

# HUMAN SECURITY IN TRADITIONAL SECURITY THEORIES – CHALLENGES AND PERSPECTIVES

Duško Vejnović<sup>1</sup>  
Predrag Obrenović<sup>2</sup>

DOI: [https://doi.org/10.18485/isimod\\_strint.2023.ch15](https://doi.org/10.18485/isimod_strint.2023.ch15)

## Keywords:

human security,  
realism,  
neorealism,  
liberalism,  
neoliberalism,  
challenges, perspectives

**Abstract:** *Since the mid-1990s, the concept of human helplessness has begun to appear in almost all theoretical discussions of the modern approach to security as one of the pressing problems. Today, after almost less than three decades, human security has become a key factor that is considered in almost all professional and scientific works all over the world, from the well-known position that security is a basic human need, a basic human value and the strongest guaranteed safety. It has become a key factor in preserving security, both at local level, at community level, and at regional level, and one could say at global level, as well. Today, there is almost no national defense strategy that does not pay special attention to the concept of human security.*

*Using scientific methods, primarily induction, then deduction, as well as description and comparison, we would like to point out that traditional theories of security such as realism, neorealism, especially liberalism and neoliberalism, indicate special importance to the individual. In addition to considering the concept of human security in traditional theories of security, this paper aims to point out the challenges and perspectives of further theoretical consideration of the concept of human security in modern society, which is increasingly characterized by multipolarity along with modern technical and technological development, based on such an analysis.*



Creative Commons Non Commercial CCBY-NC: This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial 4.0 License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>) which permits non-commercial use, reproduction and distribution of the work without further permission.

<sup>1</sup> Duško Vejnović, Full Professor, Faculty of Security Sciences, University of Banja Luka, e-mail: [dusko.vejnovic@fbn.unibl.org](mailto:dusko.vejnovic@fbn.unibl.org)

<sup>2</sup> Predrag Obrenović, Associate Professor, Independent University of Banja Luka, e-mail: [predragobrenovic@yahoo.com](mailto:predragobrenovic@yahoo.com)

## Introduction

In recent years, various forms of attempts by a large number of theorists of disunity can be seen, and the most prominent ones among them are those of strategic security studies. In their reflections, it is pointed out that the end of the Cold War did not bring any tectonic disruption in the security concept understanding. However, the post-Cold War security agenda has become such that the above-mentioned hypothesis is largely in a dilemma. Namely, in addition to the state and military as the dominant references in the traditional security concept understanding, terms and definitions such as intrastate conflicts, problems of ethnic, racial and religious identity in multiethnic states, migration, organized crime, the environment, epidemics of infectious diseases, sustainable development, and the availability of food and natural resources necessary for sustainable life of the individual could be seen in analyses dealing with security challenges at the end of the 20th century. The emergence of new concepts in the field of security has provoked a reaction from a group of security theorists, primarily those advocating the neoliberal concept of international relations regulation, and thus the concept of security (for, precisely the last decade of the 20th century was the one of the vertiginous rise of neoliberal child-globalization). They pointed out that the traditional approach to security that has emerged under the influence of realistic and neo-realistic theories of international relations and security have to and should be changed, i.e., it is necessary to redefine and adapt it to the contemporary challenges and threats. In these new approach redefinition efforts, two directions can be identified in which the redefinition process should proceed. Firstly, the concept of security should be broadened to include threats from other spheres of human society such as economic, social and environmental, in addition to traditional ones such as military and political challenges. Secondly, the traditional ways of understanding the need to be redefined, i.e. expanded and deepened in order to deviate from the narrow separation of the state as the only reference object of security. Besides the state, the individual, society and region, as well as the global order are listed equally in terms of security (what needs to be protected).

The most significant criticism of the traditional approach to security has been made by human security theorists, who explicitly demanded radical expanding of the security research agenda to issues such as sustainable development, social well-being, the economy, and the environment of a human as an individual. As a reason for this attitude, these theorists have argued that the state is no longer and can no longer be the sole guarantor and provider of individual security, and in some cases even the source of insecurity. Accordingly, in security studies, the reference object of security itself should shift from the state to the individual. Considering this approach of the proponents of the human security theory, we can state that its followers are those of the neoliberal theory of security, i.e. the followers who only further militarize the concept of individual security by expressing their views on human security, thereby allowing individual regional or global security factors and international relations, a neo-imperial approach to the interpretation of security.

The aim of this paper is to indicate that additional militarization in theoretical interpretation and practical operation of human security is not necessary, because everything needed for the undisturbed life of every individual human being has already been brought almost to perfection through neoliberal postulates of security approach.

## The human security concept

As already stated in the introductory section, the concept of "human security" is of a more recent date and as such has multiple definitions and interpretations, which will be discussed further somewhat later in the paper. Despite its innovation and relevance to the post-Cold War security agenda, human security represents one of the contemporary concepts within the existing security studies that have since become the focus of scientific and professional debate. The very essence of the human security concept lies in the idea according to which the individual is the one and only object of security, not the state or nation.

Human safety – the safety of an individual is dependent manifold on the interrelationship of a number of different factors. It is this individual that constitutes the unit to which security analysis can be sublimated. Thus, "the basic concept of human security is such that the term human indicates that the focus is on the individual, and the term security indicates the need to protect against threats" (2006). This implies that human safety is concerned with the safety of individuals. A person is safe as long as his or her physical integrity, dignity, and privacy are protected from injury and endangerment. Thus, human safety is also defined as "the state of person's protection from danger, threat and injury to their personality, rights and property" (Miletić, 1997). Yet, this definition may seem very narrow and considered correct only in terms of the police role in protecting human rights and property.

Also, the idea that people have to be protected in everyday life is not new. Some theorists emphasize that "man-centeredness is actually a political philosophy feature of liberalism, which puts people and individuals at its center, and prescribes certain conditions, such as freedom and equality, for their security". (Carr, P.) Nevertheless, what is new is precisely the very term "human security", i.e. this long political and philosophical tradition focused on man has only been expressed under this term since the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century in liberal and neoliberal considerations of international relations and security regulation.

Human security is gradually positioned at the center of special attention of the "Western society", which some international relations and security theorists treat as "democratic societies". Namely, the absence of all threats and risks that could endanger human physical integrity, dignity, social status, vital rights and freedoms, ensures the existence of basic prerequisites for the ability of individuals to achieve their life goals.

In modern theoretical discussion, when human (individual) security is an issue, one can find some of the concepts that characterize it, and they are often given as follows: life, health, status, abundance, freedom. By analyzing these elements, we can notice that in the absence of one of them, it is not possible to compensate for or replace it with another one, for it is precisely in this way that they imply the whole.

In this regard, in 1993, the Human Development Report of the United Nations Development Program (hereinafter referred to as UNDP) (UNDP, 1993, Human Development Report) states and emphasizes that the traditional security approach concepts have to be changed. Instead of focusing on national security, this Report puts emphasis on human security, so that the human security concept will be introduced into the discussion in the following year in this Report. In the aforementioned Report, human security is defined as security in relation to chronic threats (hunger, disease and repression), and the protection from sudden and harmful disruptions to the flow of daily life (UNDP, 1994, Human Development Report).

Unlike modern human security concepts, where, as mentioned earlier, the term implies the existence of several key concepts such as life, health, status, abundance, freedom, the 1994 UNDP Report on Human Development introduces the terms "freedom from fear", which includes human rights and security, and "freedom from want". The United Nations has linked human security not only to the protection of the individual from violence, but also to their overall development. Thus defined human security encompasses seven different dimensions, namely: economic, food, health, environmental, personal, social, and political security (Human Development Report, 1994, pp. 25–33).

Economic security implies an adequate and predictable income, predictable employment, safety and health at work, covered social security, income satisfaction, income disparity, and competitiveness. Food security involves physical and economic food availability, i.e. the availability and quality of food items and the purchasing power of people. Health security is achieved through the protection of people from diseases and infection, the availability and quality of health care, the health status of people and the existence of health care systems. Environmental security is achieved through the protection from pollution, as well as unimpeded access to clean water and air and an unpolluted terrestrial ecosystem. Personal security involves the absence of fear of violence and abuse, the protection of people from crime and self-destructive phenomena, etc. Social security implies family stability, quality of housing, quality of life in the local community, security of cultural identity, effects of community code of ethics, development and freedom of media and communication, freedom and effects of trade union organizations. Political security includes the development and protection of human rights, the impact of politics on the quality of life of citizens, and the impact of formal social control bodies on people's safety.

By analyzing the current professional and scientific debates and discussions, it can be concluded that at least three different approaches, three different conceptions of human security interpretations, have crystallized in them. The first approach is based on human rights, as well as the rule of law, and it defines human

security in terms of the feasibility of a wide range of different human rights. This approach is based on liberal postulates, i.e. the liberal assumption of basic individual rights to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness", as well as the obligation of the international community to protect and promote these rights.

It is safe to say that the second conception of human security is not much different from the first one, i.e. the followers of this concept advocate a humanitarian approach to human security. In advocating this approach, they describe security as the absence of fear and that this is precisely what international intervention should be aimed at in the future. Proponents of this approach view war as a major threat to human security and emphasize the idea that people should be protected from threats of violence. Also, since protection has to be provided by the international community, this approach introduces humanitarian intervention as a model of behavior in the "Western democratic societies" in the human rights preservation.

As we can see, human rights and their protection are at the core of these two concepts, whereas the third concept of understanding human security is in conflict with the first two, i.e. the followers of this concept of human security believe that human security has to and should be viewed more broadly, and as such it has to have breadth in its foundation that will encompass various forms of harm to the life and well-being of individuals. The third view is the broadest and includes sustainable human development, the exercise, protection and promotion of economic, environmental and social rights (Commission of Human Security, 2003).

Considering the concept of human security, it can be stated that currently there is no generally accepted consensus in the professional and scientific community about human security, and the concept has gained a large number of both followers and opponents over time. The main opponents of human security, meanwhile, are concerned with a broader definition of human security, according to which it represents not only freedom from fear, but also freedom from want, which encompasses so many contents (physical violence, environment, etc.) in a way that it is not clear what is and what is not the domain of human security. In addition, the concept of human security has been criticized for legitimizing humanitarian interventionism, which has been abused several times by the democratic West to undermine the sovereignty of primarily multinational states. Finally, it can be concluded that the concept of human security is based on liberal, i.e. neoliberal theories of international relations and security. However, in the following part of the paper, we will try to point out the different notions of individual and human security, because both of these concepts are at the heart of the neoliberal notion of security.

## Human security in traditional security concepts

In this part of the paper, special attention will be devoted to conceptions of human security, through four classical security theories such as realism, neorealism, liberalism and neoliberalism. For the purpose of this paper, we will consider that

security theorists, who base their views on security issues on the postulates of realism and neorealism, can be viewed, in a broader sense, as sharing the same considerations when it comes to the safety of the individual. If it is known that for realists and neo-realists the nation-state is the key and only factor in both international relations and security, then the relationship and correlation between the concepts of national security and human security will be briefly discussed.

Analyzing the professional and scientific approaches to understanding the concept of national security, it can be seen that this concept implies a synthesis of citizens' security (all members of society regardless of their ethnicity, religion, race and ideology) and state security, as well as their participation in the international and global security spheres.

The understandings of the security theories followers based on the postulates of realism and neorealism lead us to the conclusion that reference values and interests are protected from a wide range of threats to security of a human, natural and technical-technological nature, and not only from armed aggression or subversive activities of other states. A significant sphere of protective function is the prevention of emergencies, risks and threats, i.e. we can point out that followers of the theory of realism and neorealism advocate a defense approach to solving problems of human security within the framework of national security. The protection of national security involves subjects of all levels of security, such as individuals - people, society, state and the international community. According to the concepts of realists and neo-realists, states have and always will be the only ones that possess all the capacities (human, material, technical and organizational) to protect all levels of security, all its residents, as well as themselves from a large number of challenges, risks and threats. An essential characteristic of national security concept is its openness, according to which certain new and old values can simultaneously be included or excluded depending on circumstances, time and places change.

Traditional notions of national security based on realism and neorealism postulates in professional and scientific works have been presented as survival in the broadest sense, state and national survival, physical self-sustainability, territorial integrity, political independence, quality of life, national identity, and national interests. On the basis of the aforementioned, the conclusion can be drawn that national security implies the state of unimpeded access, exercise and optimal protection of national (state and social) values and interests (primarily peace, freedom, rights and security of people and social groups; quality of life; national unity, dignity, pride and identity; healthy environment; energy stability, economic and social prosperity; information resources; constitutional and legal order, the rule of law; territorial integrity; political independence; sovereignty) that are achieved, maintained and promoted on the basis of citizens' security, national security system and mechanisms, as well as the absence of (individual, group and collective) fear of their threat and a collective sense of tranquility and control over the development of future phenomena and events of importance for the life of society and the state (Mijalković, 2009).

National security includes people's security (citizens, foreigners and stateless persons in a country's territory) and the state security, and also participation in the field of international and global security.

However, changes that have occurred in the field of the conceptions of security have necessitated that the traditional division of the national security component into internal and external security be modified and adapted to new challenges and threats. Security, which encompasses an already overcome division, has integrated components both internally and externally, and the integral national security consists of several components, including peace and freedom (security from military challenges and threats), national sovereignty, territory and political system security, political independence, legal order, energy, information, social, environmental security and security of national identity, honor and dignity. These components permeate into multiple sectors and these are as follows:

- individual security sector;
- some social groups and minorities in the security sector (ethnic, religious, racial, gender, sexual, cultural, peer, etc.);
- the whole society security sector, including the one of its members living in other states;
- the state security sector, and
- the sector of the state participation in international and global security.

Therefore, nowadays national security does not only imply state functioning based on force, but also on political, economic, military, social, environmental and information stability, international reputation and integrity of the state (Simić, D., 2002). Contemporary national security is a synthesis of citizens (individuals) and state security, as well as their participation in international security. The protection of vital values is achieved through the implementation of the security function, i.e. state and non-state security sector activities, and also with the help of international cooperation in the field of security.

Evidently, new forms of security enabling the nation-state to respond to all or almost all challenges and threats jeopardizing the nation-state's security and thus each of its inhabitant regardless of religion, race, ethnicity or any other affiliation, have developed under the influence of realism and neorealism theory.

Just as for the purpose of this paper, the followers of realism and neorealism have been considered to share the same views on the security component, so liberalism and neoliberalism followers will be considered to have the same views on the security component, i.e. those that would like to remove the nation-state from the separation process in every security component. However, unlike the previous part of the paper, where the relationship of human security from the aspect of national security, in the case of liberal and neoliberal theories has been explained, the primary focus has to be on the relationship between the concepts of individual and human security, i.e. the relationship between human rights and security have to be considered.

When we begin to analyze both national and foreign professional and scientific literature, it can be noticed that a number of theorists identify individual safety with the concept of human safety. There is also a larger group of authors defining individual safety as an integral part, and for some it might be said to be the core of human safety. Sabina Elkir, for example, defines this core as "the minimum, basic or essential set of achievements related to survival, livelihood and dignity" (Elkir, 2012).

As stated in some interpretations, human safety is reduced to individual - as the absence of a threat to the physical survival of the individual. However, most authors, as well as the aforementioned and cited UNDP Report itself, interpret human safety as a broader concept that implies the focus on people and their physical and mental integrity, as well as their interaction with the social environment, for it is precisely such interactions that can generate negative consequences on the value of the person. Thus, Barry Buzan argues that most threats to individuals originate from the view that people "have merged with their social environment generating inevitable social, economic and political pressures" (Buzan, 1991).

As a means to achieve the desired state of human security, in addition to protecting the individual from violence, it is necessary to create all other social conditions for achieving comprehensive security, which includes emancipation as its ultimate outcome. According to some foreign authors, it is precisely this emancipation in people that creates freedom from restrictions that prevent them from doing freely what they would otherwise do, and not power or order based on coercion. It creates security that is both theoretical and practical.

The contribution of individual safety is also to shift the perception of the primary object of safety from the state to the individual. In order for the state, as a means of achieving security, to accomplish its goal, which is people's security, firstly it has to be able to ensure the security of individual integrity, i.e. the physical survival of a person. Nowadays, it is common to imply personal security, as the protection of the physical integrity of an individual from violence, because it is guaranteed by the state and a number of other regional and international entities, so this concept extends to the individuals' protection and other forms of threat.

As is shown, personal security concept, contained in the human security concept, has the status of a base around which all other dimensions of human security are concentrated, which, depending on the context, can be economy, ecology, health, food, education, etc. This list of human security dimensions is not definitive. Quite the contrary, it is as fluid as the concept of human security itself, and is conditioned by the time context, so that it is possible to distinguish between pre-Cold War, Cold War and post-Cold War era in understanding human security. Personal safety and individual security, which are focused on the individual in a social and biological sense, are the basic premise of a new post-Cold War conception of security contained in the human safety concept.

There is a close, or one might say inseparable, link between human security and human rights. Nevertheless, theories still offer different answers to these questions and carry out detailed analyses of the relationship between human security and human rights, although both concepts focus on the human being, i.e. the individual. Thus, in order to make any distinction between these two concepts, some authors have persistently been looking for differences in contrast to obviously similar features, asking such questions, as: Is human security a human right in itself? Are human rights the core or normative basis for the concept of human security? What is the relationship between human security and human rights in terms of the potential for "mutual support and enrichment"? Human security is definitely a holistic concept, as could be said for



human rights, which is distinguished, above all, by universality. Human rights have always implied the individual's safety. "Security" is a human right in itself, pursuant to Article 3 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. 'Everyone has the right to life, liberty and personal security', refers explicitly to security within the framework of human rights. Regarding the relationship between human rights and human security, numerous questions have been raised, but at least two seem to have been asked at the level of theoretical and empirical debate: the first one, security is a human right in itself and the second one, the concept of human security relies heavily on the theoretical discourse, practice and framework of the human rights concept. Notwithstanding, this connection is even more pronounced in the daily lives and peer systems of individuals, who, especially in conditions where their personal safety is directly threatened, will neglect every other human right and seek to eliminate circumstances and risks that threaten the basic right to life.

Currently, it can be noted that states that adhere to the values of the "Western model of democracy" primarily based on neoliberal postulates of advancing international relations and security, have different approaches to the debate on human security. Thus, we can say that Canada places more emphasis on "freedom from fear", while other countries rely more on "freedom from want" as is the case in Japan. In any case, freedom from want is based on a modern understanding in the context of economic, social and cultural rights that every human being should enjoy, and is indisputably a part of human security.

It could be noted that human security as a derived and new social and security concept, still does not have complete social support, and as such does not have the institutional and theoretical capacity that the concept of human rights has recognized in the international law and practical implementation it has. For this reason, human security relies on both this infrastructure and a part of the academic and professional argumentation developed in the human rights doctrine.

In view of the breadth of the subject concepts by the followers of the aforementioned human security postulates, the opinion that human security is a broader concept than human rights, which, in addition to fundamental rights includes the basic abilities and absolute needs of an individual, has begun to prevail in the professional and scientific community. Human security, among other things, also refers to challenges and threats such as natural disasters, or it can be said that human security includes all emerging challenges, risks and threats that will arise from both state and non-state actors.

Hence, when it comes to human rights in the concept of human security, currently an acceptable answer could be given that human rights are a part of human security, that is, they are the very core or essence of human security.

## Human security – challenges and perspectives

As it has been shown, modern theorists, who base their views primarily on the neoliberal postulates of security theory, have placed the concept of human security very broadly, thus future challenges, risks and threats to human security can be viewed

through the prism of society and life quality. It can be stated that the society and life quality are closely interrelated and have both positive and negative interactions. The term "quality of life" describes the factors that affect the living conditions of a society or individual, and more generally, it implies the degree of well-being of an individual or group of people. The life quality concept refers to the overall well-being within a society, with the tendency to provide every member of society with equal conditions to achieve their goals, of course, as long as they are not illegal or harmful to the member or the environment.

The concept of human security has a very "long list of threats", as well as insufficiently defined values: human rights, quality of life, freedom from exclusion/fear or value understood as the ability of an individual to fully and freely realize their potential in the environment in which they live. Therefore, while there is no consensus about what human security is, it is worrying that it seems even more complicated to determine what it is not. Thus, while there is no consensus about what constitutes human security, even more disturbing is the difficulty in determining what it is not, when its concept is so broadly framed as to have unforeseeable implications for global security. There is a danger that the mere interpretation of human security in the future will be one of the risks to global security itself. To avoid this possibility, the aforementioned 1994 UNDP Report lists threats to human security, but allows a large number of future challenges, risks and threats to be classified into one of the following seven groups:

- *Economic security* – faced with threats of unemployment, job insecurity, poor working conditions, income inequality, inflation, poor social security and homelessness.

- *Food security* – is achieved by addressing problems related to physical and economic access to food. People starve not because of the lack of food, but because they cannot afford it.

- *Health security* – focuses on threats to human life and health caused by infectious and parasitic diseases, HIV and other viruses, diseases caused by polluted air or water, and inadequate access to health services.

- *Environmental security* focuses on the degradation of local and global ecosystems, water scarcity, floods and other natural disasters, irrational deforestation, as well as water, air and soil pollution.

- *Personal security* focuses on suppressing threats that can take several forms: torture by the state (physical violence), threats from other states (war), threats from another group of people (ethnic tensions), threats from individuals or criminal groups (crime or street violence), threats directed at women (rape and domestic violence), threats directed at children (abuse) and threats directed at oneself (suicide, drug use).

- *Community security* focuses on ethnic tensions and violent conflict.

- *Political security* is one of the most important aspects of human security and involves living in a society that respects basic human rights and does not carry out state repression.

Human security advocates feel that subjective insecurity among people today originates more from various everyday challenges than from fears of various military, subversive, or nuclear threats. Therefore, according to them, the greatest threat is no longer war, which seems to be at least a utopian theory, from standpoint today in international relations and security. Job and income security, health and environmental

security, protection from violence - these are the primary concerns nowadays in terms of human security around the globe. It can also be noted that the catalogue of risks, challenges and threats is huge, one might say quite long. Human rights, as a set of inalienable rights and freedoms of individuals, are under particular threat in many world regions today. Global society has faced numerous contradictions in the process of reshaping the very concept of global international order and security.

Today the world is in a much more complex state of global security in which the risks, challenges and threats to security compared to the last decade of the 20th century, when the neoliberal worldview was at its peak, are much more complex compared to the aforementioned period.

In addition to the multi-vector complication of challenges, risks and threats to global survival, an even greater challenge for us is the growing alienation of people from each other. Simply put, it is very difficult to explain that a human being, who is by nature a social being and depends on interactions with other human beings, in an era of undoubted technical-technological development of civilization, becomes increasingly alienated from others. As a matter of fact, when human beings are alienated from each other, they are actually alienated from themselves, from the very essence of their existence. The ultimate and most disastrous result of this seemingly sustainable state of our global society may be the destruction of an individual as an intelligent and human being, thereby nullifying the value of human life.

When human security prospect in the coming period is in question, we should first bear in mind that the human security concept presented in the UNDP Report from 1994 represents one of the most humane ideas of the world politics. Analyzing publicly published views and reflections of a large number of security theorists, it can be concluded that in the profession and science there is a great amount of restraint, not to mention skepticism regarding the scientific scope of such a broad concept, as well as the possibility of its contribution to security studies. The representatives of the critical school, whose teaching is the closest to the ideas underlying the human safety concept, often "hinge" from it, most notably due to the analytical unprofitability that results from the imprecise determination of what is implied by human safety, i.e. what should be the subject of analysis.

Human security has originally emerged as a practical concept aimed at identifying and solving problems to which a human being, as the lowest unit of security analysis, is exposed. Contemporary literature clearly recognizes and distinguishes between the scientific treatment of human safety (analytical applicability of the concept) and its treatment as practical policy (normative applicability). From this aspect, a highly significant division is made between the stated approach to human security put forward by Mary Kaldor and others, distinguishing between two aspects of the human security doctrine, which are as follows: "... lexis – what is said and written about it and praxis – what it means in terms of everyday practical activity" (Kaldor, Martin, Selchow, 2007). The aforementioned authors subject the human security concept to particular tensions, which is natural, because placing the individual at the center and focus of security calculations has caused major changes in modern security studies and at the same time has led to numerous criticisms and contradictions. This state of affairs can best be perceived in attempts to find and establish a point of balance, between the authority of the state and the freedom of the individual, and

one might say, between the individual and collective rights. Thus, the human security concept, in modern theory, especially in practice, reflects a multitude of different ideas and conceptual notions, which are frequently difficult to harmonize and reconcile.

By analyzing the concept of human security itself, it can be noted that it is extremely complex and multidimensional. It is this multidimensionality that is reflected in the following:

- comprehensiveness- very broadly-based, with no borders preventive;
- multi-sectoral;
- contextualized;
- participatory;
- gender-aware.

When presenting and clarifying the human security concept, it is important to bear in mind the principles upon which it is based. In order for this clarification to be done at a very high level, it is necessary to put the protection and empowerment principles in focus, especially the protection principle, because people and communities are facing a fatal threat of events far beyond their control: financial crisis, violent conflict, AIDS, terrorist attacks, water scarcity, poverty, environmental destruction, etc., and many of them can appear suddenly and then they are even more dangerous. In highly turbulent world today, it is vital to be aware of risks, challenges, and threats before they arise. Indeed, when a more detailed analysis is conducted, it can be confirmed that human security, as well, has to and should adopt a defensive approach in response to emerging multi-vector challenges, risks and security, in order for it to have a complete understanding.

The power and novelty of the human security concept is perhaps best reflected through synergy with related concepts that are widely accepted. For example, human security and human resource development are often described as two closely related concepts, which also applies to the concepts of "freedom from fear" and "freedom from want". Broadly speaking, the human security concept advocates the possibility for all to enjoy the fruits of human development in a safe environment. Therefore, human development represents an important mechanism to effectively strengthen and implement the concept of human security. These initiatives are complementary. One without the other may not make the concept of human security impossible, but it makes it meaningless.

The perspective of the human security concept based on the main principle of the "centrality" of the individual, despite current debates and criticisms, is entirely certain. It is the concept that will definitely remain in the international dialogue, experiencing many successes and failures, which is a natural and logical process.

## *Conclusion*

The individual security concept emergence after the end of the Cold War on the premises of liberal, i.e. neoliberal security theory was the expected reaction of different groups of theorists, when conducting various academic research, to include in the framework of security studies other and different levels of analysis that are below the nation-state, but with which it has the least possible interaction. By virtue of such efforts, the end of the 20th century marked the human security concept, or, as many theorists

put it, its worst-case scenario, the use of human security to justify the so-called "humanitarian intervention" that the "democratic West" carried out across much of the globe in pursuit of their proclaimed goals. Human security, on the part of its followers, was used to change the previous approach to security, which had been based on national state security. However, in analyzing the conceptions of human security through the postulates of classical security theories, primarily realism and neorealism and against them liberalism and neoliberalism, it is necessary to highlight the human dimension of human security, precisely the one mentioned in the 1994 UNDP Report.

With all the positive effects of human security, which are primarily based on its human dimension, human security can be embraced through theoretical considerations of security that are based on the concepts of traditional security theories, as contemporary challenges, threats and risks require a defensive approach to security, since modern multi-vector risks, challenges and threats cannot be eliminated if they are not recognized in time.

As long as we live in the world in which the tendency of some people to impose their views on others, by various forms and methods of coercion, will not and cannot be fully accepted, human insecurity will not and cannot be fully accepted. That is, as Albert Einstein said long ago, when the pursuit of creating and maintaining decent living conditions for all people is recognized and accepted as the common obligation of all people and all countries – only then we will be able to speak of the human race as civilized with some degree of justification. Meanwhile, we will be left with anarchy in security, where every individual, every state will seek ways and means to overcome security challenges, risks and threats.

## *Bibliography*

1. Buzan, B. (1991). *People, States & Fear*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder, Colorado.
2. Oberlajtner, G. (2006). *Ljudska bezbednost i ljudska prava*. in: Dulić, D. (pr.) *Ljudska bezbednost*, Collection of Texts 2, Belgrade, Open Society Fund.
3. Mijalković, S. (2009). *Nacionalna bezbednost – od Vestfalskog koncepta do posthladnoratovskog*. Military work 2, 55-70.
4. Mary Kaldor; Mary Martin; Sabine Selchow. (2007). *Human security: a new strategic narrative for Europe*, International Affairs, Volume 83, Issue 2, SAGE Publications Ltd, Thousand Oaks, California.
5. Kerr, P. (2010). *Ljudska sigurnost at*: Collins, A. (ur.) *Contemporary Security Studies*, Zagreb, Faculty of Political Science of the University of Zagreb – Center for International and Security Studies, Political Culture, p. 115.
6. Elkir, S. (2006). *Konceptualni okvir za ljudsku bezbednost*. published in: *Human security, textbook 1*, Fund for open society, Belgrade.
7. Simić, D. (2002). *Nauka o bezbjednosti*. Official Gazette of the FRY, Belgrade.
8. The Commission of Human Security. (2003). *Human Security Now*, New York.