors perceive the security threats and to deal with them not only with the military conclusions but also a way to support human betterment and surveillance in the end. Therefore the EU emphasises that there are both new challenges and new opportunities to be faced. In this new and continually transforming context, the European Union has to play a proactive role in designing and implementing the political choices needed to ensure the prosperity and security of European citizens which will henceforth lead to the security and stability in the world, too. As the EU unites a continent, it seeks a close relationship with its neighbours so that new artificial divisions do not replace old ones. Having brought stability and prosperity to its own citizens today, the EU also seeks to work with others in an interdependent world to spread the advantages of open markets, economic growth and a political system based on social responsibility, democracy, the rule of law, respect to the human rights and development all around the world. And it can be presumed that the EU does play a significant role to become more influential in an increasingly interconnected world by supporting economic, social and human development, security and political stability for the rest of the world, as well as it does for its own sake. By

helping others, the EU clearly outlines its endeavour to support human betterment for all.

For this reason, in today's complex world, with the growing independence between the countries and the uncertainty of the threats to human life, the EU has added new policy tools to the traditional instruments of foreign policy in order to tackle the rising global problems and make the EU become more influential in world politics. The EU has, for instance, taken the international lead in tackling the issue of global warming and climate change with its devoted support to Kyoto protocol. In energy and climate security the EU is aware of the fact that the global problems can only be solved by acting globally and the world needs reliable and affordable measures to be taken in order to protect the global commons, together with development it enhances to reach the final goal of human development Indeed, the achievement of economic development is one of the key elements for sustainable growth that the EU has adopted the Lisbon Strategy in 2000.

However, the global change in almost every corner of world affairs has made the earth a shallow place with striking results. There are severely devastating events are threatening the global commons like the atmosphere and the environment as a whole, therefore it has been a fact that the world requires more focused and more responsible Europe when dealing with these human related crises, if they need to be solved.

The emerging humanitarian crises have resulted in humanitarian catastrophes, they became intolerable threats to human security and in most extreme cases they range from genocide and slavery to natural disasters, such as hurricanes or floods, the massive violations of the rights to food, health and shelter. Therefore, in this highly complex and challenging world, Europe needs to make its wider arc of influence reshown and evident both on the eyes of its own and the world citizens. Such as the one it has achieved during the political will that drove its nations from the Common Market to the European Community and on to the European Union.

In its each pillar, the European Commission has made several policy configurations regarding the EU's commitment to address issues such as development

aid and humanitarian assistance, external relations, trade regulations, climate change and environmental security matters. Other issues which also fall under the Commission responsibility can be considered in roots of the human development, human rights and other policy initiatives that are of concern to the liberal political economy and cooperation.

However, this political vision is more important then ever before since it has been a fact that any single actor can cope with the real stalemate of the new interdependent world. And just like every international actor, the EU cannot secure either its prosperity on its own or make contribution to the human betterment globally, if it does not work and support global cooperation in the security of human beings. Therefore, there is a necessity to align the decisions taken at the Community level with every element of development and security policy. Otherwise, the pillars will weaken and conflict and instability will follow. Obviously, the fate of the pillars of prosperity is now determined by decisions taken in many places in the world. And responsibility must be globalised as well as opportunity if the EU seeks to preserve the pillars of prosperity and willing to make a contribution to the prosperity of the world citizens.

With regard to the EU's role in the human security area, it is far enough to suggest that the EU has the human security elements in its character. Its devoted character of soft and normative power in its response to the crises situations, and its attempts in redefining its crises management and humanitarian interventions as well as its given priority to adhere to the human and sustainable growth and development through the EU Development Policy, development assistance and development aid that it pursues with the partnering countries, also with its efforts to extend the security threats to human life by recognising that the global climate change and other environmental problems are the major sources of security to human existence are the best evidences that the EU is closely in favour of the human security principles 'freedom from fear and want'. Furthermore making the poverty elevation as its primary objective to reach the Millennium Development Goals, the EU once again underlines its approach to human security.

However, given the fact that human security in its own premises is far more than just the support of human development, human rights or sustainable development, it has complemented with those elements of human centred security and human betterment initiatives. Thus far, it has also critical elements covering the traditional state centred security, with regards to its devoted ideal of protecting the human beings from critical and pervasive threats and sudden and hurtful disruptions of daily life, such as violent armed conflicts, internal wars, refugee problems and crises that harm the women and children the most.

The European Union is, therefore, ideally corresponding with the human security rhetoric when the prior attention is given mostly to the 'freedom from want' part of human security, to the support of human dignity, human survival and increasing of human potential and human betterment. However, the Union is rather less active in the 'freedom from fear' aspect which is mostly related with the sudden and pervasive threats that was convened on the human lives. The latter requires Union to establish a more powerful and capable foreign policy under the CFSP and ESDP. The 'European Security Strategy' of 2003 and 'A Human Security Strategy for Europe' of the Barcelona Report of 2004, draw the need for a more capable role for the EU in crises management, humanitarian assistance and the achievement of Petersberg tasks- which has outlined for the EU to strengthen its role in peace building and peace-making and humanitarian intervention in violent conflict situations.

The Human Security agenda, in fact is a policy framework that addresses all the issues threatening human life and existence. However, it has many points that are open to criticism. But the very idea that it suggests is that it enhances the protection and empowerment of individuals from the threats of nuclear weapons, violent conflicts, humanitarian and all forms of crises that end up with humanitarian emergencies. And it further supports the increase in the human potential in everyday life; let them be in the forms of economic, political, social and environmental in nature.

Therefore, in an era of globalisation where there are new unpredictable and severe threats become a major challenge to all human existence, it can be argued that any single international efforts would be meaningless to tackle with those problems all

alone. Holistic approaches are needed to internalise human well being into all policy areas. It is fact that the changing nature of both the global political economy and the global international relations require a change in the ideational level, as well. Not any country can be separated from the threats of today, since both the countries and the global threats have become deeply connected and interdependent to each other. Thus far, consensus at the international level is a prerequisite for the nation states if they are seeking a global peace and a sustainable environment both for their own citizens and the global citizens.

The international actors like the European Union does play a vital role in creating consensus at the international level to cope with the new threats more in the terms of sustainability. However, this requires a change in the ideological matrix convened by the international actors to establish universally accepted cooperation that further enhances sustainability of the world resources for all the generations both for now and the future.

REFERENCES

Acharya, Amitav (2005) "Human Security, Identity Politics and Global Governance: From Freedom from Fear to Fear of Freedoms" *Civil Society, Religion & Global Governance: Paradigms of Power & Persuasion*, 1–2 September 2005, Canberra Australia: 442-460.

Alkire , Sabina (2003) "A Conceptual Framework for Human Security" ,*Center for Research on Inequality, Human Security and Ethnicity* (CRISE), *Working Paper 2,*Queen Elizabeth House, University of Oxford, , 2002: 2-50.

Amouyel, Alexandra (2006) "What is Human Security?" *Revue de Sécurité Humaine / Human Security Journal* - Issue 1 - April 2006 :10-22

Annan, K (2000) We, The People: The role of the United Nations in the 21. century, *Report of the UN Secretary General to the Millennium Assembly,* , United Nations, March 2000, Available at: http://www.un.org/millennium/sg/report/ch3.pd (11.05.2008)

Annan, K. (2005) *,* In Larger Freedom*, Report of the Secretary-General of the United Nations for Decision by Heads of States and Government in September 2005*, United Nations, New York, 2005, available at: http://www.un.org/largerfreedom/contents.htm (12.06.2008)

Arts, Karin and Dickson, K.Anna, (Eds.) (2004) *EU Development Cooperation: From Model to Symbol*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2004.

Axworthy, Lloyd (2001) "Human Security and Global Governance: Putting People First" *Global Governance*, Vol:7, 2001:19-23.

Bajpai, Kanti (2000) Human Security: Concept and Measurement, *The Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies*, *Occasional Paper 19,* University of Notre Dame, (August 2000) http://www.nd.edu/~krocinst/ocpapers/op_19_1.PDF(22.03.2008)

Baldwin, David A. (1997) "The Concept of Security" *Review of International Studies* 23.1, January 1997: 5-26.

Barnett, John (2001) Security and Climate Change, *Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research working paper*, 7 October 2001: 35-44.

Bedeski, Robert (1998) Human Security and Sun Tzu's Thought: An Alternative Approach to Peace-building, Paper prepared for *the 4th International Symposium on Sun Tzu's Art of War*, Beijing, Oct. 19-21, 1998.

Boutros-Ghali, Boutros (1995) "At 50, Does the UN Resemble the League of
Nations?", *New Perspectives Quarterly,* Summer 1995, Vol. 12, No.
3: 23- 37.

Brown, Michael E., Sean M. Lynn-Jones and Steven E. Miller, (Eds.) (1995)
*The Perils of Anarchy: Contemporary Realism and International
Security*, Cambridge and London: MIT Press, 1995.

Bruderline, Claude (2000) People's Security as a New Measure of Global
Stability,*Harvard University,* paper presented at *the International
Security Forum*, Geneva, 15-17 November 2000
(http://www.isn.ethz.ch/4isf/4/Papers/ISF_WS_II-2_Bruderlein.pdf)
(10.05.2008)

Buzan, Barry and Ole, Weaver (2003*) Regions and Powers: The Structure of
International Security*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,
2003.

Buzan, Barry, Ole Wæver and Jaap, de Wilde (1998) *Security: A New
Framework for Analysis,* Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1998

Chen, Lincoln (2004) Health as a Human Security Priority for the 21stCentury
Paper for Human Security Track III, MD December 7, 2004.

Commission on Global Governance (1995) Our Global Neighbourhood: The
Report of the Commission on Global Governance*,* Oxford: Oxford
University Press, 1995.

Commission on Human Security (2003) Human Security Now - Protecting and
Empowering People UN Publications, New York, 2003.

*Council of the EU (*2007a) Presidency Conclusions of the Brussels European
Council, 9 March 2007, available at:
http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/07/st07/st07224-
re01.en07.pdf, (07.12.2008)

Council of the EU (2007b) The Africa-EU Strategic Partnership: A Joint Africa
EU Strategy Document, Brussels, 15 May 2007, available at:
http://ec.europa.eu/development/icenter/repository/EAS2007_joint_st
rategy_en.pdf, (03.02.2009)

Council of the EU (2004) Council Meeting, General Affairs and External
Relations Luxembourg 14 June 2004, press release, available at:
http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/
gena/80952.pdf, (11.01.2009)

Council of the EU (2001) Council Common Position on the International
Criminal Court European Union External relations human rights
homepage,Official Journal of the European Communities, 2001

http://ec.europa.eu/comm/external_relations/human_rights/doc/cp06_ 01_en.pdf, (11.12.2008)

Crisis Management Initiative (2005) Report of the Helsinki Process on Globalization and Democracy Track on Human Security: Empowering People at Risk: Human Security Priorities for the 21 st century, 2005, available at: http://www.cmi.fi/files/HP_report_track3.pdf, (19.05.2008)

Dalby, Simon (2002) Environmental Change and Human Security, *Woodrow Wilson Center's Environmental Change and Security Project Report*, 2002: 71-79 Available at: http://www.isuma.net/v03n02/dalby/dalby_e.pdf (05.04.2008)

Duffield, R. Mark and Waddell, Nicholas (2004) Human Security and Global Danger, *Economic and Social Science Research Council's (ESRC) New Security Challenges programme*, 2004::53-72

European Commission (2009a) European Commission Development Policy Homepage, Development Policies 9 Intervention areas, *Infrastructure, communication and transport* http://ec.europa.eu/development/policies/9interventionareas/infrastru cture_en.cfm, (12.02.2009)

European Commission (2009b) European Commission Development Policy homepage, 9 intervention areas, *governance and response to the situations of fragility,* http://ec.europa.eu/development/policies/9interventionareas/governa nce_en.cfm, last updated 17.02.2009, (19.02.2009)

European Commission (2009c) European Commission External Relations homepage, *EU Human Rights guidelines,* http://ec.europa.eu/external_relations/human_rights/guidelines/index. htm, last updated on January 2009, (21.01.2009)

European Commission (2008a) European Commission Development Policy homepage, *European Consensus on Development*, http://ec.europa.eu/development/policiesgen_en.cfm(13.01.2009)

European Commission (2008b) European Commission Development Policy homepage, *European Consensus on Development*, http://ec.europa.eu/development/policies/consensus_en.cfm, accessed on (13.01.2009)

European Commission (2008c) European Commission Development Policy homepage, *Development Policies*, 9 Intervention Areas, http://ec.europa.eu/development/policies/9interventionareas/trade_en. cfm, (19.01.2009)

European Commission (2008d) European Commission development policy homepage *EU aid for trade regulations, , 9 intervention areas, aid for trade,* http://ec.europa.eu/development/policies/9interventionareas/trade/aid-for-trade_en.cfm#5, (12.01.2009).

European Commission (2008e) European Commission Development Policy homepage, *9 intervention areas, water and sanitation,* http://ec.europa.eu/development/policies/9interventionareas/waterenergy/water/water_sanitation_en.cfm, (10.01.2009).

European Commission (2008f) European Commission Development Policy homepage, *9 Intervention areas, Rural development, territorial planning, agriculture and food security,* http://ec.europa.eu/development/policies/9interventionareas/ruraldev/food_intro_en.cfm, (10.02.2009)

European Commission (2008g) European Commission Development policy homepage, *9 intervention areas, security and development,* Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/development/policies/9interventionareas/peace-and-security/security-and-development_en.cfm, (10.01.2009)

European Commission (2008h) European Commission Development policy homepage, *9 intervention areas, human development,* http://ec.europa.eu/development/policies/9interventionareas/humandev_en.cfm, (04.01.2009)

European Commission (2007a) The EU in the world: The foreign policy of the European Union, Directorate-General for Communication Publications, B-1049, Brussels, 2007.

European Commission (2007c) Building a Global Climate Change Alliance between the European Union and Poor developing countries most vulnerable to climate change, *COM (2007)*, Brussels, 18.09.2007, http://ec.europa.eu/development/icenter/repository/env_cc_GACC_com2007_0540_en.pdf, (10.01.2009)

European Commission (2007b) Furthering Human Rights and Democracy Across the Globe, European Communities, Belgium, Brussels, 2007. http://ec.europa.eu/development/icenter/repository/brochure_hrd_07_en.pdf, (02.02.2009)

European Commission (2007d) EC Legislation, Freedom, Security and Justice, Human Trafficking homepage http://ec.europa.eu/justice_home/doc_centre/crime/trafficking/doc_crime_human_trafficking_en.htm, last updated on October 2007, (10.12.2008)

European Commission, European Commission Humanitarian Aid Department, (2007e) European Commission Humanitarian Aid, Annual Review 2007, Information and Communication Unit ECHO *(A5),* Brussels, 2007, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2008:0449:FIN:EN:HTML, (04.05.2008)

European Commission (2006a) Acting Together: a Common Commitment to the Global Environment. International Cooperation on biodiversity, Climate Change and Desertification, Luxembourg, Office for Official Publications for the European Communities, 2006. http://ec.europa.eu/development/icenter/repository/env_cc_brochure_rio_conventions_en.pdf, (10.01.2009)

European Commission (2006b) European Initiative for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR) Programming for 2005 and 2006 http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/worldwide/eidhr/documents/eidhr-programming-2005-2006_en.pdf ,(04.08.2008)

European Commission (2006c) A European Strategy for Sustainable, Competitive and Secure Energy, *COM (2006),* Brussels, 8.3.2006, http://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2006:0105:FIN:EN:PDF, (05.01.2009)

European Commission (2006d) Accompanying the Communication Governance in the European Consensus on Development: towards a harmonized approach within the European Union", *COM(2006)* Brussels, 30.8.2006. http://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SEC:2006:1020:FIN:EN:HTML, (05.01.2009)

European Commission (2005) Commission Communication on 'Policy Coherence for Development – Accelerating progress towards attaining the Millennium Development Goals – *COM(2005)*134 final of 12 April 2005 and May *2005*, http://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2005:0134:FIN:EN:PDF, (02.02.2009)

European Commission (2004) European Neighbourhood Policy Strategy Paper, *COM (2004),*Brussels, 12.5.2004). http://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2004:0373:FIN:EN:PDF, (04.02.2009)

European Commission (2002) Fighting Rural Poverty European Community policy and approach to rural development and sustainable natural resources management in developing countries, Brussels, 25.7.2002,

COM (2002) 429,
http://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2002:0
429:FIN:EN:PDF, (05.02.2009)

European Commission (2001) "Environmental Integration Handbook",
prepared for *Europeaid Unit E6 by the Helpdesk Environment*,
Brussels,Belgium,2001http://ec.europa.eu/development/icenter/repos
itory/environmental_integration_handbook_en.pdf, (11.01.2009)

European Commission (2000) Communication from the Commission to the
Council and the European Parliament: European Community's
Development Policy, Brussels, 26.4.2000, COM (2000) 212,
http://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2000:0
212:FIN:EN:PDF, (07.01.2009)

European Convention (2003) "Draft Treaty Establishing a Constitution for
Europe", Brussels, 18 July 2003
http://europeanconvention.eu.int/docs/Treaty/cv00820-re01.en03.pdf,
(14.12.2008)

European Union (2003) A Secure Europe in a Better World: European Security
Strategy, Brussels, 12 December 2003, p.15

European Union (2005) The European Consensus on Development', joint
statement by the Council and the representatives of the governments
of the member states meeting within the Council, the European
Parliament and The commission 2005,
http://ec.europa.eu/development/icenter/repository/eu_consensus_en.
pdf , (11.12.2008)

European Parliament (2006) Final Report on the Conference on Greening
Foreign and Security Policy: The role of Europe, European
Parliament, Brussels, 6-7 December 2006.

European Parliament and the European Council, EC Regulation (2006)
Investing in People, Thematic Programme,
http://ec.europa.eu/development/icenter/repository/how_we_do_strat
egy_paper_en.pdf, (02.01.2009)

Fitz-Gerald, M.Ann (2004) "Addressing the Security-Development Nexus:
Implications for Joined-up Government", *IRPP-Policy Matters*,
Vol.5, No 5, July 2004:1-24.

Floyd, Rita (2007) "Human Security and the Copenhagen School's
Securitization Approach: Conceptualizing Human Security as a
Securitizing Move", *Human Security Journal* Vol. 5 Winter 2007:38-
48.

Foong Khong, Yuen (2001) "Human Security: A Shotgun Approach to Alleviating Human Misery?" *Global Governance* 7 (2001):231-236.

Freedman, Lawrence (1998) "International Security: Changing Targets." *Foreign Policy*, 1998, no 110: 48-64.

Glasius, Marlies and Kaldor, Mary (2004) A Human Security Doctrine for Europe: *The Barcelona Report of the Study Group on Europe's Security Capabilities*, Barcelona, 15 September 2004, Routledge, London,2004: 62-82.

Gleick, Peter H. (1993) "Water and Conflict: Fresh Water Resources and International Security", *International Security*, Vol:18, 1993: 79-112.

Grayson, Kyle (2001) Re-evaluating Public Goods: Human Security in the Global Era, *Robarts Working Papers, Robarts Centre for Canadian Studies, York University,* 2001.

Hadfield, Amelia (2008) Development, Security and Energy: Improving Coherence, EDC2020, *7th Framework Programme, Policy brief*, No: 2, October 2008:1-4.

Hammerstad, Anne (2000) "Whose Security? UNHCR , Refugee Protection and State Security after the Cold War." *Security Dialogue* 31.4 2000: 391-403.

Hampson, Fen Osler (2002) *Madness in the Multitude: Human Security and World Disorder,* Ottawa: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Head, I. (1991) *On a hinge of history: the mutual vulnerability of South and North*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, ON, Canada, 1991

Homer-Dixon, Thomas (1999) *Environment, Scarcity and Violence*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1999.

Jägerskog, Anders (2006) "The Perils of Conceiving EU Foreign Policy as a 'Civilizing' Force" ', *Internationale Politik und Gesellschaft I*, 2006 :150-162.

ICISS (2001) "Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty: *The Responsibility to Protect*", IDRC 2001.

Jones, Richard Wyn (1999) *Security, Strategy, and Critical Theory* Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 1999.

Keohane, Robert and Nye, Joseph (1989) *Power and interdependence*, Boston MA: Scott, Foresman, and Co.,1989.

Khagram, Sanjeev , Clark C. William and Firas, Raad Dana (2003) "From the Environment and Human Security to Sustainable Security and Development", *Journal of Human Development* Vol. 4, No. 2, July 2003: 289-313.

King, Gary, and Christopher Murray (2002) "Rethinking Human Security" *Political Science Quarterly, Vol.116- No 4,* winter 2002:585-610.

Kittelman, Mark (2006) "The Conceptual Debate on Human Security and its Relevance for the Development of International Law", *Human Security Perspectives,* Vol:1, Issue 3, 2006:39-51.

Kotsopolus, John (2006) "A human security agenda for the EU?" *European Policy Center*, Issue Paper No.48 June 2006: 3-22.

Krause, Keith (2004) "Is Human Security 'More than Just a Good Idea?' in Michael Brzoska and Peter J. Croll (eds)*Promoting Security: But How and For Whom?* (2004), Bonn International Centre for Conversion (BICC), 2004: 123-156.

Leaning, Jennifer and Sam Arie (2000) "Human Security in Crisis and Transition: A Background Document of Definition and Application." *Working Draft Prepared for USAID/Tulane CERTI*, September 2000.

Levine, Ross (1997) "Financial Development and Economic Growth", *Journal of Economic Literature* Vol.35, June 1997: 688–726.

Liotta, P.H. and Owen, Taylor (2006) "Sense and Sysmbolism: Europe Takes on Human Security", *Parameters,* Autumn 2006: 85-102. http://www.carlisle.army.mil/USAWC/PARAMETERS/06autumn/liotta.pdf (12.03.2008).

Maartje, Rutten (2001) From St-Malo to Nice: European Defence: Core Documents, *Institute for Security Studies Western European Union Chaillot Papers*, No. 47, May 2001: 45-75.

Mabey, Nick and Burke, Tom (2006) *Europe in the World Pamphlet, Third Generation Environmentalism Ltd (E3G) London*, 2006:1-54.

MacFarlane, S. Neil (2004) "What is 'Human Security'? Comments by 21 Authors", *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 35, No. 3, September 2004: 347-87.

Manners, Ian (2008) "Normative ethics of the European Union" *International Affairs*; 84:1 (2008); 65-80.

Martin, Mary (2007**)** Human Security: Does Normative Europe Need A New Strategic Narrative? Paper prepared for the panel *Normative Power*

Europe: Perspectives on Power, European Union Studies Association Conference Montreal, 17 May, 2007: 1-22.

Matthew, Richard A. (2000) The Relationship between Environment and Security, paper presented at the *Earth Forum*, 4 October 2000, Amman, Jordan.

Nef, Jorge (1999) *Human Security and Mutual Vulnerability,: The Global Political Economy of Development and Underdevelopment*, International Research Development Centre, Canada (2nd edition), 1999.

Newman, Edward (2005) "Human Security: Mainstreamed despite the Conceptual Ambiguity', *stair* 1, No 2 (2005): 24-36.

Nuruzaman, Mohammed (2006) "Paradigms in Conflict the Contested Claims of Human Security, Critical Theory and Feminism", *Cooperation and Conflict: Journal of the Nordic International Studies Association* Vol. 41(3): 285–303.

Nye, Joseph (2002) *The Paradox of American Power: Why the World's super power can't go alone,* New York: Oxford University Press Inc, 2002.

Nye, Joseph (2005) *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*, Cambridge*,* MA: Public Affairs.2004.

Ogata, Sadako (2001a) Overview for the Commission on Human Security paper presented at the *First Meeting of the Commission on Human Security*, 8-10 June 2001, http://www.humansecurity-chs.org/activities/meetings/first/overview.html, (01.11.2008)

Ogata, Sadako (2001b) State Security—Human Security, *UN Public Lectures*, the Fridtjof Nansen Memorial Lecture, UN House, Tokyo, 12 December 2001 www.unu.edu/hq/publiclectures/ ogata.pdf, (02.04.2008)

Ogata, Sadako (2005) "Human Security: Theory and Practice", *stair* 1, No. 2 (2005): 11-23

Ogata, Sadako (1999) Human Security: A Refugee Perspective. Keynote Speech at the *Ministerial Meeting on Human Security Issues of the 'Lysoen Process' Group of Governments*. Bergen, Norway. 19 May 1999.

Ortega, Martin (2005) Petersberg Tasks, and Missions of the EU Military Forces, European Union, *Institute for Security Studies*, February 2005, http://www.iss-eu.org/esdp/04-mo.pdf, (13.04.2008)

Owens, Heather and Barbara, Arneil (1994) "The Human Security Paradigm Shift: A New Lens on Canadian Foreign Policy?" *Canadian Foreign Policy*, 7 (1999): 1–12.

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

Rani, Gustav (2004) Human Development and Economic Growth, *Economıc Growth Center Yale Unıversıty Center, Discussion Paper* No 887, May 2004:1-15.

Regehr, Ernie and Whelan, Peter (2004) Reshaping the Security Envelope, *Ploughshares Working Paper* May 2004, Vol 4, No 4: 43.

Renner, M. (1989) National Security: the Economic and Environmental Dimensions. *The Worldwatch Institute*, Washington, DC, USA. *Worldwatch Paper* No. 89, 1989: 36-52.

Rothschild, Emma (1995) "What is Security?" *Daedalus*, 1995, Vol.123,1995: 53-98.

Rothstein, Robert L.(1999) (ed.), *After the Peace: Resistance and Reconciliation,* Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner, 1999.

Ryan, J. (1991) "Sustainable forestry"in Brown, L., (ed)., *The worldwide reader on environmental issues.* W.W. Norton & Co., New York, NY, USA, 1991:188-212.

Scheipers, Sibylle and Daniela Sicurelli (2007) "Normative Power Europe: A Credible Utopia?" *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Volume 45, Number 2; 435-457.

Schoeman, Maxi (1998) "An Exploration of the Link between Security and Development", published in *Monograph* No 27, *Security, Development and Gender in Africa*, August, 1998:45-67.

Sen,Amartya (1981) *Poverty and Famines: An Essay on Entitlement and Deprivation*, Oxford: Clarendon Press., New York, 1981.

Sen, Amartya K. (1999) *Development as Freedom.* New York: Anchor Press., 1999.

Sen, Amartya (2002) Human Security and Development: Examining Some Policy Implications, Keynote Speech to the *Report Third Meeting of the Commission on Human Security*, 2002.

SIPRI (Stockholm International Peace Research Institute) (2000) Armaments, Disarmament and International Security *Stockholm International*

       Peace Research Institute Oxford University Press, October 2000.
       http://editors.sipri.se/pubs/yb00/pr00.html, (12.05.2008)

Social Watch (2004) Social Watch Report 2004, Fear and Want: Obstacles to
       Human Security, Montevideo, Uruguay, 2004.
       http://www.socialwatch.org/en/informeImpreso/tablaDeContenidos2
       004, (13.04.2008)

Solana, Javier (2006) Speech Graduation Ceremony ESDC High Level
       Training Course, Stockholm. March 2006
       http://consilium.europa.eu/cms3_fo/showPage.asp?id=286 & lang=en
       & mode=g, (13.04.2008)

Solana, Javier (2004) Responds to Report by Study Group on Europe's
       Security Capabilities, *European Union press release S0239/04,*16
       September 2004.

Solow, Robert (1991) Sustainability: An Economist's Perspective, paper
       presented at the *Eighteenth J. Seward Johnson Lecture, 14 June,*
       Marine Policy Center, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution,
       Massachusetts, 1991: 58-74.

Stewart, B. Frances (2004) Development and Security, *Center for Research on*
       Inequality, and Ethnicity, CRISE Working paper 3, Queen Elisabeth
       House, University of Oxford, January 25-26 2004: 1-26.

Suhrke, Astri (1999) Human Security and the Interests of States, *Security*
       Dialogue 30.3 (1999): 265-276.

Taylor, Owen (2004) Human Security - Conflict, Critique and Consensus:
       Colloquium Remarks and a Proposal for a Threshold-Based
       Definition, Special Section: What is 'Human Security'? *Security*
       Dialogue, September, Volume 35, No. 3, 2004:345-387.

Tehranian, Majid (1999) *Worlds Apart: Human Security and Global*
       Governance by the Toda Institute for Global Peace and Policy
       Research, London: I.B. Tauris, 1999.

Thakur, Ramesh (2006) Human Security: Incoherent Concept or Policy
       Template? Joint open lecture at the United Nations University the
       United Nations, Peace and Security: From Collective Security to the
       Responsibility to Protect (Cambridge University Press) 2006:1-10.

The Centre for Conflict Resolution (2005) HIV/ AIDS Report Final,
       "HIV/AIDS and Human Security: An Agenda for Africa", Policy
       Advisory Group Meeting, Seminar Report, 9-10 September 2005,
       http://ccrweb.ccr.uct.ac.za/fileadmin/template/ccr/pdf/hivinvite/HIV_
       Report_Final1.pdf, (04.05.2008)

Thomas, Caroline (2000) *Global governance, development and human security: the challenge of poverty and inequality,* VA: Pluto Press London and Sterling, 2000.

Toole, M.J. and Waldman, R.J. (1993) "Refugees and displaced persons: War, hunger, and public health", *The Journal of American Medical Association*, Vol. 270 No. 5, August 1993: 548-634.

Todaro, Michael P. (1997) *Economic Development: Redefining Poverty*, Longman, London, 1997.

Ullmann, Richard H., 1983 "Redefining Security," *International Security,* Vol. 8, No.1 (Summer 1983): 129–153

UNAIDS; WHO (2005) "Report on the global HIV/AIDS epidemic December 2005, http://www.unaids.org/epi/2005/doc/EPIupdate2005_pdf_en/epi-update2005_en.pdf, (05.04.2008)

UNCTAD (2006) 10th African Oil and Gas, Trade and Finance Conference and Exhibition, April 2006, UNCTAD Press office.

UNDP (2006) Human Development Report 2006: Beyond Scarcity: Power, poverty and Global Water Crises, Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

UNDP (2007) *Human Development Report 2007/2008, "Fighting Climate Change: Human Solidarity in a divided world"*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

UNDP (2003) Human Development Report 2003, Millennium Development Goals: A Compact among nations to end poverty, UNDP publications, New York, Oxford University Press, 2003.

UNDP (1994a) *Human Development Report 1994,* New York: Oxford University Press, UN Publications, 1994.

UNDP (1994b) "Redefining Security: The Human Dimension." *Current History* 94 (May 1994): 229-236.

UNDP (2000) Overcoming Human Poverty UNDP Poverty Report 2000, UN Publications, New York, Oxford University press, 2000.

UNDP (1990) Human Development Report 1990, published for the UNDP, New York, Oxford University press, 1990.

UN (2006) The Millennium Development Goals Report 2006, United Nations, UN Publications, June 2006 http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/pdf/mdg2006.pdf, (23.03.2008)

UN (2004) A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility-Report of the Secretary General's *High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change*, UN Publications, New York, Oxford University press , 2 December 2004.

UN (2005) In Larger Freedom: Towards Development, Security and Human Rights for All, New York, UN Publications, Oxford University press, 21 March 2005.

UN (2003) Commission on Human Security, "Human Security Now: Protecting and Empowering People", UN Publications, New York, 2003.

UN (2000) Millennium Development Goals, UN Millennium Summit, New York 2000, UN publications.

Waever Ole (1995) "Securitization and Desecuritization" In Lipschutz R. D. (ed) *On Security,* Columbia University Press, New York:1995: 46-86.

Walt M., Stephen (1991) "The Renaissance of Security Studies", *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 35, No. 2. (Jun., 1991): 211-239.

Wolf, Aaron T. and Hammer, Jesse H. (2000) "Trends in Transboundary Water Disputes and Dispute Resolution", in Miriam R. Lowi and Brian R. Shaw (Eds), *Environment and Security*, St Martin's Press, New York, 2000: 123-148.

World Bank (1998) *Post Conflict Reconstruction: The Role of the World Bank*, Washington: World Bank, 1998.

World Bank, World Bank Post Conflict Unit (1999) *Security, Poverty Reduction & Sustainable Development: Challenges for the New Millenium*, Washington DC: The World Bank, 1999.

World Bank (2000/1) *World Development Report 2000/2001: Attacking Poverty*, New York: Published for the World Bank by Oxford University Press, 2001.

World Commission on Environment and Development (1987), *Our Common Future*, Oxford University Pres Oxford, 1987.

World Health Organisation (2001) World Health Report 2001: Mental health, new understanding, new hope, WHO 2001, Geneva, 2001.