

Modern Concept of Security: *Human Security*

Hany El Basoos

Islamic University of Gaza

تاريخ الاستلام 2011/12/12 تاريخ القبول 2012/5/29

الملخص: هذا البحث يتطرق لموضوع الأمن من ناحية نظرية. يعتبر الأمن موضوع واسع النطاق يشمل الكثير من الجوانب التي تتضوي في إطار تصنيفات متعددة لدى مجموعة من العلماء المتخصصين. هذه الدراسة تلقي الضوء على المفهوم الأمني بشكل عام ومن ثم تركز على الأمن الانساني كمحور اهتمام الدراسات الأمنية المعاصرة. لاسيما سيتم التركيز على بعض القضايا المختلفة في مجال الامن وذلك لإبراز مفهوم أوسع لهذه الظاهرة.

هذا البحث يناقش الأسس النظرية للدراسات الأمنية في إطار أكاديمي يتناسب والمعايير المطلوبة. إن مناقشة مفهوم الأمن من الناحية النظرية لأمر ملج وضروي؛ حتى يتسنى توضيح المفهوم الأمني واستيعابه بشكل أكبر.

بدايةً، سيتم اختبار المفهوم الأمني والنظر فيه، حيث ستعمل هذه الدراسة على التفريق بين مفاهيم مختلفة في مجال الأمن بناءً على وجهات نظر متباينة مما يثير العديد من القضايا الاقتصادية، البيئية، الاجتماعية أو الخاصة بعلوم المجتمع، والعسكرية السياسية في هذا المضمون. وفي إطار التركيز على الأمن الانساني، سيتم طرح بعض الأفكار المتعلقة بالعولمة والصراعات الداخلية وأثرها على الأمن الانساني الواقعة ضمن الدراسات الأمنية في الوقت الحالي.

Abstract: This research is about security from a theoretical perspective. Security is a broad-spectrum subject, including matters which can be classified differently according to a range of scholars. This study will give attention to the perception of security in general then focuses on human security as a concern in contemporary security studies. Some attention will be given to different issues in security to portray a broader understanding of this phenomenon.

This research highlights the theoretical bases of security studies in an academic and appropriate framework. To understand security, it is necessary to discuss this concept from different theoretical perspectives. The concern is the achievement of a comprehensive understanding of security.

This study will firstly examine the concept of security. It will differentiate between different perspectives of security based on dissimilar viewpoints of the concept. This will emphasise the broadening approach, which raises new issues (economic,

Hany El Basoos

environmental, and societal as well as the military-political sectors) in the field of security. This research will concentrate on human security. There will be some reflections on the impact of globalisation and intra-state conflicts on human security as a rising subject within security studies.

The Importance of the Research:

Security is a constant concern, an ongoing pursuit, and an abiding national interest. The expansion of security is necessary to recognise what it involves, what it means to be secure, and what one is to be secure from. Security is claimed to be expanded to cover the totalising necessities of statecraft and the sovereign power in a state of emergency. However, states are not the only referent objects of security. Civilians are mostly victims of security threats such as military attacks, which undermine their safety and stability. Thus, the need for human security results from a set of political, military, societal, economic, and environmental threats directed towards human lives and dignity. Human security can be described as a condition under which human dignity and the meaningful participation of society can be combined.

The Objectives of the Research:

- To give an explanation on the concept of security based on the modern approach.
- To demonstrate that national security should be complementary to human security.
- To reveal that human security can be described as a condition under which human dignity and the meaningful participation of society can be combined
- To examine how human security is influenced by a number of problems which extend beyond the state's security

Hypothesis of the Research:

Security is accepted as a concept in international relations and as a central organising notion by both practitioners and academicians. It leads to a comprehensive perspective no less useful than the one provided by power or peace. The concept of security is based on the state interests and its institutions. The political order of the state is the

Modern Concept of Security: Human Security

direction of every other form of security. Even though the state cannot replace society, it can constitute the value of political order for social and individual values. Thus states must take into account both domestic and external threats to society. However, security as an essential element to humanity has led to contradictions between individual and state security. Yet, states have the chief responsibility and authority to fulfil human security needs.

Research Methodology:

This research is a combined study of two topics, security in general and human security in particular. It highlights challenges to human security in modern world. The researcher in this study argues that the need for a common understanding of human security requires a comprehensive understanding of security studies. The fulfilment of the objectives of this research requires the implementation of document analysis. Thus, the academic investigation of this research is based on a secondary research method, document analysis. Documentary sources constitute a major source of data in social science researches, and these sources and their implementation are affected by practical constraints, for instance timing and the aim of the research. Therefore, the main research method used for this thesis is document analysis, utilising substantive books, journal and magazine articles, official reports and documents, and the results of research studies conducted by a range of different organisations. A number of considerations will be taken into account when using documentary sources, including reflection on the general and particular situations forming the context of the research.

Conceptual Perspectives:

During the Cold War security was firmly addressed in the military concept to defend the integrity and sovereignty of the state, and arguably the safety of individuals. Despite the conversion into the economic and environmental concerns during the 1970s, discussions still imply a heavy military emphasis. The concept of security in its militaristic interpretation was criticised by many authors as excessively narrow and needed to be expanded outwards from the

Hany El Basoos

limits of parochial concepts to include a range of considerations¹. Nevertheless, state security dominated thinking until the 1980s and traditionally appeared in the form of two concepts (Realism and Idealism) upon which, to some extent, analysis is still based. These concepts are explained predominantly in theories of International Relations.

Realism is a perception of International Relations and favours the approach to national security through power. The Realist school of thought was active during the Cold War. Realists tend to see security as a result of power. For instance an actor with enough power would acquire security as a result. They assume that the behaviour of all states in the pursuit of self-help policies was determined by power differentials between friend and enemy, and by rational calculations of gains and losses². For Realists, interdependence derives from the narrow agenda of an international system, which depends upon power to include economic, environmental and societal issues³.

Realism is criticised for no longer reflecting the preoccupation of much of the international agenda. After decades of development its central doctrine of deterrence provided neither intellectual nor practical security⁴. In response to the criticism of Realism, this considered the state as the highest end and the ultimate goal for security in an anarchic system⁵, and *Neorealism* as a new structural theory of power politics was formed. Its insights are associated with the powerful logic that anarchy in the international arena is a primary political context for international security, which means the absence of central government⁶. Since each state claims ultimate sovereignty over its territories and denies recognition of any higher political authority,

¹ Buzan, B. (1991) *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era*. London: Longman.

² Ibid

³ Mangold, P. (1990) *National Security and International Relations*. London: Routledge.

⁴ Buzan, B. (1987) *An Introduction to Strategic Studies: Military Technology and International Relations*. London: Macmillan. P. 199-202

⁵ Waltz, K. N. (1979) *Theory of International Politics*. Reading, Mass. Addison-Wesley. P. 126

⁶ Ibid

Modern Concept of Security: Human Security

this system is by definition politically structured as anarchy. By preserving their independence and sovereignty, states perpetuate anarchy in the international system, but this does not mean relations between states are inevitably violent under anarchy¹.

Idealism is another aspect of International Relations, and favours the approach to national security through peace. Idealists tend to see security as a consequence of peace. A lasting peace would provide security for all. Idealists are not only opposed to the idea of Realism, but focus attention directly on the issue of war. Since war is the major threat arising from the national security problem, a solution would be to eliminate it from the international agenda. A combination of logical anarchy and the imperatives of Idealism produced common security, which emphasised the interdependence of secure relations and opposed the traditional national security priorities. It motivated peace researchers to become involved in the defensible policy debate through the operational idea of non-provocative defence².

Voices called for a change in the status quo made by the return of the Cold War and recession. Therefore the convergence of significant sections of Realistic and Idealistic agendas to generate security became the preferred conceptual tool³. More recently the focus moved from the state, and distinction between internal and external security became blurred⁴.

Defining Security:

The nature of security defies pursuit of an agreed general definition⁵.

The concept of security does not lend itself to neat and precise formulation. It deals with a wide variety of risks about whose probabilities we have little knowledge and of contingencies whose nature we can only dimly perceive⁶. Security does not have a proper framework within which to gauge a nation's sense

¹ Buzan, (1991)

² Ibid

³ Ibid

⁴ Carey, R. (2000) The Contemporary Nature of Security. In: Issues in International Relations. (Ed, Salmon, T. C.) London and New York: Routledge, pp. 55-75.

⁵ Buzan, (1991:16)

⁶ Schultze, C. L. (1973) The Economic Concept of National Security Policy. Foreign Affairs, 51(3), 529-530.

Hany El Basoos

of security. Security “means different things at different times and in different places, depending on what people have to protect, and the nature of the threat...Security is no longer seen simply as a matter of defending a state from its enemies from within and without, but of ensuring that its citizens do not suffer undue hardship when they are sick or unemployed.¹” Wolfer (1962) perceives security as an ambiguous symbol which may not have any precise meaning. However authors define security from different perspectives². He perceives security as an objective value, which derives from human nature. Security is an elusive concept. It is a strange phenomenon, a subjective ‘feeling’, and therefore relational and relative, rather than an objective ‘thing’ that can be seen and handled. You cannot touch security, you can only feel secure. Security, according to the Oxford English Dictionary is “the state of being secure³. Secure means “untroubled by danger or fear, impregnable, certain not to fail or give way⁴.”

Security could be objective, which means there is a real threat, and subjective, which means there is a perceived threat. There is a problem defining a clear boundary between the two threats. However security ultimately rests neither with the objects nor with the subjects but among the subjects when the audience accepts that there is something of an existing threat to a shared value. Threats to human security come from different sources or directions which are impossible to anticipate precisely, such as foreign military threats, terrorism, low-intensity warfare, conventional attacks, and nuclear terror. In addition to instability, threats breed violence, including insurgency, the rise of dissident and protest movements, and a breakdown in government systems, as well as a rise in violent crime and lawlessness, the increase in human rights atrocities, sectarian struggles, religious extremism, and ethnic separatism. The presence of

¹ Mangold, (1990:4,5)

² Arnold Wolfers, *Discord and Collaboration: Essays on International Politics* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1962, Chapter Five, "The Goals of Foreign Policy," pp. 67- 80

³ Buzan, (1991)

⁴ According to the Oxford English Dictionary

Modern Concept of Security: Human Security

atomic, biological, and chemical weapons can contribute to the prevailing atmosphere of insecurity¹.

Most definitions of security point out the values and intensity of threats and the political nature of security as an objective for the state, but they are incomplete and have become ineffective as years of effort have failed to produce a generally acceptable definition. This, however, does not prevent constructive discussion².

The debate regarding security entails explanation of the problem of insecurity. Nonetheless, the emphasis is on the subject of security. Insecurity is an amorphous concept and appears to be endemic to the human condition. Insecurity has a negative connotation and means a loss of basic things, like protection or hope. It is vulnerability in one part (this stems from permeability), compounded by the loss of control as a second element. Insecurity beckons powerlessness, deprivation, and disvalue, as well as a crisis of self-confidence. Mangold (1990) expresses the view that insecurity is a condition rather than an end, a product of the structure of the international system, and a reflection of a cause of tension. It may be reflected in frenetic or aggressive behaviour. It affects everything; the way policies are established, the way they are expressed, attitudes, as well as the way draft political decisions are formed³.

Different Perspectives on the Concept of Security:

One of the major threats to security studies is the contrasting methods in understanding it⁴. "There is no common understanding of what security is, how it can be conceptualised, and what its most relevant research questions are"⁵. "The difficulties of analysing the meaning of security and of finding ways in which this meaning might be reinterpreted or reconstructed, derive less from its notorious imprecision or susceptibility to propagandistic abuse than from its

¹ Buzan, (1991)

² Ibid

³ Mangold, B. (1990), National Security and International Relations. Routledge, London.

⁴ Walt, S., M. (1991) The Renaissance of Security Studies. *International Security Quarterly*, 35(2), 211-239.

⁵ Haftendorn, H. (1991:15) The Security Puzzle: Theory-Building and Discipline-Building in International Security. *International Studies Quarterly*, 353-17.

Hany El Basoos

derivation from a prior account of who or what is to be secured”¹.

The concept of security was illustrated by Berki (1996) in terms of freedom from doubt or a state of self-assurance. It means freedom from anxiety and apprehension. It also means protection, assurance and freedom pathways to the establishment of good human value. Therefore security is a condition of life and freedom. Security and life are totally inter-connected. This view encounters difficulties. The equation of life and freedom on the one hand and the value of security on the other is not conceivable. Security cannot contain the meaning of life and freedom since it is utterly inconceivable for an individual to live and to act freely in a condition of insecurity. Life and freedom have transcendent elements not easily subsumable under security². Similarly, Booth (1991) equated security to emancipation. Emancipation is the freeing of people from physical and human constraints which prevent them from carrying out what they would freely choose to do. Security and emancipation are two sides of the same coin³. This view was criticised by Ayoob (1997) arguing that society or a group of people can be secured without being emancipated and vice versa. Even though this equation may be possible in Western Europe, it would be far-fetched to apply it in the case of the Third World. Furthermore emancipation can be interpreted as the right for self-determination, which can be a grave danger and lead to anarchy as far as most Third World states are concerned⁴.

Security is the condition under which it is possible to think, speak, and make authoritative claims about what is referred to in the language of modern politics. Modern accounts of security have been articulated in relation to the modern states, including the historical transformation of

¹ Walker, R. B. J. (1997) The Subject of Security. In: Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases. (Ed, Krause, K. W., M. C.) London: UCL Press Limited, pp. 61- 81.

² Berki, R. N. (1986:19-20) Security and Society: Reflections on Law, Order and Politics. London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd.

³ Booth, (1991) Security and emancipation. [Review of International Studies](#) (1991), 17: 313-326 Cambridge University Press

⁴ Ayoob, Mohammed. (1997). Defining Security: A Subaltern Realist Perspective. In Critical Security Studies, edited by Keith Krause and Michael C. Williams, 121-146. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Modern Concept of Security: Human Security

structures, practice and determination from gunpowder to nuclear threat. He assumes that the incoherence of modern accounts of security is related to our incoherent sense of how things are probably changing. The complicity of these accounts with practices of intolerable violence must be harnessed to work towards the location of political life. The state and its institutions seem to be the answer for many of these accounts; that security questions cannot be separated from political theory. The understanding or reconceptualisation and reconstruction of security to a constitutive account of politics that make the prevailing accounts of security seem so plausible. Thus security of states dominates our understanding. State sovereignty defines its need of peace and what has to be secured. In this context the claims of state sovereignty must be expanded to encompass everything within the state, even in its potential emergency state¹. Buzan, Waever & Wilde (1998:23-24) define security as an extreme version of politics. It means that an existing threat requires emergency measures and justifies actions outside the normal bounds of political procedures. However, security can be enacted using other formulas. The meaning of a concept lies in the way people use it, not according to analytical or philosophical terms. "Security is thus a self-referential practice, because it is in this practice that the issue becomes a security issue – not necessarily because a real existential threat exists but because the issue is presented as such a threat." Definitions of security are constituted by the inter-subjective establishment of an existing threat; the latter requires emergency action and acceptance from a significant audience.

Nevertheless, Buzan, Waever and Wilde (1998) introduced a new framework for security analysis. They widened the security agenda to include economic, environmental and societal sectors, as well as the military-political ones (traditional security studies), keeping the security agenda open to many different types of threats as they can arise in military and non-military areas. It responds to the rise of economic and environmental agendas in International Relations during the 1970s and 1980s and concerns of identity issues and trans-

¹ Buzan, B., Waever O. & Wilde J. (1998) Security: A New Framework for Analysis. Boulder & London: Lynne Rienner Publisher.

Hany El Basoos

national crimes during the 1990s. The new framework, based on the non-military sources of threat, widened the definition of threat from being purely military to a more general formulation. Scholars in favour of a broader security framework argue that the shift from strategic to security studies ought to expand the areas of analysis beyond their traditional scope¹. Others argue that security studies should retain a relatively narrow understanding of their purpose². Walker (1997:75) criticised the broadened concept of security in that it begins to open out to encompass new accounts of what security means, and to whom it refers, and it will cease to have any significant reference at all³. Ayoob (1997) accused the broadening definition of security of creating a major dilemma for students of International Relations which threatens to make the concept so elastic as to render it useless as an analytical tool. There are major intellectual and practical hazards in adopting such an elastic definition. Security is not designed to explain the entire human reality. Ayoob attempts to provide an alternative definition of security, going beyond the traditional Realist definition to overcome its external orientation and military bias. He insists on the political realm, expressing the societal impact on the political arena because of the potential capacity to influence the political outcome by society. Ayoob therefore concentrates on the political sector and the development in other realms, ranging from economic to environmental, that can be taken into account as a part of a state security agenda if they threaten to have imminent political consequences or cause a potential threat to state boundaries and political institutions⁴.

Human Security:

National or state security had dominated security policy in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Security in its traditional concept was subjected to thought and analysis of internal security threats (activities within the state boundaries) and external threats (arising from the aggressive behaviour of other states). Nevertheless, the

¹ Buzan, (1991:23-25).

² Walt, (1991)

³ Walker (1997)

⁴ Ayoob (1997).

Modern Concept of Security: Human Security

distinctions between internal and external threats have been relatively ambiguous. Crime was largely seen as a domestic concern which reflected criminology and justice studies, while external threats which emanated from inter-state conflicts reflected the security or strategic studies¹. Recently, the centre of attention within security studies has shifted towards human security in the twenty-first century, regardless of gender, race, religion, ethnicity, or other characteristics².

The impact of individual security is fundamental to the understanding of human security. Individual security is the basic unit in which the concept of security can be applied³. Human beings provide the major source of threat to each other, therefore individual security takes on a wider perception in societal and political dimensions. This leads to questions about the nature of the state and the connection and contradiction between human security and the security of the state⁴.

Security of an individual human being cannot easily be defined. Security is applicable more to things than to people. Materials can be replaced and can be enhanced by insuring them against loss. Meanwhile, life, health, status, wealth, and personal freedom are complicated and all of them cannot be replaced if loss occurs. It is difficult to distinguish between subjective security (feeling safe), objective security (being protected from danger) and confidence in one's knowledge (being free from doubt). Threats are vague and the feeling of safety is not always real. Comprehensive security of individuals is beyond the possibility of attainment. Threat, doubt and danger loom over everybody. Some people can distance themselves from some threats, but they are sharing different kinds of dangers with other people, thus security cannot be complete for anyone. Efforts to achieve comprehensive security can be self-defeating, even if

¹ Lutterbeck, D. (2004) Between Police and Military: The New Security Agenda and the Rise of Gendarmeries. Journal of the Nordic International Studies Association, 39(1), 45-68.

² Alkire, S. (2002) Conceptual Framework for Human Security: (Excerpt: Working Definition and Executive Summary) In: Prevention and Resolution of Conflict Shimane, Japan.

³ Buzan, (1991:35)

⁴ Berki, (1986)

Hany El Basoos

objectively successful. Undertaking more measures to achieve security would raise awareness of threats and increase feelings of insecurity. Buzan (1991:36, 37) used the example of an urban householder's efforts to burglar-proof his house. Locks and alarms amplify the magnitude of the threat by advertising to burglars the presence of valuable possessions, which leads to a loss of tranquillity for the householder. The final point of obsessive security would be attached to paranoia.

The contradictions between individual and state security led to the question of human rights, which rose to international prominence during the 1970s and 1980s¹. As it became an international issue, individual security became part of the national security problem in many states. It is possible for individuals to enhance or improve their security against threats from the state or against threats which the state failed to alleviate through many kinds of organisations. They can be militant political groups, minority rights groups, peace organisations, political parties, human rights organisations, environment organisations and almost the whole sub-state organisations encompassed by the notion of pluralism. In states where the structure of government is weak, families, clans, tribes and religious organisations play a central role in relation to human security².

Globalisation and Human Security:

Development after the end of the Cold War in human activities including economy and technology has rapidly widened the division between human beings, nationally and internationally. The benefit of the new age of technology has not been equally distributed among people and nations. Internationally organised crimes have grown through the smuggling of human beings, trade and information technology. Global warming has amplified the problem, where, accordance to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Japan, around 20% of the world population still subsist on less than one dollar a day. "The collapse of the Cold War order has also culminated in numerous

¹ Vincent, R. J. (1986) Human Rights and International Relations. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

² Ibid

Modern Concept of Security: Human Security

conflicts due to historic and cultural factors such as religion, race and ethnicity. Various issues have surfaced in many parts of the world, including those related to human rights violations, refugees and internally displaced persons, anti-personnel landmines and small arms.”¹ Infectious diseases have rapidly spread in the poorer countries causing millions of lives every year, many of which are preventable.

Globalisation in the twentieth century has witnessed dramatic developments concerning security issues. Globalisation was defined by Fukuda-Parr (2003:168) as “Trend in the world today, intensifying interactions among people and integrating markets. Its outcomes are not accidental, but are driven by clearly identifiable political, economic and technological changes that have removed barriers to contact across national borders.” Such enormous changes in the world have their positive and negative impact on human security. Public policy at all levels should facilitate the spread of positive aspects and tackle the negatives. Such efforts need coordination and cooperation locally and worldwide so that the concept of human security assesses the impact of globalisation on human well-being and considers the safety and economic aspects of the consequences of violence².

Globalisation of human activities has its problems regarding individual security. Poverty and inequality caused by the uneven distribution of benefits during times of globalisation, while the idea of International Relations kept silent towards them, resulted in the diversion of attention from state to human security. International Relations takes the state as the central issue of analysis, while in contrast human security concentrates on the well-being of human beings and their social, economical, political, and cultural relations rather than the territorial security of the state³.

Definitions and Objectives:

¹ The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan. The Trust Fund for Human Security for the “Human-Centred” 21st Century. Online on 29 Aug. 04

http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/human_secu/t_fund21/what.html

² Fukuda-Parr, S. (2003) New Threat to Human Security in the Era of Globalisation. Journal of Human Development, 4(2), 67-179.

³ Thomas, C. (2000) Global Governance, Development and Human Security: The Challenge of Poverty and Inequality. London: Pluto Press.

Hany El Basoos

The consideration of national security as a central component of the study of International Relations has decreased with the rise of intra-state conflicts. In contrast, the study of human security, focusing on the threats to personal and communal safety, has become prevalent. The focus on security has to be broadened from the national context to people as individuals. Security of individuals is complementary to state security by being the central concern of the state's agenda. Hence, human security is people-centred.

The provision of human security does not necessarily include all aspects of human living. It contains a vital core of human activities and capabilities which are mostly described through fundamental human rights and absolute needs even if they are not specified. According to Alkire (2002), the effective response to the tension of defining human security is to maintain a self-consciously vague and wide working definition, and to articulate procedures for implementing this definition in tangible situations by constrained institutions for particular populations. Alkire said: "The vital core of human security may be thought of as a rudimentary set of human freedoms, or as some set of human rights. The vital core includes both political and civil liberties, and economic, social, and cultural abilities¹."

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 creating systems that give people the building blocks of survival, dignity and livelihood. Human security connects different types of freedoms - freedom from want, freedom from fear and freedom to take action on one's own behalf."² According to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, human security "is a concept that focuses on the viewpoints of individuals to protect them from those threats to human lives, livelihoods, and dignity and to bring out the full potential of each

¹ Alkire, Sabina (2002) "Dimensions of Human Development," *World Development*, 30 (2), 181-205. February, 2002.

² The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan. Outline of the Report of the Commission on Human Security. online on 29 Aug. 04 <http://www.humansecurity-chs.org/finalreport/outline.html>

Modern Concept of Security: Human Security

individual”¹. According to Thomas (2000:6), “Human security describes a condition of co-existence in which basic material needs are met, and in which human dignity including meaningful participation in the life of the community can be realised.”

The intention of human security is “to safeguard the vital core of all human lives from critical pervasive threats, in a way that is consistent with long-term human fulfilment...To guarantee a set of vital rights and freedoms to all people, without unduly compromising their ability to pursue other goals...To create political, economic, social, cultural, and environmental conditions in which people live knowing that their vital rights and freedoms are secure².” These objectives are pursued collectively through, most commonly, the household, religion, ethnicity, gender, or caste, or a combination of them³.

Human security is intensely interconnected with human rights, democracy, and human development, giving consideration to the protection of the vital core of human life. Nonetheless, human security differs from other subjects by focusing on the risk of sudden changes for the worse whether in the financial or physical condition, which can affect the poor and the affluent. “Conflict resolution perspectives focus on politics and humanitarian relief, the poverty eradication framework focuses on economic and social areas, and the human rights framework focuses on details of human dignity. Adopting a human security framework of analysis provides a more complete view of people’s well being⁴.”

Threats to Human Security and Internal Conflicts:

Threats to human security have increased in parts of the world and decreased in others. The capacity for encountering threats is dependent on policies and mechanisms adopted by several security institutions within different states. Threats can be critical (which jeopardise the foremost activities and functions of human lives),

¹ The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan. The Trust Fund for Human Security for the “Human-Centred”. online on 29 Aug. 04 <http://www.humansecurity-chs.org/finalreport/outline.html>

² Alkire, (2002).

³ Thomas, (2000).

⁴ Fukuda-Parr, (2003:177).

Hany El Basoos

pervasive (especially, if they are on a large scale), direct (including genocide and degradation), or indirect (the investment in the military sector at the expense of education and health). Thus, human security has two aspects, quantitative refers to material sufficiency (food, health care, and education), and qualitative refers to human dignity, personal autonomy, and community participation¹. New threats to the well being of people are emerging and the old ones are intensified as the pace of globalisation accelerates. Human security gives attention to global crimes, human trafficking, instability in financial markets, labour market instability and threats to job security, spread of diseases, and conflicts within national borders².

Wars and conflicts increase poverty and crime, and create a situation of deprivation. Poverty is a critical systemic threat facing humanity. "When we think about security, we need to think beyond battalions and borders. We need to think about human security, about winning a different war, the fight against poverty³." "For most people today, a feeling of insecurity arises more from worries about daily life than from the dread of a cataclysmic world event. Job security, income security, health security, environmental security, security from crime, these are the emerging concerns of human security all over the world⁴."

Uneven globalisation has divided regions, nations, and local communities. This has created tensions and conflicts among tribes, communities and local groups within the borders of the same country. Inequalities between groups (ethnic, religious, or social) are the foremost source of current civil conflicts⁵. Inequality applies to all aspects of human life including inequality of income, political participation, economic assets, and in social conditions. Tensions can be raised between the poor and the rich or between ethnic groups as

¹ Thomas, (2000).

² Fukuda-Parr, (2003).

³ Wolfensohn, J. (2000) Address to the UN Security Council on HIV/AIDS in Africa: World Bank News Release 2000/172/S.

⁴ UNDP (1994) Human Development Report Oxford: Oxford University Press.

⁵ Stewart, F. (2002) Horizontal Inequality. A Neglected Dimension of Development Oxford: International Development Centre, Queen Elizabeth House, University of Oxford.

Modern Concept of Security: Human Security

the aftermath to an economic crisis. The number of people who died or suffered from violence between groups within the same country in the last two decades has exceeded the number of people who died in wars between countries. According to the UNDP (2002) Human Development Report, "In the 1990s, almost 3.6 million people died in conflicts within states, while 220,000 have died from wars between states. The number of internally displaced persons has increased dramatically, accounting to six million people by the end of 2000¹."

Recommendations:

Institutions which are responsible for protecting human security cannot prevent all threats posed to individuals. They are primarily focusing on human lives. Individuals and societies can be threatened by incidents beyond their control. This includes financial downturns, violent conflicts, and health crises.

Protecting civilians requires mechanisms and policies including economic, military, societal and political strategies to strengthen human security. These include the following:

- Co-existence should be promoted among people to uphold an agenda of protecting civilians. Attention should be given to vulnerable groups within society such as women, children, the elderly, and disabled people. Local concern should include the disarmament of militant groups and the prevention of the illegal trade of weapons².
- Cease-fire or peace agreements in post-conflict areas do not intrinsically incorporate human security. The responsibility of rebuilding conflict-torn nations is to give attention to protection and empowerment of the local population by meeting the immediate needs of displaced people, strengthen civilian police, promote reconciliation, and launch reconstruction and development programmes. Fundraising activities have to be in place in order to successfully implement coherent policies in post-

¹ Fukuda-Parr, (2003:177).

² The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan. Outline of the Report of the Commission on Human Security.

conflict regions¹.

- Empowerment of local and international institutions to develop norms and processes is fundamental in order to enable individuals to participate in decision-making processes and realise their potential. Establishing the rule of law would promote democratisation and enable individuals to participate in governance².
- Efforts must be exerted to ensure that sustainable livelihoods are available for all. Measures have to be taken to prevent financial crises.
- Education, basic skills and knowledge are crucial to human security. They prevent violence, promote multiplicity of human identities, and provide work opportunities and family health³.
- The protection of human lives has to be consistent with their long-term interests including establishing a mechanism of transparency and institution-building.

Conclusion:

Security is an essential element to humanity, is of supreme value to individuals, society and state policy, and the need for it is instinctive. Genuine security is subjective, varies from one person to another and from one culture to another. The quest for security is a continuous and ongoing struggle. Security offers protection, assurance, confidence of success, and virtual certainty of an assured future. It comes from a stable, unstressful environment, a basic structural equilibrium, a feeling of immunity, and an ability to determine one's own fate through personal power to directly affect events.

Human security is influenced by an enormous number of problems which extend beyond the state's security. Human beings have to be respected regardless of their nationality, sex and race. Human security looks at sudden economic crises and natural disasters which are the key to poverty eradication. It can be difficult for individuals to realise

¹ ibid

² ibid

³ ibid

Modern Concept of Security: Human Security

their potential if their dignity and livelihood are threatened. This would lead to the future of the whole society to be at stake. In order to enable individuals to realise their potential, state policy alongside that of international and national non-governmental organisations should work towards the creation of a society which can sustain individual potential. This necessitates the state to protect the dignity and livelihood of its citizens, while state security and its economic policies are not undervalued. Thus, national security should be complementary to human security. Humanitarian intervention in conflict, post-conflict and peace-building zones should be provided at the international level. Such intervention requires the establishment of an international criminal court to prosecute criminals who commit crimes against humanity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Alkire, S. (2002). *Conceptual Framework for Human Security*: (Excerpt: Working Definition and Executive Summary) In: Prevention and Resolution of Conflict Shimane, Japan.
- Alkire, S. (2002). *Dimensions of Human Development*. *World Development*, 30 (2), 181-205. February, 2002.
- Wolfers, A. *Discord and Collaboration: Essays on International Politics* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1962, Chapter Five, "The Goals of Foreign Policy," pp. 67- 80
- Ayoob, M. (1997). *Defining Security: A Subaltern Realist Perspective*. In Critical Security Studies, edited by Keith Krause and Michael C. Williams, 121-146. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Berki, R. N. (1986) *Security and Society: Reflections on Law, Order and Politics*. London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd.
- Booth, (1991) *Security and emancipation*. [Review of International Studies](#) (1991), 17: 313-326 Cambridge University Press
- Buzan, B. (1987). *An Introduction to Strategic Studies: Military Technology and International Relations*. London: Macmillan. P. 199-202
- Buzan, B. (1991). *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era*. London: Longman.
- Buzan, B., Waever O. & Wilde J. (1998). *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. Boulder & London: Lynne Rienner Publisher.
- Carey, R. (2000). *The Contemporary Nature of Security*. In: *Issues in International Relations*. (Ed, Salmon, T. C.) London and New York: Routledge, pp. 55-75.
- Fukuda-Parr, S. (2003). *New Threat to Human Security in the Era of*

Hany El Basoos

- Globalisation*. Journal of Human Development, 4(2), 67-179.
- Haftendorn, H. (1991). *The Security Puzzle: Theory-Building and Discipline-Building in International Security*. International Studies Quarterly, 353-17.
- Lutterbeck, D. (2004). *Between Police and Military: The New Security Agenda and the Rise of Gendarmeries*. Journal of the Nordic International Studies Association, 39(1), 45-68.
- Mangold, B. (1990). *National Security and International Relations*. London, Routledge.
- Schultze, C. L. (1973). *The Economic Concept of National Security Policy*. Foreign Affairs, 51(3), 529-530.
- Stewart, F. (2002). *Horizontal Inequality. A Neglected Dimension of Development* Oxford: International Development Centre, Queen Elizabeth House, University of Oxford.
- The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan. *Outline of the Report of the Commission on Human Security*. online on 29 Aug. 04 <http://www.humansecurity-chs.org/finalreport/outline.html>
- The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan. *The Trust Fund for Human Security for the "Human-Centred" 21st Century*. http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/human_secu/t_fund21/what.html
- Thomas, C. (2000). *Global Governance, Development and Human Security: The Challenge of Poverty and Inequality*. London: Pluto Press.
- UNDP (1994). *Human Development Report* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vincent, R. J. (1986). *Human Rights and International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Walker, R. B. J. (1997). *The Subject of Security*. In: *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*. (Ed, Krause, K. W., M. C.) London: UCL Press Limited, pp. 61- 81.
- Walt, S., M. (1991). *The Renaissance of Security Studies*. *International Security Quarterly*, 35(2), 211-239.
- Waltz, K. N. (1979). *Theory of International Politics*. Reading, Mass. Addison-Wesley. P. 126
- Wolfensohn, J. (2000). *Address to the UN Security Council on HIV/AIDS in Africa*: World Bank News Release 2000/172/S.
- Oxford English Dictionary