DEEPENING THE NOTION OF SECURITY: USING THE HUMAN SECURITY APPROACH TO BETTER ACCOUNT FOR SECURITY IN THE 21ST CENTURY

By

Amir Abdulkhaev

Submitted to

Central European University

Department of International Relations

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts in International Relations

Supervisor: Paul Roe

Vienna, Austria

2024

Abstract

Human security is a new strand of security studies that brings the individual to the forefront. Because of its focus, this approach has great potential for security studies, however, it is too heterogeneous and includes too many concepts. This has led to an academic debate on whether it can be applied in practice. At the same time, a literature review shows that only a few papers empirically demonstrate how its application can improve or worsen academic and practical understanding of security. Given the above, this thesis will empirically investigate whether and how exactly human security can help better account for security threats. It will argue that the human security approach, by expanding the concept of security and promoting traditionally neglected aspects, can better account for security in contemporary realities. To achieve this goal, the thesis builds on existing human security concepts but advances, expands and sometimes criticises them, creating its own multifaceted and in-depth human security framework. Most importantly, this work will empirically identify which concrete elements of the human security approach are most suitable to better conceptualise and implement security. To do so, the thesis will apply the presented framework to two case studies of Rwanda and Ukraine, where the issue of human security is particularly acute. Based on empirical evidence from interviews and fieldwork conducted by specialists in these countries, it will show how the specific concepts of the presented framework have proved to be important in practice.

Acknowledgements

Above all, I would like to express my gratitude to my family - my mother, grandmother and grandfather. We may not always understand each other, but I am grateful for everything you have done for me previously and are still doing.

I also want to send my regards to my friends from high school and Bachelor's degree and reflect on our journey together and the way we have shaped each other. I have been thinking a lot about in what order to name you all so as not to offend anyone and decided to do it in the order of the (Russian) alphabet. Comrade Andrei, thank you for the wonderful and memorable years of school. It was so much fun and interesting time that I have not had since then, probably until now. As I promised you, I will take you to Mars when I am there myself and start its terraformation. And you still owe me to finish watching 'Agents'. I still remember how in our last year, you, Natasha and I used to lie on the floor of the auditorium and discuss the fifth season while the others were rehearsing the Last Call. Wonderful, unforgettable and unique times you and I have shared. Dasha, it is an irrevocable fact that I have never spoken to anyone more than you in my entire life. I have just checked, and in our dialogue, there are almost 500 thousand messages in these almost six years. Hopefully, we will reach that jubilee soon. And it is not only the quantity but also the quality of our conversations. I do not think there is anyone on Earth who knows me better than you and who would always be with me, always help me, and support me even when evil people hurt me. Delya, I really miss our collective gatherings at your place and the bartender's kit we gifted you, not to mention Kommunalka, Relab and Sol'. But our most memorable event with you was probably at Stoff due to a number of occasions. I wish you would continue talking to me directly, but Senya sends me all your words. Take good care of Senya; he is our only one. And most importantly, feed him more, he needs to eat a lot. Denis, may your Real win all the competitions it can. I still expect that one day, our

teams will meet in the Champions League final, and it will be a legendary battle. I will always remember our time together and all of the laughs we had in English and Spanish classes over the years, starting with the very first class with Juan Pablo and the way we wrote down Spanish numbers. And, of course, I remember our adventures and trips to the Orenburg Tract in all kinds of weather and situations. Good luck with your further career as well.

Luisa, we had not known each other that long, but it was still a wonderful and unforgettable time. I will always remember our time in Portugal, especially the fun with the robes at that event in the ancient monastery. We do not communicate much, but you are still one of the main sources of inspiration for me, and I hope to be as cool as you one day. I hope to see you soon somewhere in our old Europe. Masha, we also had a lot of great and wonderful times together, what is worth only our trip to Piter and Karelia. Sure, you have hurt me several times, but all this allowed me to grow as a person and to prepare myself for the subsequent bad events that happened to me. Although some of your actions will forever be wounds in my heart, we kind of got through those times. I would like to talk to you more often, but usually, it is you who do not want to. Dear Senya, you still owe me for going to Razvedka. Lubyanka is calling. It will be more dangerous for me to go there than for you, so I hope you will not be scared. I remember our constant games of badminton at the Orenburg Tract while Denis was playing football. We agreed one day to become masters of it and win a doubles badminton tournament. I am still waiting for that. I certainly remember our adventures with you and Dasha on the Golden Ring. Those were great times; I hope you remember that in 18 years, we will meet in Uglich at the same place. I think by that time, you would become a great culturologist and archaeologist and dig up something new in Sviyazhsk, Bulgars or in our Kremlin.

My Viennese friends from CEU, I have not forgotten about you either, so do not worry. Alina, thank you for the wonderful company to drink and for showing me many interesting places in

Vienna. I am sure you will cope with all the difficulties you now have, and everything will get better for you soon. I will be waiting for you when you finally get to Korea, and if I am there before you, I will bring you a couple of personal K-pop singers to keep you happy. Vasya, things really are not the same in Vienna without you. What a great time it was when you used to take me to different cafes in Vienna. It is a pity it happened so late. I miss you and hope to see you soon, in case of something, I will turn up unexpectedly at your house, luckily I know your address now. Egor, last year with you was wonderful, and you helped me the most to get to Vienna and understand how everything works here when I needed it the most. And your birthday last year was one of the best events for me in all my Vienna time. This is why it is too bad that this year you are not writing to me; you disappeared from everywhere, and I do not even know how you are doing. Jiawei, my Chinese brother from another mother, thank you for being with me all this time and, especially the last six months. You and I were in a similar situation when we only got into CEU, and it grew into something more. I send you many wishes for success with your PhD, and I know you will definitely get some position. And if it is necessary, you know I will make sure you get a spot. And you also have to take me to Hong Kong and Shanghai; I will be waiting for that moment. Ilija, my dear New York roommate, thank you for the time we spent together and all the support you gave me in New York and here in Vienna. Thank you, especially for being there for me when I needed it most and when certain people hurt me. Good luck with your work, and I am sure you will achieve a lot. Finally, sunshine Kristina, if it were not for what is happening now, I would have said to you so much. But given the current situation, I honestly do not know what I should say best. Our time together was the best time I have had in all recent times, and I just wish it would continue. Thank you for all the happiness, joy and good memories you have given me. Just know that you are always the best, and I hope things get better for you as soon as possible. And then you and I will see how to proceed further.

iv

Most importantly, although, unfortunately, I never got to know you all in person, you are the ones who have allowed me to achieve everything I have achieved so far. Without you, I would be nowhere, as you have helped me through all my worst, hardest and most depressing times. So, the most important recognition goes to you: Tada Banri, Kaga Koko, Marin Kitagawa, Wakana Gojo, Okabe Rintaro, Makise Kurisu, Sakuta Azusagawa, Mai Sakurajima, Kosei Arima, Kaori Miyazono, Amane Fujimiya, Mahiru Shiina, Vincent Law, Re-l Mayer, Riza Hawkeye and Roy Mustang.

Surely, I cannot leave out the acknowledgement for the professors who allowed this thesis to happen. First of all, a huge thank you to my supervisor, Paul Roe, for all the support and valuable comments you gave me and for guiding me through this complex and confusing path of human security. I would also like to send a special thanks and credit to other CEU professors who helped me polish the ideas for the thesis at different stages - Erin Jenne, Xymena Kurowska and Thomas Fetzer. I would like to give a special mention to Akos Kopper; although I did not study with you as much, you gave me a lot of valuable knowledge, skills and insight. I would also like to thank Judit Minczinger very much for her great support, help and valuable feedback on the thesis writing, my other papers and just the engaging chats we have had. Finally, separately, I would like to address Robin Bellers. Unfortunately, you will not see these words, but you have become like the father to me, whom I have never had. You have supported me and provided me with the most invaluable help from the very beginning of my CEU studies, even when I was stuck in a foreign country due to visa problems. I will always remember going out for coffee with you the day before I left for New York. Unfortunately, that was the last time we met... I dedicate this thesis to you, and it is the least I can do to thank you.

In Memoriam of Robin Bellers, not just a teacher, but a valued advisor and close friend...

Table of contents

Introduction: Can human security be applicable in practice?

The considerable political, social and economic changes brought about by the end of the Cold War have reshaped the understanding of security. Leading security studies scholars such as Steve Smith (1999) and Barry Buzan and Lene Hansen (2009) note that the changed global realities created a lack of understanding of what/who, to what/whom and how exactly can pose a threat nowadays. Such developments have sparked debates within the discipline about the very essence of security and led to the emergence of new strands of thought. Most significant among these was Critical Security Studies (CSS) and especially the Copenhagen School (see further Peoples and Vaughan-Williams 2020, 3-12). However, in the early 2000s, a separate discourse of human security developed within the discipline. It focused on studying the individual as an imperative for (national) security and analysed what might threaten humans and how to counter it (see, for example, Waisová 2003). Academics of human security also sought to explain how the human discourse is consistent with and influences national security nowadays and can expand academic and practical understanding of security.

This way, the human security approach seeks to change what is at the forefront of security discourse and makes the individual's life and well-being, who has been excluded from mainstream discussions of security, a referent object of security (Peoples and Vaughan-Williams 2020, 3-12; see also Watson 2011, 5). Thus, it indeed brings essential contributions to the current understanding of security. However, the primary problems with this strand lie in its heterogeneous nature, with academics examining various and, at times, contradictory concepts and lacking consensus about its use in the narrow or broad approach (Hammerstad 2000; Claessen 2012). The narrow understanding of human security focuses specifically on violence against individuals, which can be perpetrated by different actors in various forms. In

1

turn, the broad understanding further considers a wide range of environmental, economic, social and cultural threats that can negatively affect individuals. This thesis will adhere to and argue for the broad approach as it, despite broadening the notion of security, can properly cover all significant and pressing threats to security as perceived by individuals in the 21st-century realities that are not limited to conflicts and go beyond only direct violence.

Given the named issues and the break with traditional understandings of security, the Human Security School has not only failed to take a leading position in contemporary security studies but also attracted considerable criticism from other schools of thought. Under such conditions, a debate has emerged in academia about the feasibility of using the human security approach to actualise security in contemporary realities. The first camp of the debate consists mainly of conservatives, committed realists and national defence specialists. They argue that although the human security approach has some potential, using it to rethink security is not sound because of its major systematic flaws. The opposing camp comprises some CSS academics, humanitarianism scholars and proponents of the Human Security School. They recognise that this approach has some shortcomings and should narrow the range of issues it is interested in, but believe that it will bring long-needed developments and improvements to security studies and cover important but traditionally neglected problems without which it is impossible to imagine the 21st-century security.

When it comes to the first side of the debate, Walter Dorn, for example, has a primary concern about the very existence of human security "since all the initiatives in the human security agenda were already advancing before the advent of the concept" (Dorn 2009). Dorn fears that the human security approach will unnecessarily overshadow the significant threats to states and societies and argues that it can be dispensed with as many of its elements are already manifested in the national security concepts worldwide. Additionally, he considers that the

2

emphasis on the security and development of individuals will contradict the national interests of countries (Dorn 2009). David Bashow takes similar positions but goes much further in his criticism than Dorn. He states that "[t]his well-intentioned if still somewhat vague initiative, however, denies long-established principles of state sovereignty, and may well encourage unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of other states" (Bashow 2000, 23-24). According to Bashow, introducing the human security approach into security theory and practice will contrariwise increase human insecurity since, to avoid external aggression, weak countries will further repress their populations so that they will have no say whatsoever about their insecurity, which will deteriorate human security.

Among the proponents of the opposite standpoint, Kanti Bajpai argues that human security is crucial in contemporary realities because it highlights the role of indirect security threats (Bajpai 2000, 25-27). He refers to such problems as "population growth and movements, underdevelopment, environmental degradation, resource scarcity, unequal patterns of consumption" (Bajpai 2000, 27). According to Bajpai, these threats are paramount to security in the 21st century but are rarely addressed by classical approaches. Thus, a human security approach promoting attention to such indirect threats can help scholars and politicians to better account for contemporary security. Furthermore, Sarah Petrin, based on a review of NATO's security discourse and the experience of contemporary conflicts, notes that "[f]ocusing on human security is an important crisis-management tool that can strengthen resilience [of societies]" (2021). When a country faces internal and external security threats, a society must "resist and recover" to return to normal life. However, the "military preparedness" that security studies have traditionally focused on is not enough to preserve and revitalise society, and attention must be paid to the human condition. Petrin also notes that "[b]uilding a more inclusive security ... also strengthens public trust in [state] institutions" (Petrin 2021).

3

Therefore, human security also helps the interests of national security, which endeavours to have a country's population on the side of its institutions.

Although there is an academic debate about using the human security approach to better account for security in contemporary realities, the literature lacks comprehensive empirically grounded research on how specifically implementing this approach can improve or, vice versa, worsen the understanding of security with most academics limiting themselves to vague and general claims (see discussion in Fukuda-Parr and Messineo 2012). Given the above, it seems highly relevant for this thesis to empirically investigate whether broadening the essence of security through the human security approach can help better account for security or whether it will only dilute the notion of security. In other words, the thesis will examine whether human security can play a favourable role in the next turn of security studies' development and offer a better and more thorough approach to explaining and implementing security in the early 21st century. Accordingly, the findings of this paper may prove useful equally for academics in the context of rethinking the essence of security and policymakers to better understand how to incorporate the concerns of individuals into security implementation. The thesis will take the second side of the debate and argue that the human security approach, by expanding the concept of security and promoting traditionally neglected aspects, can better account for security in contemporary realities. Most importantly, this work will empirically identify which concrete elements of it are most suitable to better conceptualise and implement security. Therefore, the thesis will also contribute to the academic elaboration of the human security approach and present its own substantiated theorisation of what elements the former should include.

Accordingly, the methodology of the thesis centres on developing its own theoretical framework of human security and using empirical cases to evaluate it. The framework building on existing concepts will advance, modify and, in places, criticise them to make human security

coherent and applicable in practice. To evaluate its applicability and robustness, the thesis will then undertake an in-depth and well-rounded analysis of empirical cases from Rwanda and Ukraine. In doing so, it will draw on interviews and fieldwork findings of experts in these countries. This way, the methodology will enable the thesis to contribute to the development of security studies by offering a lens for analysing the applicability of human security to assess contemporary security threats in practice.

The structure of the thesis is as follows. The first chapter will examine the evolution of academic thinking about the role of human security and critically analyse the views on the human as a referent object by the main strands of the discipline. The second chapter will create a framework for how human security can better account for security development in the 21st century. The third chapter will illustrate how the presented framework allows for better addressing of human security problems in empirical cases. The conclusion wrap ups a discussion of the applicability of human security for contemporary security.

.

Chapter 1. The evolution of scholarly thinking on human security

1.1 The place of human security in "traditional" security studies

In academic debates about the referent object of security, it is often said that in international relations and security studies, the traditional and, therefore, natural referent object is the state. This is true, but only partially. A more thorough delving into the formation of political thought shows that since the signing of the Peace of Westphalia that changed the political landscape of the Western world and created the first system of international relations, "[t]he permissive or pluralistic understanding of security as an objective of individuals and groups as well as of states" prevailed (Waisová 2003, 58). The political thinkers of this period, be it Locke, Hobbes, Rousseau or Voltaire, on whom realists and liberals of international relations would rely in the 20th century, elaborated this pluralistic understanding of security. Only at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries did the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars change the understanding of what constitutes the primary imperative of security (Waisová 2003, 58-59). The creation of the Vienna System of international relations as a reaction to the new upheavals in Europe developed "the military sense of security, where security [was for] states", which was, in fact, an innovation for thinking about security (Rothschild 1995, 60-61). However, as Šárka Waisová notes, even so, "[u]ntil the beginning of the 20th century security was seen as a condition of both individuals and of states", and only "[t]he world wars, increasing armaments ... and the nuclear path of the superpowers in the 1950s led to a redefinition of security, which lost non-military and non-state features" (2003, 59).

Against this background, mainstream international relations, dominated by realism from the 1940s onwards, made the state the primary referent object of security (see further Buzan, Waever and de Wilde 1998). Thus, for realists, security was manifested in preserving

the state's sovereignty over its territory and the absence of military attacks by the enemy. Accordingly, their political thinking gave little space to the individual in security, but for them, "security is derived from the state, and [the latter] must be able to provide a sufficient level of protection for its population, from external as well as internal threats" (Waisová 2003, 60). Moreover, the realist view of security equated the security of individuals with the citizenship of a country and implied that human security was achieved simply by having strict and fixed ties with one's state (Sørensen 2001, 151-153). Thus, in traditional international relations and security studies, human security was perceived only as a variable dependent on states and was strongly linked to the interests of states, which completely ignored people's own concerns about security and the threats they face. The problem with this state-centric approach is that the state, represented by its elites, is not always able or even willing to understand that its populations often have different security threats than the state itself and, therefore, cannot effectively address them.

However, in the mid-1970s, the first meaningful expansion of the understanding of security occurred through the efforts of neoliberals. This happened when "due to the oil shocks, economic issues entered the national security debate ... and initiated a much broader and wider redefinition of the security concept" (Waisová 2003, 60). Leading neoliberal scholars Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye, looking at security through the lens of economics, conclude that a state's ability to respond to military threats does not mean that it is also capable of responding to economic and resource-based security threats (see Keohane and Nye 1977). Moreover, according to this thinking, it is impossible to argue that any one security area is more important than others. On this basis, Keohane and Nye come to the fundamental conclusion that "military security does not consistently dominate the agenda", and countries need to ensure their security in other areas, which sometimes requires the involvement of other actors (1977, 21). In terms of human security, it can be argued that such changes in thinking about security have led to an

academic recognition that the security of individuals goes much further than simply having citizenship of a country and is not only related to the military security of states. Although this contribution of neoliberals was an important movement in broadening the notion of security, for them, like realists, human security per se did not play a significant role, and economic security was more about states. Therefore, although in the 1970s, the notion of security moved towards covering the security of spheres with which individuals interact daily, such as the stability of markets or the availability of resources, it still retained the state as the main referent object of security and continued to keep human security in the background of thinking.

1.2 Critical Security Studies, duality of referent objects and human emancipation

Nevertheless, neoliberals' reconsideration of security opened the door for its further redefinition. The most crucial development in this regard was the formation of the Copenhagen School in the late 1980s, which gave rise to a separate strand of the discipline known as Critical Security Studies. Like the neoliberals, the Copenhagen School "rejected the traditionalist restricted approach to political-military security, arguing that security is ... applicable to a wide range of issues" (Waisová 2003, 60), but in its endeavour went much further than the former. Thus, this school of thought initiated the debate on referent objects of security, and one of its founders, Barry Buzan, delved into the study of "the relationship between individual security and state (national) security" (Buzan 1991, 35). He notes that when it comes to human security, the state is simultaneously "a major source of both threats to and security for individuals" (Buzan 1991, 35). The significance of this conclusion is that academic thinking has developed a strong position that the state not only provides security to its constituents, as traditionally perceived by default, but can also itself pose threats to society's security. However, for Buzan, despite his frequent statements about the "relevance of individual security" (see, for example, 1991, 35), the main referent object of security is still the nation-state. Accordingly, he even

argues that "[t]he link between individual and national security is anyway so partial that variations in the latter should not be expected to produce immediate or drastic variations in the political stability of the state as a whole" (Buzan 1991, 51).

Buzan's associate and co-founder of the Copenhagen School, Ole Wæver, also significantly contributed to discussing human security as a referent object. He extends Buzan's theorisation of the relationship between human and state security and introduces the concept of the duality of security. On the one hand, the state remains a referent object "for political, military, environmental, and economic security", and on the other, in parallel, society becomes an object of "societal security" (Wæver et al. 1993, 23). More importantly in the context of this thesis, for Wæver, societal security is realised for "the preservation of the population's identity" (Wæver et al. 1993, 67). That said, another important contribution of his work is the problematisation of the interdependence between traditional state sovereignty and the human identity he introduced. Wæver continues that in certain scenarios, a security threat to a country's sovereignty may not be perceived by society as a threat to its identity and may even be welcomed as something positive (Wæver et al. 1993, 46-47). This finding is important for the development of the human security approach because it not only shows that the state and individual security may differ but also that the state may not always be the actor that provides security to society. However, as in Buzan's case, for Ole Wæver, the former does not become a major referent object, and the state-human security nexus does not depart far from traditional conceptualisations. Thus, despite its contribution to problematising referent objects, the Copenhagen School has not become the framework that empowers human security.

Another essential strand within CSS that is often contrasted with the Copenhagen School is the Welsh School. It has also significantly contributed to rethinking who security should be designed for and made an even more drastic break with traditional security. As Johan

Eriksson emphasises, the Welsh School, and especially Ken Booth, is not satisfied with the concept of the state as a referent object and "criticises the state-centric approach for being part of instability, injustice, and hostility", which negatively impacts people's security and capabilities (1999, 318). The school's founder, Ken Booth, notes in this regard that "security is what individuals make of it" (1991) and "the individual physical being … must naturally be the ultimate referent in the security problematique" (2005, 264). More precisely, in contrast to the previously discussed ideas of identity preservation as what human security is created for, the Welsh School argues that the genuine security of individuals is emancipation, that is, the total absence of threats or even fears. As Booth remarks, "[e]mancipation is the freeing of people (as individuals and groups) from those physical and human constraints that stop them carrying out what they would freely choose to do" (1991, 320). Another leading figure of the Welsh School, Richard Wyn Jones, for his part, takes a similar position but further highlights that emancipation and security occur "when individuals are saved from military and non-military threats such as poverty, state-based oppression, and environment" (Jones 1999, 116). However, one of the problems with the emancipation approach is that the Welsh School scholars do not give a definite answer as to how far emancipation can continue and whether it might reach too far that it will irreversibly destabilise the social fabric (Floyd 2007).

Delving deeper into the Welsh School's understanding of humans as a referent object of security, it can be noted that "while 'the individual' of [the Copenhagen School's] theorisation may be on the lowest end of their micro- to macro-level spectrum, 'the individual' of [the Welsh School] [has] … much more circular and recursive relationality" (Zhou 2021, 20). Moreover, the ontology of individuals in this strand of CSS means that all interpersonal relations in societies are built on the foundations of humanity and cover all dimensions of social relations. Ultimately, this leads to the fact that "[this relationship] …. transcends or supersedes any other lower-'level' political, cultural, ethnic, social division" (Zhou 2021, 21). Given the

above, the theorisation of the Welsh School allows, on a theoretical level, to place states in the background when it comes to whom security is created for. These findings suggest that the Welsh School and especially Jones' approach to human security comes much closer to the views of the Human Security School than anything else, but has its own vital differences. Aspirations to downplay the role of states in ensuring the security of individuals, as seen in most works of the Welsh School (Eriksson 1999), can lead to adverse consequences. The state is a centralised actor that can control and implement the security process; however, if it is deprived of such a function, society and individuals composing it will no longer possess a force that can intervene when necessary and resolve accumulated security problems and threats (Newman 2010, 87). Thus, a proper human security approach, considering the security threats to individuals and assessing the significance and capabilities of the state, should combine human security and state security and not completely oppose the state's role. This thesis argues that such a combined approach can positively expand the understanding of security and better account for modern security threats.

1.3 The transition to the Human Security School and the emergence of critical and policy-grounded strands

The Human Development Report, which became the guiding principle of the Human Security School, appeared in 1994 (see UNDP 1994). However, before considering the thinking of this school's representatives, it is worth referring to another strand of security studies that has significantly shaped human security. This is the Third World School, which emerged in the mid-1990s as a critique of the CSS strands that were at the forefront of the academic debate. This approach to security analysis, lesser known in Western academia, "criticised the Euro American framework for analysis based on the 'western' concept of states and norms [and implied] there is a great difference between Euro-America and the Third World in terms of the consolidation of state structures and their relations with the international [security] system"

(Waisová 2003, 61). The most prominent academic of this school, Amitav Acharya, emphasises that the "Western security analysis is seen as insufficient, not only because of its terminology but also because it ignores the basic parameters of Third World states and their national security" (1995 cited in Waisová 2003, 61). This school also argues for creating a security framework for non-Western countries that considers local specificities and significant developments in security, including attention to the Third World people (Ayoob 1995). Eventually, the Human Security School academics drew on the Third World School to make their concept more universally applicable to countries outside the West, borrowed a particular emphasis on the diversity of actors involved in security beyond the state and implied a different approach to the relationship between the individual and the state compared to traditional security studies.

Turning directly to the Human Security School's perception of security, there are several important points to note. One of the early proponents of this approach, Šárka Waisová, acknowledges that it is a very broad school and highlights that its most applicable in practice version would have "[an emphasis on] the welfare of ordinary people, maintaining basic human rights and the realisation of human potential" (Waisová 2003, 62). Moreover, Waisová notes that "the concept of human security is very significant because it prioritises the individual over the state, and emphasises the role of indirect threats" but admits that state security continues to have a place in changing realities (2003, 62). Kanti Bajpai has a similar understanding of human security, arguing that it is about "the bodily safety of the individual and his personal freedom" and also focuses on the significance of indirect threats for the academic understanding and practice of security in the 21st century (2000, 37). However, he goes much further and argues that "ultimately state security is merely the means by which to achieve individual security" (Bajpai 2000, 37). Interpretation of such positions of the Human Security School representatives and their comparison with the Welsh School imply that the former

12

prioritises human security without completely ignoring the matter of the state, does not give the idea of 'emancipation' paramount importance and does not share the relationality and ontology of the latter (see Section 1.2).

Delving further into the essence of the Human Security School, it is fundamental in view of the goals of the thesis to consider its newest developments that started to prevail in the 2010s. One of the leading contributions in this regard is Edward Newman's theorisation of developing the human security approach in a critical framework and the formation of Critical Human Security Studies. Newman argues that the main analytical problem with the Human Security School is that it is not sufficiently critical while recognising that its non-critical nature allows the approach to be closer to policy implementation (2010, 90). Despite this, he maintains that "human security scholarship must go beyond its uncritical conceptual underpinnings if it is to make a lasting impact upon security studies" (Newman 2010, 78) and "survive as a credible academic focus" (Newman 2010, 92). To overcome this shortcoming and make the human security approach a more sound discipline, Newman, within his critical strand, emphasises that the former "needs to make a much clearer distinction between explanatory and normative theory", "must interrogate and problematise the values and institutions which currently exist as they relate to human welfare" and "[should] engage much more in debates about the ontology and epistemology of knowledge claims regarding the nature of security and insecurity" (Newman 2010, 93; for a similar discussion, see Kerr 2009). So, while retaining the underpinnings of the approach, critical human security seeks to make human security more theoretically sound, embedded in practice and linked to the broader security literature.

In parallel with the development of the Critical Human Security School, in the 2010s and early 2020s, the human security approach that is grounded in policy practice and is more positivist emerged in literature. This body of literature is extremely important in the outlook of

13

this thesis as it displays the most topical but sometimes controversial developments of the approach and problematises the scope of human security. For example, Sakiko Fukuda-Parr and Carol Messineo, drawing on the political domain analysis, argue that in the 21st century, security should not be about arms and states but about the "development" of people happening in their homes, jobs, communities and society, which will provide the necessary sense of security (2012, 2). Moreover, the authors emphasise that human security "can be useful for social, economic and environmental themes [through] focus[ing] on progress, deprivation or disparities" (Fukuda-Parr and Messineo 2012, 11). Similarly, Mary Martin and Taylor Owen conclude that human security is crucial to the contemporary development of security studies because "[p]eople endangered by risks to health, lack of food and shelter or environmental change require policy responses that no longer emanate solely from traditional sources" (2013, 3). Moreover, in the present times, "it is not only objects of security, but the nature of subjectivity, as well as the interrelation between providers and receivers of security, which have undergone a transformation" that also requires a changed approach to security, which human security effectively provides (Martin and Owen 2012, 3).

Neil Adger and his collaborators continue to develop a policy-grounded positivist understanding of human security. Thus, they propose that "increased human insecurity may coincide with a decline in the capacity of states to conduct effective adaptation efforts", leading to a greater potential for the emergence of security threats (Adger et al. 2014, 760-761). In saying so, they also consider that different population segments in various societies experience insecurity from global threats in a varying manner and conclude that the wide range of issues posited in "international research programmes and initiatives" constitute the realm of human insecurity (Adger et al. 2014, 762). Finally, Garry Jacobs makes an influential contribution to the discipline and presents an organic and integrated approach to peace and human security based on years of studying the policies of countries and organisations. He "regards peace and

14

security as emergent properties of harmonious social organisation" (Jacobs 2016, 49) and argues that when human security is addressed, the emphasis should not be on "physically destructive" actions but on developments that "[have] a sudden and pervasive impact [that is] deeply disruptive of the very fabric of peace, prosperity and human wellbeing" (Jacobs 2016, 57). Nevertheless, the thesis must admit that most works in this policy-grounded bulk of literature are too vague and not applicable in practice. Respectively, the primary imperative of the following two chapters is to empirically argue for concrete concepts of human security that help to better account for security in the 21st century.

To summarise the first chapter, academic thinking about human security has evolved significantly. Classical thinkers held a pluralistic view of security that was both for people and the sovereign, but traditional 20th-century international relations and security studies, influenced by a state-centred reality, perceived the state and its interests as the sole referent object of security. The end of the Cold War and the development of Critical Security Studies opened the door for a shift away from a state-centred understanding of security. Still, most CSS concepts never attributed a major role to individuals. At the same time, since the end of the 20th century, the Human Security School emerged, which put the individual at the forefront of security discussions. Yet, its problem lies in its extreme heterogeneity and lack of a precise framework. The literature review shows that in the 2010-2020s, a wide range of critical and policy-grounded human security literature has emerged, but most of the works on the topic are too vague and not practically applicable. Therefore, the following sections of this thesis will present an empirically grounded and more focused framework for human security that will help to better account for security in the 21st century.

Chapter 2. The framework of human security to better account for contemporary security developments

2.1 Overcoming the identity/securitisation clash and understanding the individual

As envisaged, the second thesis chapter will highlight which and, most importantly, how concepts of the broad human security approach actually help to better account for security in the 21st century and present its own framework for its operationalisation. The first framework element is human security's capability to overcome the identity/securitisation clash and, in general, better explain the human as a referent object of security. The intersection of identity and security concerns is at the heart of most contemporary conflicts (see Rumelili 2015), so addressing their clash is significant and extremely timely. Bahar Rumelili is highly critical of CSS and especially the Copenhagen School for "theorising the identity/security nexus in the processes of securitisation/desecuritisation", which prompts conflicts to flare up in practice (2015, 52). The human security approach can overcome this problem and disentangle the nexus between identities and securitisation. Within the human security literature, there is a novel strand that is concerned with issues of the human psyche, psychology and self-perception (see Leaning 2013; Gasper and Gómez 2015; Jacobs 2016). Linking this approach to the issues outlined by Rumelili, the thesis argues that human security, viewed through the lens of the psychological strand, will help to handle the negative conundrum of identity and security/securitisation.

Rumelili notes that overcoming the identity/securitisation clash requires understanding how different identities beyond the antagonistic ones can form and what they will include (2015, 53). Human security, as argued by proponents of the psychological approach, thoroughly covers issues of identity per se as well as the overarching problems, complexities

and threats associated with human ontology, world- and self-perception and interaction with the Other (see Gasper and Gómez 2015). Thus, the use of human security in this embodiment suggests opportunities for the creation and development of identities that do not necessarily involve conflict with and securitisation of the Other. Instead, it enables the formation of mutually beneficial identities through which the security of people within societies is ensured. Furthermore, this thesis acknowledges that critical approaches to security currently dominating the academic agenda "fail to distinguish between the ontological security to constitute a distinct Self and physical security defined as the freedom of [this] pre-constituted Self from harm, threat, or danger" (Rumelili 2015, 53) and argues that thus significantly undermines the possibility of ensuring positive relationships between identities and security in practice. In turn, human security does not reproduce this development because by grounding itself in the human psyche and self-perception, on the contrary, provides a strict differentiation between the Self for whom security consists in understanding and feeling itself and the Self that understands security as the absence of physical threats from the outside (see Lesnikovski 2011). This distinction is also a fundamental factor that, if properly applied, allows the human security approach to overcome the securitisation of identities.

Academics who have addressed the identity/security clash further argue that to overcome this dilemma, it is also necessary to focus on "the socio-psychological needs of stability and recognition" that populations have, especially in times of conflict (Bilgin 2003, 209-210). In this regard, a number of works have addressed the alleged inapplicability of human security, arguing that it cannot overcome the securitisation of identities because, despite its human focus, it ignores precisely these socio-psychological developments (see, for example, Rumelili 2015). While this might be true for early scholarship on human security or studies adopting a narrow definition, the psychological approach considered in this section precisely takes psychological needs and an understanding of stability and recognition as the starting point

of its security theorisation. Beyond that, human security, viewed through a psychological lens, also considers the multidimensionality of the relationship between the Self and the Other, noting that it is not necessarily limited to conflict and confrontation. Thus, it provides another rationale for how contemporary approaches to human security can overcome the problem of the identities and security clash, paramount to both ongoing conflicts and likely conflict-prone situations.

Moreover, drawing on the reasoning of Garry Jacobs that stability, predictability and freedom from fear "are fundamental attributes of [any] society" necessary for its optimal and sufficient functioning (2016, 48), human security can also challenge claims found in conventional security writings that the securitisation of the Other is a natural development in societies. Understanding that societies, sometimes contrary to their political elites, actually seek stability, mutual understanding and freedom from threats, including those artificially created by securitisation, has the potential to reverse the frequent arguments for the need to securitise the Other on the basis of a distinct identity. Moreover, when it comes to conflicts arising from identity/securitisation clashes, the causes are embedded in very deep layers of societies (Leaning 2013, 160-161). Consequently, traditional explanations of security and even narrow understandings of human security that are more material in nature cannot adequately address the problem. In contrast, the psychological lens of human security involves looking inside society and identifying these fundamental causes of insecurity to propose ways of addressing and resolving them.

Finally, the thesis argues that using a psychological approach to human security is essential to the security domain in a wide sense because it allows for a better understanding of the human as a referent object and how exactly human security should be realised. One of the common criticisms of human security is that it foregrounds the security of the individual but

that, unlike the situation of states, it is unclear how the individual understands and reflects on their security (see discussion in Dejaiffe 2019). However, by delving into psychology and understanding the human psyche, human security allows for understanding what exactly causes concerns and feelings of insecurity and destabilises worldviews and self-perceptions for different communities finding themselves in different contexts (see also Section 2.3). Thus, it explains what individuals expect from security providers and how they understand themselves as security objects. By doing so, the presented approach will not only enable the elaboration and application of identities outside of the securitisation framework but also show which specific security threats to an individual should be addressed in a particular situation. These findings have crucial academic and empirical implications for ensuring human security and freedom from threats.

2.2 Elucidating "new wars" and evaluating the "just war" theory

The ability to address the problem of identities and securitisation and better explain what the individual is as a referent object is an important but not the only explanation of how human security can be relevant for a better explanation of security in the 21st century. This thesis argues that the next helpful element of human security for security studies is its ability to better elucidate "new wars" and evaluate the "just war" theory. Mary Kaldor (1999) illustrates that since the end of the Cold War, the dominant type of conflict has been the "new wars", which are a mixture of armed conflict, organised crime and social violence. In new wars, the actors involved are not so much states and armies as non-state actors and guerillas (Claessen 2012, 4-5), the conflict itself is most often intra-state rather than inter-state (Blin 2011, 289) and the political goals of the parties are usually terror and destabilisation (Kaldor 1999, 4-6). Despite the broad significance of this conceptualisation for developing security understanding and the increasing prevalence of new wars in recent years, this thesis notes that traditional approaches to security still cannot fully account for the new type of war. They are narrow,

state-centred and physical violence-focused theorisations and are therefore not flexible enough to adequately explain security developments that challenge their very essence. The human security approach, on the other hand, due to its non-state perspective and grounding in policy developments, is devoid of such a limitation.

A more precise examination of the issue highlights several key features. Above all, the new wars are marked by massive human rights violations and resort to excessive and unjustified violence (Kaldor 1999, 2) as well as deliberately target people more than anything else (Claessen 2012, 17). At the same time, traditional and even some critical approaches to security "tend to prioritize the national interest over respect for and violations of human rights" (Meredith and Christou 2009, 6; see also Liotta and Owen 2006) and are generally concerned with how nation-states can defend themselves against each other rather than what happens to their populations during conflicts. In turn, human security and especially its strands grounded in human rights (Hanlon and Christie 2016; Stivachtis 2023) analyses how individuals' security is comprehensively undermined in conflicts and proposes measures and practices to increase the protection of populations from violent action, prepare them for possible outbreaks of violence and, most importantly, prevent or, at least, mitigate the effects of new wars. On a similar note, new wars are not usually fought for "a definable political end ... in geopolitical or ideological terms" (Claessen 2012, 10) but have vague goals and aspirations that change depending on the situation on the ground, thus creating uncertainty of ends as well as means. While traditional security is less suited to explaining rapidly changing circumstances affecting security, the human security approach is equipped to incorporate and analyse abruptly changing security conditions because it is concerned with "sudden and hurtful disruptions in the patterns of ... life" (Paris 2001, 89). This notion further underlines the importance of human security in addressing complex but constantly changing types of security threats arising from new wars.

Human security is also essential in the context of new wars because it explains that the just war theory in its current form is not applicable enough to new wars. Much could be said in this regard, but the thesis will focus on analysing the main just war principles directly related to human security. Above all, analysing security through a human lens shows that the important principle of proportionality is not usually found in new wars. In relation to civilians, "proportionality considerations of expected costs and benefits [are not present] in the minds" of the leadership of non-state parties to the conflict, which are the majority in new wars, as they do not attribute any importance to the situation of civilians when pursuing their objectives (Claessen 2012, 29-30). Applying state-centred approaches to security in this regard would entail a serious mistake, as the principle of proportionality on the part of guerillas, terrorists and other non-state actors may sometimes apply to states but not to civilians. Moreover, in some instances, this principle is deliberately perverted concerning civilians (Dill 2019, 331-332). Thus, if the principle of proportionality does not apply to humans as the primary target of new wars, then human security illustrates a broader problem with framing new wars as consistent with the just war theory.

Furthermore, the human security approach reveals that the principle of discrimination between combatants and non-combatants during and after new wars is also hardly applicable. State-centred explanations that imply a strict binary between state armies and civilians fail to account for the fact that in the realities of new wars, it is difficult to distinguish between soldier and civilian (McMahan 2008, 21). The fact is that in such conflicts, rebels and guerillas play a significant role, and even ordinary civilians themselves often join the fighting if identity politics is implemented against them (Heinze 2009, 136). The human security approach, however, not only pays attention to such ambiguity but also questions the status and role of all conflict actors, providing a better understanding of how new wars are fought and what this means for the populations. Such advances in human security have both academic and practical

significance as they problematise the attribution of responsibility for imposing security threats and, conversely, the provision of security in contemporary conflicts, deepening the scope of security studies.

Finally, human security is meaningful because it both questions the "just" principle of vindication of rights after the end of a conflict and illustrates that new wars do not end where traditional conceptions of security suggest they do. Even when the conflict between the parties ends, which is not always the case in new wars that "tend to bleed to death" and flare up again (Kaldor 2013, 8; see also Claessen 2012, 36), the affected societies continue to face a broad range of threats to their security because their post-war situation, unlike that of states, is rarely addressed. Conventional security no longer considers this as such developments are beyond its scope, but for human security, what happens after a conflict ends is as important as what happens during it. Accordingly, human security points out that remnants of war remain in the form of parallel criminal economies, entrenched mistrust and antagonism between societies due to the traumas inflicted, problems of social reconstruction or the harsh repressive policies of states (McMahan 2008, 22) that continue to pose security threats to humans. Human security addresses these kinds of security threats and develops practice-oriented policies aimed at overcoming remnant threats to finally ensure people's security.

2.3 Creating an integrated context-specific approach

The third element of the human security framework proposed in this thesis implies the use of an integrated perspective while drawing on the specificity of the context. Des Gasper and Oscar Gómez criticise many strands of human security for "adopt[ing] compartmentalization [and] trying to separately discuss" different security areas (2015, 100). This approach may be helpful in squeezing the theorisation into the existing conventional security studies but lacks theoretical coherence and soundness. This thesis advocates for an

"integrated" understanding of human security that has recently entered the academic debate (see Gasper and Gómez 2015; Jacobs 2016). The main strength of this line of thinking in the perspective of this thesis lies in its emphasis that the vast majority of security threats to individuals and societies stem from the interconnectedness of different spheres of life, the security actors present and the existing political practices of countries and organisations. This way, "much of the value-added from human security analysis comes ... from functioning as a boundary concept to transcend [the compartmentalisation]" (Gasper and Gómez 2015, 100-101; see also Jolly 2013) and considering how spheres of life, actors and policies construct threats imperceptible when focusing only on isolated elements of security.

The contemporary reality of a globalised world is highly multidimensional, so to fully understand what and how poses security threats or challenges to individuals and societies, it is necessary to adopt a holistic approach (Estrada-Tanck 2013, 166-168). In the understanding of this thesis, an integrated human security approach aims to see the linkages and draw comparisons between different security threats to inform adequate ways to address them in an integrated and comprehensive manner. Otherwise, security analyses will fail to see the real scope and significance of threats and will have less understanding of how to specifically address them and what can be done. As proponents of an integrated approach note, "[e]xcept for bureaucratic or academic ease, there is little reason to consider any [security] area in isolation" (Gasper and Gómez 2015, 103). Indeed, human security has greater analytical soundness and practical effectiveness than most other approaches to security because it examines how the overlapping of security threats shapes and defines a complex of threats to the individual in different spheres of life. As a result, it advances the understanding that targeting individual security threats in different spheres in isolation will not ensure proper security in practice because security threats are intertwined and affect several spheres simultaneously. Finally, academics note that the residual security threats that remain in practice

after the primary issue has been addressed are ignored by traditional security thinking but continue to be of significant importance to affected societies and prevent them from achieving the full condition of security (Fukuda-Parr and Messineo 2012, 4). Using an integrated human security approach that takes into account the layering of security domains on top of each other and recognises the multidimensionality rather than monolithic nature of threats is capable of detecting such residual threats and relieving individuals and societies of vulnerability in the face of them, which is another theoretical and practical value of the approach.

Despite the presented significance, one might argue that an integrated approach to human security would only further unnecessarily expand the concept and make it even less applicable. The thesis acknowledges this might happen, but only if the approach is used without further concretisation. In view of this, as envisioned, this thesis argues that concurrently with using an integrated approach, human security must be context-specific. In other words, a theoretically and practically sound approach to human security should indeed consider the interdependence and overlapping of distinct security threats without compartmentalisation, but only those that, in a given context, might pose a real threat to the individual/society and not the whole possible list of them. This will enable the human security approach to reasonably narrow the analytical scope and retain theoretical and practical relevance. The presented theorisation comes close to, but does not repeat, Taylor Owen's argumentation that "[b]y shifting scales from the national to the local, human security becomes a manageable concept, reducing from hundreds of possible threats down to a handful of priority challenges" (2013, 310-311). Moreover, the thesis contends that the extreme breadth of human security taken as a whole is, on the contrary, its main advantage when properly employed. This is so because it provides academics and policymakers with a comprehensive list of possible security threats and problems from which they can identify and contextualise what is appropriate for their case (see Jolly and Ray 2007).

24

An integrated and context-specific approach will more reasonably account for the security threats faced by individuals finding themselves in different contexts than a static traditional understanding of security. The latter usually postulates that security is the same in any circumstance and unifies its notion, ignoring that in different contexts and for different referent objects, different developments will present security threats (see Fusiek 2020). In turn, human security "provides fresh situation-specific understandings and insights, by applying a non-conventional boundary-crossing perspective in ways tailormade to specific cases" (Gasper 2010, 36). By contrast, in implementing an integrated context-specific human security approach, security priorities are identified "after exploring the concerns of people in specific situations rather than before" (Jolly and Ray 2007, 457), allowing for coming up with tailored responses to thoroughly address the issue. Finally, since human security typically analyses the level of development of individuals and their communities, the methodology of an integrated context-specific approach of seeing linkages and drawing comparisons can help to address or prevent security threats in communities at a similar level of development to those where comparable threats have previously occurred. This possible application of human security is rarely noted in the literature (see Pietsch and McAllister 2010) but is nevertheless an essential development for contemporary security.

2.4 Achieving effective policy manifestation and implementation

Human security can help to better account for security in contemporary realities also because it achieves a better and more effective policy addressing of security threats than other security approaches and thus has a greater empirical impact on security. The elements discussed in Section 2.3 per se lead to a better policy addressing of pressing security threats and a more effective policy implementation of security measures. However, human security involves more facets that provide it with a more capable policy embodiment. Above all, as Newman puts it, human security in its current stage of development is "an uncritical approach",

but instead, it actively contributes to problem-solving dialogue without hiding behind the veil of academia (2010, 92). This nature inherently weakens the academic position and influence of human security but makes it recognised amongst the policy actors who rely on it. The latter, in turn, strengthens it in the policy domain and provides more opportunities to influence policy and shape how security is actually operationalised. Similarly, human security has an impact on the policy domain and thus on human security in practice because it provides policy actors with a set of tools to realise their aspirations, including in the security sphere. Thus, the advantage of human security is that it "provide[s] a shared language to highlight a new focus in investigation; guide[s] evaluations; guide[s] positive analysis; focus[es] attention in policy design; and motivate[s] action" (Gasper 2010 cited in Fukuda-Parr and Messineo 2012, 15), reinforcing itself as not just another purely theoretical security field but an effective framework in practice.

An equally important manifestation of human security's greater capacity and effectiveness in policy implementation is its theorisation that security providers nowadays are not limited to states. Frequently, it is suggested that the idea of a diversity of security providers is a significant achievement in itself (see Holm 2017; Reveron and Mahoney-Norris 2018; Valenciano and Arugay 2021), but this thesis argues that the importance of this concept is manifested precisely in the domain of policy implementation. As noted throughout the thesis, human security distinguishes a wide range of security threats and postulates that cooperation between states, international and regional organisations, businesses, civil society and local actors is necessary to address the diversity of problems in practice. This thesis argues that, most of all, a diversity of security providers is necessary because a wide range of actors beyond states will bring their own appropriate approaches, competencies and tools that states do not possess to address human security problems in practice (Martin and Owen 2013, 4). This is imperative because states commonly lack the capacity and skills to correctly address human

26

security threats that go beyond state security and need practical cooperation with actors capable of doing so. Furthermore, involving additional actors beyond the state in security can "help to clarify and develop standards, begin integrated activities and monitor progress and effectiveness", which has a direct effect on policy areas (Titko and Kurtynets 2019, 566). These developments, if properly realised, "can create a horizontal, cross-border source of [security] that complements traditional vertical structures" (Titko and Kurtynets 2019, 566-567) that in the policy domain allows human security to become a framework that will unify many existing security initiatives and channel the practical efforts of the global community to a desired goal.

Delving further into policy manifestations, the methodology of human security in its broad understanding, "based upon analysis of causal processes, permits policy makers to establish linkages among traditional military threats, nontraditional human security threats, and human development" (Fukuda-Parr and Messineo 2012, 12-13). While at first, this may seem like a superficial finding, it is, in fact, of crucial importance. It shows that human security places particular emphasis on the relevant empirical cause-effect relationship of insecurity that helps to determine how the targeting of emerging security threats in practice should or should not happen. At the same time, the causal process in the understanding of human security is comprehensive and also considers elements of the traditional understanding of security if they have an essential causal influence (Tanaka 2019, 23-25). In turn, the described developments allow for the creation of policy responses to security threats that are comprehensive and coherent, take into account interrelationships ignored by traditional security and hence are better applied in practice. Moreover, this causal nature of human security methodology enables the development of "a conceptual and practical way to deal with the future trajectory of global insecurity" by analysing the causes and possible outcomes of different security threats (Liotta and Bilgin 2013, 113). This provides a further illustration of how human security methodology can make the approach more effective and influential in the policy domain.

Finally, another key constituent showing that human security is more meaningful and effective in a policy setting is its conceptual design that focuses on "foundational prevention rather than crisis management" of security threats (Gasper 2010, 36). Such a design, in practical terms, is highly significant because it empowers security actors in all their diversity to change the essence of the existing global security system to prevent the emergence of threats in various spheres instead of focusing on the post-factum treatment of problems that have already arisen. The thesis asserts that individuals in current realities are the most vulnerable object of security. Therefore, the change in the security system's nature promoted by human security is extremely important for them and increases their likelihood of feeling secure given the 21st-century's developments. Equally importantly, human security's focus "on prevention and mitigation" enables the creation of "comprehensive and multifaceted policies [and] practical frameworks" that better address the "moral, ethical dimension" of security and thus more effectively "protect and empower individuals and communities" in practice than traditional approaches (Takasu 2006, 6). Finally, this preventive human security design assumes that, in practice, prevention will be more cost-effective than intervention in already unfolding situations and more efficiently address the underlying causes of insecurity (Acharya 2014, 448-449). This makes the human security approach further suitable for a practical course of action.

2.5 Addressing gendered threats and empowering feminist security

The final element of the framework proposed in this thesis on how human security better accounts for security in the realities of the 21st century is that it addresses gender issues in security and empowers feminist approaches. Such developments are almost completely ignored by traditional understandings of security but are highly relevant and necessary in contemporary realities. This is so because despite little attention in security studies, "women are often the ones most victimised by violence in times of armed conflict [and] their basic well-being is also severely threatened in daily life by unequal access to resources, services and

opportunities, not to mention the many forms of violence women experience under 'ordinary circumstances'" (Rubio-Marin and Estrada-Tanck 2013, 237-238). In this regard, Laura Heideman argues that "[t]he concept [of human security] was a boon for feminist scholars in particular: it gave them a language to interject concerns about the kinds of interpersonal and structural violence women experience" (2013, 217). While Heideman does not specify how exactly this becomes possible, this thesis argues that this is so because human security implies a close examination and analysis of the personal conditions of individuals as well as highlighting what are the key security threats to different sections of the population. In view of this, it is not surprising that human security has increased academic and practical attention to gendered issues of security, even though the literature rarely links gender aspects of insecurity to it.

More importantly, human security, through its broad perspective and practice-oriented approach, allows the issue of gender-based security to be addressed not in isolation but directly within the broader security debate and thus enriches it in line with the needs of the 21st century. Accordingly, human security has become an extremely timely and long-needed lens to cover the security threats experienced by women, as explored by Rubio-Marin and Estrada-Tanck (2013). While the question of how human security can address the clash between identity and security has already been addressed in this thesis (see Section 2.1), in the context of gender-based security, the issue of identity is likewise important but in a more specific sense. It is argued that gender is a key element in the study of identities in security contexts (see Truong, Gasper and Handmaker 2014), so human security overcoming the "identity-less" security assumptions of traditional theorisations (Gasper and Gómez 2015) allows for the generation of appropriate and substantiated approaches for understanding gender-dependent and gender-specific security threats and their subsequent addressing.

Yet there is another key layer of how human security advances the problematisation of gendered security threats, issues and risks and hence becomes highly relevant to account for contemporary security developments. Traditional Western conceptions of security are not interested in providing women with security conditions, instead promoting discrimination and security limitations, as well as "convert the agenda of physical security for women into a project for their control" (Bumiller 2013, 192-194). At the same time, the human security approach precisely addresses and seeks to overcome this system of gender-based security discrimination in both theory and practice and thus "has real configuring power on gender relations and issues" in the context of security (Ferree 2013, 291). In a similar vein, Rubio-Marin and Estrada-Tanck illustrate that human security methodology emphasises that "the violations of [women's security] happen as part of a systematic pattern ... of structural discrimination and vulnerability" in the field of security (2013, 253). However, this thesis goes further and argues that human security, due to its focus on studying people's personal conditions and security concerns, is equipped with analytical tools to overcome systematic and sometimes intentional violations of women's security and create a practice-oriented security framework in which everyone in society enjoys a sense of security, including women. Finally, the presented discussions show that one of the main advantages and strengths of human security is its ability to perceive and frame various issues that are important when examined in detail but are habitually ignored by other security approaches intentionally or due to analytical inability.

To summarise the second chapter, this thesis has advanced the academic theorisation and understanding of human security and presented a multidimensional and thorough framework of how it can better account for security in the 21st century. Firstly, human security is equipped to overcome the clash of identities and security that is at the root of many contemporary conflicts and generally better explain the individual as a referent object of security. Secondly, it is capable of adequately explaining the security threats emanating from

new wars and showing that the concept of just war does not apply to new wars that significantly affect civilians. Thirdly, through an integrated and context-specific approach, human security can analyse and address in its entirety what threats in contemporary realities are experienced by people and societies and how they are intertwined and affect different spheres. Fourthly, this approach has a robust policy implementation of its theorisation and practical impact on the implementation of security that strengthens it in the policy domain. Fifthly, human security devotes attention to gendered security issues that are extremely important in contemporary realities and empowers feminist and other deprived views of security. Yet, to be most effective and realise its full potential, this thesis argues that human security should use all elements of the presented framework interconnectedly rather than separately. The next and final chapter of this thesis will examine several case studies that empirically illustrate how the presented framework is specifically applicable in practice and what role its various elements play in addressing threats to human security on an empirical rather than theoretical level.

Chapter 3. The empirical value of the human security approach

3.1 Human security in practice: The case study of the (post-) genocide in Rwanda

As envisaged, the third thesis chapter will examine how human security allows for better addressing pressing security threats to individuals in practice and apply the presented framework to the study of two cases where the importance of human security is particularly acute. The thesis will analyse the situations in Rwanda after the 1994 genocide and Ukraine during the Donbas conflict between 2014 and 2022. To assess the empirical situation, the work draws on fieldwork and interviews with local residents conducted by scholars, but it will go further than the existing findings and link them to human security.

Regarding Rwanda, the reconstruction of the country after the events of the genocide has indeed provided comprehensive security for the population in various spheres, which is particularly notable when compared to fragile and unstable neighbouring states (see Baker 2007; Grant 2015; Reyntjens 2016). The thesis notes that this was achieved primarily because, after the horrific events of the genocide, security was reasoned and operationalised through the lens of the people rather than the state, which directly influenced the genocide (Baker 2007, 346). A superficial examination of the current situation in Rwanda may show that the country is still providing security to its population. However, an empirical delve into Rwandan developments illustrates that "[w]hile on the surface Rwanda appeared to be a safe, stable, and economically vibrant democracy, underneath this façade people felt insecure in their lives and relationships" (Grant 2015, 21). Since Rwanda shifted its security focus from people to state security in the mid-2000s, an increasing number of Rwandans are experiencing a state of insecurity that can only be detected using a human security approach rather than traditional

notions of security. Whilst academics typically view Rwandans' increasing insecurity through the lens of other security perspectives (Longman 2011; Grant 2015), the thesis argues that these developments are most effectively addressed when applying the framework presented in the second chapter.

Primarily, in the context of the clash of identity and security (Section 2.1), security for Tutsis and Hutus in the immediate aftermath of the genocide was achieved by a government of national reconciliation by discarding ethnic identities in society that suggested antagonism. Instead, a single 'Rwandan' identity was constructed, devoid of the confrontation between the Self and the Other (Jacquemin 2022, 152-154). In recent years, however, the Rwandan government has begun to reproduce the confrontation of identities and incite social conflict to maintain its security and power. While the state claims equal security for all Rwandans, this is only true if based on state-centred understandings of security (see McLean-Hilker 2014). The use of human security, which pays attention to the personal situations of different sections of the population (Section 2.4), reveals that the Rwandan government is deliberately reintroducing Tutsi and Hutu antagonism into the discourse, openly providing more benefits to Tutsis and conversely oppressing Hutus (see interviews in Grant 2015), which significantly reinforces insecurity amongst the population belonging to a particular identity. Such developments manifest themselves in physical violence and non-material oppression, which can be detected by focusing on socio-psychological developments in society through the psychological approach to human security (Section 2.1).

In addition, Section 2.3 argues that understanding the full range of aspects of human insecurity requires an integrated, holistic approach, and the case study of post-genocidal Rwanda illustrates the importance of this. Rwandans perceive their insecurity situation to be a "metastasis" which, being deliberately created by the state for the sake of its own security in

33

one sphere, "spreads to all areas of social life, engendering fear and mistrust amongst friends and even family members" (Grant 2015, 16). Traditional approaches to security would not account for such developments because, at the state level, security is maintained, but using a human lens allows for emphasising such underlying insecurity developments in contemporary Rwandan society. Furthermore, the interviews show that the spread of human insecurity threats into different spheres of life causes the "development of secondary foci of disease at a distance from the primary site" (see interviews in Grant 2015, 21), which within the framework presented relates to the problem of residual security threats (Section 2.4). These threats to human security are not regulated by traditional approaches but are addressed by human security, which, by examining how different security domains specifically overlap, offers practice-oriented approaches to addressing them.

Analysing the situation in Rwanda through a human security lens further shows that the Rwandan population also experiences deliberately created systems of gender-based security discrimination and exclusion from security along gender lines (Section 2.5). While most gender-based approaches to human security show that such systems target women, the case study of post-genocidal Rwanda illustrates that they can also be created against men. In Rwanda, men, especially those who are young, fit and involved in community activities, "seem to be targeted more frequently by the state as potential agents of violence" who may turn against the government (see interviews in Grant 2015, 17). Similarly, for Rwandan men, "the 'security' [the state] offered was ... differentially experienced based on ethnicity" (Grant 2015, 26), which further confirms the existence of a combination of gendered and ethnic systems of exclusion from security by the state. Such developments significantly reinforce Rwandan men's insecurity in all spheres, which is ignored by traditional understandings of security and even narrow approaches to human security that ignore issues of gendered human security.

34

Another problem that human security detects is that the Rwandan state is not an actor able and, more importantly, willing to provide real rather than superficial security for its society, as sufficient security for the population could negatively affect the position of the current authoritarian regime (see interviews in Longman 2011, 27-28). This brings the research back to the point that the practical implementation of human security requires the coordination of different actors beyond states and their contribution of approaches, tools and capacities (Section 2.4). Indeed, in the established Rwandan reality, despite the state's suppression and intimidation, only civil society and local NGOs address the challenges and threats to human security (see interviews in Fisher 2017, 185-186). More distinctively, Rwanda is an example where, due to the antagonism of the state and the weakness of civil society and NGOs, individuals often become security providers for themselves and others through their actions and engagement (see interviews in Grant 2015, 23-24). It illustrates and even extends human insecurity theorising about the need for actors outside the state to provide security. Finally, due to the state's failure to provide security, Rwandans feel fundamentally insecure as they encounter ambiguity, uncertainty and confusion daily in different areas of their lives. Only their own actions and sometimes the activity of local actors can help them overcome this condition.

3.2 Human security in practice: The case study of the conflict in Eastern Ukraine

The second significant case that illustrates the practical importance of the human security framework presented in this thesis is the conflict in Donbas between 2014 and 2022. While most academics present it from the perspective of state security and interstate relations (see discussion in Robinson 2017; Matveeva 2022), the thesis argues that applying the human security framework to this conflict is possible and will reveal significant but usually ignored details. Thus, human security will help better understand the nature of the events and how they could have been addressed. In addition, the thesis argues that due to the extreme divisions and

contradictions in Ukrainian society at the time of 2014-2015 and the widespread consequences of the conflict in Donbas, the latter caused significant threats to human security not only in the regions affected by the war but also throughout Ukraine.

Above all, analysing it through the lens of human security shows that in the war in Donbas, as in the case of (post-)genocidal Rwanda, the clash of identity and security played a key role (Section 2.1). Delving into the psychology and self- and worldview of people from Donbas according to the psychological approach shows that one of the main essences of the conflict was the problem of identities and not so much political issues as it is shown through the prism of state-centred security (see interviews in Lazarenko 2019). The fact is that Donbas has historically had a freer and more independent identity, which was jeopardised by the change of power in Ukraine and the discourse of accession to the EU, which would mean ceding sovereignty in several essential areas. At the same time, interviews with politicians and citizens also show that the identity developed in the rest of Ukraine "presupposed that people in Crimea and Donbas do not have enough Ukrainian identity, mostly because of being Russian-speakers" (Lazarenko 2019, 553). The rest of Ukrainian society also felt a sense of insecurity, fearing how Russia might use the identity domain against them. At the same time, human security shows that the space for developing other non-antagonistic identities that would overcome the securitisation of this dimension was available as Donbas and the rest of Ukraine had common ground (see interviews in Giuliano 2018).

The human security approach also allows for a much better addressing of the multifactorial nature of conflict than traditional security notions (Section 2.3). Thus, in the case of the human as a referent object of security, it can be seen that the population of Donbas was insecure due to a combination of "the economic decline during the independence period", "constant talk [of the central authorities] about the unprofitability of the region" due to its coal

mining nature, "fear of losing [the Self]" and concerns about "turning towards the Ukrainian language and culture" (see interviews in Lazarenko 2019), which led to the conflict. Human security shows that the combination of these multifactorial threats had to be addressed to overcome the conflict because the political problems were only a manifestation of such deep insecurities found in other spheres. Moreover, the conflict in Eastern Ukraine shows the importance of considering how different security issues overlap and addressing residual security threats (Sections 2.2. and 2.3). Thus, examining security in the Donbas through a human lens reveals that even after the signing of ceasefire agreements in 2015, after which the intensity of the conflict decreased, "human rights violations and widespread impunity, insecurity, and lack of economic prospects in the midst of deteriorating social cohesion and violent political divisions" continued to persist for the populations of both government-controlled and non-government-controlled areas of Ukraine (Tronc and Nahikian 2020, 5). These developments posed extremely significant security threats to the people, and only their complete understanding could have restored a sense of security to the population of Donbas. At the same time, as a consequence of this conflict, the population of the rest of Ukraine also felt substantial threats to their security due to the vast flow of internally displaced persons, the severance of important economic ties within the country and the weakening of trust in their authorities (see interviews in Lazarenko 2019).

In addition, analysing the conflict in Donbas through a human security lens further shows that it deliberately created systems of security discrimination that targeted certain sections of the population (Section 2.5). Thus, Emmanuel Tronc and Anaïde Nahikian, based on their fieldwork, note that "the people of Donbas [became] more isolated than ever ... subjected to [security] discrimination and stigmatisation by both the Ukrainian authorities and separatist leaders" (2020, 70). Thus, the population of Donbas was subjected to double security discrimination without any separation between civilians and soldiers (Section 2.2), which is

37

essential for human security in this type of conflict. In terms of gendered lines of security discrimination, as in the case of Rwanda, the young male population of Donbas encountered them more because their security as potential conflict participants was not considered by both sides (Tronc and Nahikian 2020, 34). Given the above, the conflict further illustrates the practical necessity of engaging actors other than the state to ensure human security (Section 2.4). Neither the Ukrainian leadership nor the separatist leaders, despite having the capacity to do so, have been particularly committed to providing security to the population, especially on the contact line (Fischer 2019, 28-29), where the civilian-military distinction was almost non-present, and civilians suffered the most from shelling (Section 2.2). In practice, the entire provision of human security became a matter for international organisations and NGOs that addressed security threats directly affecting people, to which human security draws attention (Section 2.4). At the same time, these actors have been deprived of extensive opportunities to address security threats to the population due to the unwillingness of the leadership of the parties to the conflict to accept assistance and cooperate (Tronc and Nahikian 2020, 34). Such developments, when viewed through human security, show how states or similar actors can contrariwise deliberately reinforce human insecurity by only focusing on their own security.

From the perspective of the framework presented, it is also essential that the conflict in Donbas shows how a human security approach can better account for the security threats posed by "new wars" to people (Section 2.2). Thus, Valeria Lazarenko notes that from the perspective of people, "the war in the Donbas [lied in] local identity politics" more than in any interstate political development (2019, 559). Respectively, human security allows for considering a different but no less important dimension of security threats and underscoring that a different approach than the political one that was adopted was necessary to fully address them. Furthermore, the war in Eastern Ukraine also illustrated the inapplicability of the principles of proportionality towards civilians and discrimination between them and the military (Section

2.2). Regarding the former, the conflict on the Ukrainian side involved "clans, warlords, and oligarchs fighting[ing] for financial gain and political influence", and the Russian side was seeking "to destabilise the Westward-leaning Ukrainian authorities" (Tronc and Nahikian 2020, 6). None of them considered civilians' security imperatives in pursuing their goals. As for the latter, on the contact line, "civilians have endured shelling, destruction of their homes and cities, economic sanctions, blockades [by Ukrainian army] and villainisation by Ukrainian media" and vice versa, without any distinction between them and the actual military (Tronc and Nahikian 2020, 6).

Finally, analyses of interviews of Ukrainian respondents (see Katchanovski 2016; Giuliano 2018; Lazarenko 2019) show that human security, when it comes to its best policy addressing topical issues, can overcome pressing security concerns by drawing attention to personal stories and understandings of the current conflict (Sections 2.4 and 2.5). This approach provides an opportunity to challenge dominant security discourses and narratives that ignore the human perspective on conflict and change the focus of security. In doing so, human security allows people from opposite sides of the conflict, focusing on understanding this personal perspective and exploring social-psychological developments (Section 2.1), to approach reconciliation, overcome societal tensions and channel identity development in a positive direction. All of this is crucial to overcoming human insecurity and qualitatively distinguishes the possibilities and prospects of this approach from others that are less policy-grounded.

To summarise the third chapter, this thesis has empirically analysed and evaluated how the presented human security framework demonstrates its significance in practice. To empirically substantiate the concepts discussed, the chapter has examined two cases where human security issues are of particular importance, namely the (post-)genocidal situation in Rwanda and the conflict in Donbas. Both cases showed in practice the importance of addressing

the clash of identities within the conflict through a psychological approach, the existence of deliberately created systems of security discrimination around gender and, in the case of Rwanda, ethnic lines, the need to consider actors other than the state as security providers and the impact on people of the multidimensionality of threats and the presence of residual security threats. In addition, the conflict in Donbas also vividly illustrated security threats for people stemming from it being a new type of conflict and the possibility of national reconciliation through attention to personal perspectives and the challenge of dominant security discourses. In turn, the situation in Rwanda also highlighted how individuals themselves can be security providers in the face of weak local actors and state antagonism and how the façade of alleged security viewed through the lens of the state can be challenged by a human security approach.

Conclusion

Human security breaks with traditional state-centric strands of security and makes the individual the referent object. However, this approach has received considerable criticism in academia because it is too heterogeneous, and there is an inconsistency between its broad and narrow understandings. Consequently, there is academic debate about whether it is practically applicable to address current security threats. Despite this, there is little empirically-based and thorough work on how its application in practice can improve or worsen academic and practical understanding of security. This thesis has filled this academic gap and, by adopting a broader but more comprehensive understanding of human security, has argued that human security can indeed better address contemporary security threats in practice by paying attention to those essential elements that are usually neglected.

The first chapter of this thesis has examined the evolution of academic thinking about the human as a referent object of security. It has shown that the traditional approach to security is pluralistic and considers the security of both the population and the state. In doing so, it has also pointed out the wide-ranging shortcomings associated with the classical state-centred understanding of security and highlighted how broadening security's essence has become possible. More importantly, the first chapter has demonstrated that in the last two decades, there has been a plethora of policy-grounded works on human security, but most are too vague and not practically applicable. This has necessitated the creation of an empirically grounded framework for human security that will help to better account for security in the 21st century.

Accordingly, the second chapter, building on existing concepts but advancing, developing and criticising them, has presented its own multidimensional and thorough framework that will help make human security an approach that is relevantly applicable in practice. Firstly, the thesis has developed how, through a psychological approach, human

41

security can overcome the clash of identities and security and better explain the former. Secondly, the second chapter has argued that human security can better account for security threats emanating from a new type of conflict and shown that these cannot be categorised as just. Thirdly, it has been argued that an integrated and context-specific approach to human security overcomes many of the limitations of traditional notions of security and can account for essential but commonly ignored threats. Fourthly, because of its problem-solving approach, human security has better practical applicability and greater empirical effectiveness in targeting security threats. Fifthly, this chapter has developed how human security can explain gendered aspects of insecurity and the creation of intentional systems of exclusion from security.

However, to properly assess the practical applicability of human security, it is not enough just to present a theoretical framework. Therefore, chapter three has shown how applying this framework allows for a better account of security in post-genocidal Rwanda and Ukraine during the war in Donbas. Both cases have revealed that human security allows for the consideration of human security threats stemming from clashing identities, the existence of deliberately created systems of security discrimination around gender and ethnic lines, the importance of actors beyond the state in ensuring human security, the impact on people of the multidimensionality of threats as well the threats stemming from new wars. That said, further consideration of how human security can better than other security notions account for security in contemporary realities and how the presented framework can be empirically applied to other cases is encouraged.

Reference List

Acharya, Amitav. 1995. 'The Periphery as the Core: The Third World and Security Studies'. *YCISS Occasional Paper*, 1 January 1995. https://www.academia.edu/95086813/The_Periphery_as_the_Core_The_Third_World_and_Security_Studies.

———. 2014. 'Human Security'. In *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, edited by John Baylis, Steve Smith, and Patricia Owens, 6th Edition, 448–62. Oxford: OUP. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339956544_Human_Security.

Adger, W. Neil, Juan M. Pulhin, Jon Barnett, Geoffrey D. Dabelko, Grete K. Hovelsrud, Marc Levy, Úrsula Oswald Spring, et al. 2014. 'Human Security'. *Climate Change 2014 Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability: Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects*, January, 755–92. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415379.017.

Ayoob, Mohammed. 1995. *The Third World Security Predicament: State Making, Regional Conflict, and the International System*. L. Rienner Publishers. https://www.rienner.com/title/The_Third_World_Security_Predicament_State_Making_Regional_Conflict_and_the_International_System.

Bajpai, Kanti. 2000. 'Human Security: Concept and Measurement'. *Kroc Institute Occasional Paper*, 2000. https://www.academia.edu/1801936/Human_security_Concept_and_measurement.

Baker, Bruce. 2007. 'Reconstructing a Policing System Out of the Ashes: Rwanda's Solution'. *Policing & Society: An International Journal of Research and Policy* 17 (4): 344–66. https://doi.org/10.1080/10439460701717924.

Bashow, David. 2000. 'Reconciling the Irreconcilable: Canada's Foreign and Defence Policy Linkage'. *Canadian Military Journal* 1 (1): 17–26. http://www.journal.forces.gc.ca/vo1/no1/doc/17-26-eng.pdf.

Bilgin, Pinar. 2003. 'Individual and Societal Dimensions of Security'. *International Studies Review* 5 (2): 203–22. https://doi.org/10.1111/1521-9488.502002.

Blin, Arnaud. 2011. 'Armed Groups and Intra-State Conflicts: The Dawn of a New Era?' *International Review of the Red Cross* 93 (882): 287–310. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1816383112000045.

Booth, Ken. 1991. 'Security and Emancipation'. *Review of International Studies* 17 (4): 313–26. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210500112033.

———. 2005. 'Beyond Critical Security Studies'. In *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*, edited by Ken Booth, 259–78. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers. https://research.aber.ac.uk/en/publications/critical-security-studies-and-world-politics.

Bumiller, Kristin. 2013. 'Feminist Collaboration with the State in Response to Sexual Violence: Lessons from the American Experience'. In *Gender, Violence, and Human*

Security, 189–213. New York University Press. https://doi.org/10.18574/NYU/9780814770207.003.0008.

Buzan, Barry. 1991. *People, States & Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era*. 2nd Revised. Michiganl: Harvester & Wheatsheaf. https://archive.org/details/peoplestatesfear0002buza.

———. 2008. 'New Introduction by the Author'. In *People, States & Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era*, Revised, 1–16. ECPR Press. https://books.google.at/books/about/People_States_Fear.html?id=sURLAQAAQBAJ&redir_esc=y.

Buzan, Barry, and Lene Hansen. 2009. 'Widening and Deepening Security'. In *The Evolution of International Security Studies*, 187–225. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511817762.

Buzan, Barry, Ole Wæver, and Jaap de Wilde. 1998. *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner. https://research.rug.nl/en/publications/security-a-new-framework-for-analysis.

Claessen, Anique. 2012. 'Necessar(Il)y Evil? A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis of the Applicability of Just War Theory to Human Security and New Wars'. Nijmegen: Radboud University. https://theses.ubn.ru.nl/server/api/core/bitstreams/0d45840a-eb49-4ccd-93ad-769840961a2d/content.

Dejaiffe, Felix. 2019. 'Critics and Prospects of «Human Security»: What Are the Contributions and Criticism of Human Security as a Theoretical Concept?' Louvain-la-Neuve. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/350500491_Critics_and_Prospects_of_Human_Security_What_are_the_contributions_and_criticism_of_Human_Security_as_a_theoretical_concept.

Dill, Janina. 2019. 'Distinction, Necessity, and Proportionality: Afghan Civilians' Attitudes toward Wartime Harm'. *Ethics & International Affairs* 33 (3): 315–42. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0892679419000376.

Dorn, Walter. 2009. 'Human Security: An Overview'. *Pearson Peacekeeping Centre*, 2009. https://www.walterdorn.net/23.

Eriksson, Johan. 1999. 'Observers or Advocates? On the Political Role of Security Analysts'. *Cooperation and Conflict* 34 (3): 311–30. https://doi.org/10.1177/00108369921961889.

Estrada-Tanck, Dorothy. 2013. 'Human Security and the Human Rights of Undocumented Migrants: Systemic Vulnerabilities and Obligations of Protection'. *European Journal of Social Security* 15 (2): 151–70. https://doi.org/10.1177/138826271301500203.

Ferree, Myra Marx. 2013. 'The Discursive Politics of Gendering Human Security: Beyond the Binaries'. In *Gender, Violence, and Human Security*, 283–308. New York University Press. https://doi.org/10.18574/NYU/9780814770207.003.0012.

Fischer, Sabine. 2019. 'The Donbas Conflict: Opposing Interests and Narratives, Difficult Peace Process'. https://doi.org/10.18449/2019RP05.

Fisher, Joanna. 2017. 'The Role of NGOs in Institution-Building in Rwanda'. In *Subcontracting Peace*, 183–89. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351148405-16.

Floyd, Rita. 2007. 'Towards a Consequentialist Evaluation of Security: Bringing Together the Copenhagen and the Welsh Schools of Security Studies'. *Review of International Studies* 33 (2): 327–50. https://doi.org/10.1017/S026021050700753X.

Fukuda-Parr, Sakiko, and Carol Messineo. 2012. 'Human Security: A Critical Review of the Literature'. Leuven. https://sakikofukudaparr.net/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/HumanSecurityCriticalReview2012.pdf.

Fusiek, Dawid Aristotelis. 2020. 'Rethinking Security: The Limits of the Traditional Concept of Security in a World of Non-Traditional Threats'. *HAPSc Policy Briefs Series* 1 (2): 265–72. https://doi.org/10.12681/HAPSCPBS.26500.

Gasper, Des. 2010. 'The Idea of Human Security'. In *Climate Change, Ethics and Human Security*, 23–46. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511762475.004.

Gasper, Des, and Oscar A. Gómez. 2015. 'Human Security Thinking in Practice: "Personal Security", "citizen Security'' and Comprehensive Mappings"'. *Contemporary Politics* 21 (1): 100–116. https://doi.org/10.1080/13569775.2014.993906.

Giuliano, Elise. 2018. 'Who Supported Separatism in Donbas? Ethnicity and Popular Opinion at the Start of the Ukraine Crisis'. *Post-Soviet Affairs* 34 (2–3): 158–78. https://doi.org/10.1080/1060586X.2018.1447769.

Grant, Andrea Mariko. 2015. 'Quiet Insecurity and Quiet Agency in Post-Genocide Rwanda'. *Etnofoor* 27 (2): 15–36. https://doi.org/10.17863/CAM.27540.

Hammerstad, Anne. 2000. 'Whose Security?: UNHCR, Refugee Protection and State Security After the Cold War'. *Security Dialogue* 31 (4): 391–403. https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010600031004002/ASSET/0967010600031004002.FP.PNG_V03.

Hanlon, Robert J., and Kenneth Christie. 2016. 'Human Rights and the Rule of Law: Foundations for Human Security'. In *Freedom from Fear, Freedom from Want: An Introduction to Human Security*, 52–76. https://muse.jhu.edu/pub/50/monograph/chapter/3326798.

Heideman, Laura J. 2013. 'The Vulnerable Protecting the Vulnerable: NGOs and Human Security in the Aftermath of War'. In *Gender, Violence, and Human Security*, 214–37. New York University Press. https://doi.org/10.18574/NYU/9780814770207.003.0009.

Heinze, Eric A. 2009. 'Private Military Companies, Just War, and Humanitarian Intervention'. In *Ethics, Authority, and War*, 123–50. Palgrave Macmillan, New York. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230101791_6.

Holm, Nikolai. 2017. 'Local Actor Strategies for Achieving Human Security Functionings'. *Journal of Human Security* 13 (1): 22–33. https://doi.org/10.12924/JOHS2017.13010022.

Jacobs, Garry. 2016. 'Integrated Approach to Peace & Human Security in the 21st Century'. *Cadmus* 3 (1): 48–71. https://doaj.org/article/6821bfe162d14d158b46dac8a15d9d32.

Jacquemin, Céline A. 2022. 'How Rwanda Transformed Identity Post-Genocide'. In *Identity Transformation and Politicization in Africa: Shifting Mobilization*, 149–69. https://rowman.com/ISBN/9781666917932/Identity-Transformation-and-Politicization-in-Africa-Shifting-Mobilization.

Jolly, Richard. 2013. 'Security and Development: Context Specific Approaches to Human Insecurity'. In *Routledge Handbook of Human Security*, 139–48. Taylor and Francis. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315885926-13/SECURITY-DEVELOPMENT-CONTEXT-SPECIFIC-APPROACHES-HUMAN-INSECURITY-1-RICHARD-JOLLY.

Jolly, Richard, and Deepayan Basu Ray. 2007. 'Human Security—National Perspectives and Global Agendas: Insights from National Human Development Reports'. *Journal of International Development* 19 (4): 457–72. https://doi.org/10.1002/JID.1382.

Jones, Richard Wyn. 1999. *Security, Strategy, and Critical Theory*. Lynne Rienner Publishers. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265023798_Security_Strategy_and_Critical_Theory.

Kaldor, Mary. 1999. *New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era. Stanford University Press,* . Stanford University Press. https://doi.org/10.5860/CHOICE.36-6532.

———. 2013. 'In Defence of New Wars'. *Stability: International Journal of Security and Development* 2 (1): 1–16. https://doi.org/10.5334/STA.AT.

Katchanovski, Ivan. 2016. 'The Separatist War in Donbas: A Violent Break-up of Ukraine?' *European Politics and Society* 17 (4): 473–89. https://doi.org/10.1080/23745118.2016.1154131.

Keohane, Robert, and Joseph Nye. 1977. *Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition.* 1st ed. Little, Brown. https://books.google.at/books/about/Power_and_interdependence.html?id=RmvuAAAAMAAJ&redir_esc=y.

Kerr, Pauline. 2009. 'Human Security and Diplomacy'. In *The Routledge Handbook of Security Studies*, edited by Myriam Cavelty and Victor Mauer, 115–25. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203866764-18.

Lazarenko, Valeria. 2019. 'Conflict in Ukraine: Multiplicity of Narratives about the War and Displacement'. *European Politics and Society* 20 (5): 550–66. https://doi.org/10.1080/23745118.2018.1552108.

Leaning, Jennifer. 2013. 'Human Security and War'. *Routledge Handbook of Human Security*, January, 159–73. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315885926-15/HUMAN-SECURITY-WAR-JENNIFER-LEANING.

Lesnikovski, Ladislav. 2011. 'State Ontological Security as Human Security?: The Case of Macedonia'. In *Human Security: New Challenges, New Perspectives*, 87–108. Istanbul: The Centre for Peace and Reconciliation Studies Turkey. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Fuesun-

Oezerdem/publication/330753377_Istanbul_Human_Security_Conference_Proceedings/
links/5c52b59392851c22a39d3fe3/Istanbul-Human-Security-Conference-
Proceedings.pdf.

Liotta, Peter H., and Aybüke Bilgin. 2013. 'Why Human Security? The Case for Resilience in
an Urban Century'. In *Routledge Handbook of Human Security*, 109–22. Taylor and
Francis. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315885926-10/HUMAN-SECURITY-CASE-
RESILIENCE-URBAN-CENTURY-PETER-LIOTTA-AYB.

Liotta, Peter H., and Taylor Owen. 2006. 'Sense and Symbolism: Europe Takes On Human
Security'. *The US Army War College Quarterly: Parameters* 36 (3): 85–102.
https://doi.org/10.55540/0031-1723.2318.

Longman, Timothy. 2011. 'Limitations to Political Reform. The Undemocratic Nature of
Transition in Rwanda'. In *Remaking Rwanda: State Building and Human Rights after
Mass Violence*, edited by Scott Straus and Lars Waldorf, 25–47. University of Wisconsin
Press.
https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=ru&user=4IYwSMkA
AAAJ&cstart=20&pagesize=80&sortby=pubdate&citation_for_view=4IYwSMkAAAA
J:_Qo2XoVZTnwC.

Martin, Mary, and Taylor Owen. 2013. 'Introduction'. In *Routledge Handbook of Human
Security*, edited by Mary Martin and Taylor Owen, 1–14. Routledge.
https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315885926-1.

Matveeva, Anna. 2022. 'Donbas: The Post-Soviet Conflict That Changed Europe'. *European
Politics and Society* 23 (3): 410–41. https://doi.org/10.1080/23745118.2022.2074398.

McLean-Hilker, Lyndsay C. 2014. 'Navigating Adolescence and Young Adulthood in Rwanda
during and after Genocide: Intersections of Ethnicity, Gender and Age'. *Children's
Geographies* 12 (3): 354–68. https://doi.org/10.1080/14733285.2014.913784.

McMahan, Jeff. 2008. 'The Morality of War and the Law of War'. In *Just and Unjust Warriors:
The Moral and Legal Status of Soldiers*, 19–43. Oxford University PressOxford.
https://doi.org/10.1093/OSO/9780199233120.003.0002.

Meredith, Catherine, and Theodora A Christou. 2009. *Not in My Front Yard: Security and
Resistance to State Responsibility for Extraterritorial Acts and Omissions*. Wolf Legal
Publishers (WLP). https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3089994.

Newman, Edward. 2010. 'Critical Human Security Studies'. *Review of International Studies*
36 (1): 77–94. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210509990519.

Owen, Taylor. 2013. 'Human Security Mapping'. In *Routledge Handbook of Human Security*,
308–18. Taylor and Francis. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315885926-29/HUMAN-
SECURITY-MAPPING-TAYLOR-OWEN.

Paris, Roland. 2001. 'Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?' *Quarterly Journal:
International Security* 26 (2): 87–102. https://doi.org/10.1162/016228801753191141.

Peoples, Columba, and Nick Vaughan-Williams. 2020. 'Critical Security Studies: An Introduction'. In *Critical Security Studies*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429274794.

Petrin, Sarah. 2021. 'Why "Human Security" Matters for Tomorrow's Conflicts'. *New Atlanticist*, 2021. https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/new-atlanticist/why-human-security-matters-for-tomorrows-conflicts/.

Pietsch, Juliet, and Ian McAllister. 2010. 'Human Security in Australia: Public Interest and Political Consequences'. *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 64 (2): 225–44. https://doi.org/10.1080/10357710903544361.

Reveron, Derek S., and Kathleen A. Mahoney-Norris. 2018. 'Actors, Institutions, and Approaches to Human Security'. In *Human and National Security: Understanding Transnational Challenges*, 21–41. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429503726-2/ACTORS-INSTITUTIONS-APPROACHES-HUMAN-SECURITY-DEREK-REVERON-KATHLEEN-MAHONEY-NORRIS.

Reyntjens, Filip. 2016. '(Re-)Imagining a Reluctant Post-Genocide Society: The Rwandan Patriotic Front's Ideology and Practice'. *Journal of Genocide Research* 18 (1): 61–81. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623528.2016.1120464.

Robinson, Paul. 2017. 'Russia's Role in the War in Donbass, and the Threat to European Security'. In *Ukraine in Crisis*, 86–101. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315233116-7.

Rothschild, Emma. 1995. 'What Is Security?' *Daedalus. Journal of the American Academy of Arts Science* 124 (3): 53–98. https://www.jstor.org/stable/20027310.

Rubio-Marín, Ruth, and Dorothy Estrada-Tanck. 2013. 'Violence against Women, Human Security, and Human Rights of Women and Girls: Reinforced Obligations in the Context of Structural Vulnerability'. In *Gender, Violence, and Human Security*, 238–59. New York University Press. https://doi.org/10.18574/NYU/9780814770207.003.0010.

Rumelili, Bahar. 2015. 'Identity and Desecuritisation: The Pitfalls of Conflating Ontological and Physical Security'. *Journal of International Relations and Development* 18 (1): 52–74. https://doi.org/10.1057/JIRD.2013.22/METRICS.

Smith, Steve. 1999. 'The Increasing Insecurity of Security Studies: Conceptualizing Security in the Last Twenty Years'. *Contemporary Security Policy* 20 (3): 72–101. https://doi.org/10.1080/13523269908404231/ASSET//CMS/ASSET/40AD05F1-EBD4-435D-81A6-04C83C404379/13523269908404231.FP.PNG.

Sørensen, Georg. 2001. 'Sovereignty and Changes in Statehood'. In *Changes in Statehood: The Transformation of International Relations*, 145–63. Palgrave Macmillan, London. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230287587_11.

Stivachtis, Yannis A. 2023. 'Human Security and Human Rights: Connecting the Global and the Local'. In *Politics Between Nations: Power, Peace, and Diplomacy*, Part F773:353–68. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-24896-2_18.

Takasu, Yukio. 2006. 'Human Security Challenges: Opportunities for Cooperation through OSCE'. Vienna. https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/3/3/20987.pdf.

Tanaka, Akihiko. 2019. 'Toward a Theory of Human Security'. In *Human Security and Cross-Border Cooperation in East Asia*, 21–40. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-95240-6_2.

Titko, Elvira, and Myroslav Kurtynets. 2019. '"Human Security" as a New Concept of International Security of the 20th Century'. *Juridical Tribune* 9 (3): 559–73. https://doaj.org/article/c41489f96c7b4295b2ae97eb5a236be6.

Tronc, Emmanuel, and Anaïde Nahikian. 2020. 'Ukraine - Conflict in the Donbas: Civilians Hostage to Adversarial Geopolitics'. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. Elsevier BV. https://doi.org/10.2139/SSRN.3657394.

Truong, Thanh-Dam, Des Gasper, and Jeff Handmaker. 2014. 'Migration, Gender, Social Justice, and Human Insecurity'. In *Migration, Gender and Social Justice*, 3–26. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-28012-2_1.

UNDP. 1994. 'Human Development Report 1994'. *Human Development Report*. New York City. https://hdr.undp.org/system/files/documents/hdr1994encompletenostats.pdf.

Valenciano, Aletheia Kerygma B., and Aries A. Arugay. 2021. 'Actors and Stakeholders in Non-Traditional Security'. In *The Palgrave Encyclopedia of Global Security Studies*, 1–7. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-74336-3_160-1.

Wæver, Ole, Barry Buzan, Morten Kelstrup, and Pierre Lemaître. 1993. *Identity, Migration and the New Security Agenda in Europe*. Pinter. https://books.google.at/books/about/Identity_Migration_and_the_New_Security.html?id=hEdnQgAACAAJ&redir_esc=y.

Waisová, Šárka. 2003. 'Human Security — the Contemporary Paradigm?' *Perspectives*, no. 20, 58–72. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23615865.

Watson, Scott. 2011. 'The "Human" as Referent Object?: Humanitarianism as Securitization'. *Security Dialogue* 42 (1): 3–20. https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010610393549.

Zhou, Jiayi. 2022. 'The (Universal) Human and beyond: Constituting Security Objects in Theory and Practice'. *Critical Studies on Security* 10 (1): 16–29. https://doi.org/10.1080/21624887.2021.2012394.