INTERNATIONALLY WELL-INTENTIONED
BUT INSTITUTIONALLY FAILED: HUMAN SECURITY NETWORK

Bülent Sarper AĞIR[1], Orçun MUTLU[2], Barış GÜRSOY[3]

ABSTRACT

The end of the Cold War provided a favourable environment for normative thoughts in the security realm and thus led to the broadening and deepening of security conception. Thereby, some states in global politics have been relatively stripped of traditional security conceptions and can focus on "human security", which is part of a wide range of security agendas. In this respect, a coalition of states, based on common ground and expectations on human security issues, launched the Human Security Network initiative with the effect of the normative milieu and achievements of the 1990s. However, it faced a myriad of challenges in the 21st century when traditional security conception was re-emphasised, especially in the aftermath of the 9/11 terrorist attacks and subsequent turning point developments such as the 2008 global financial crisis, the Brexit process of the European Union, the failure of the Arab Spring, refugee flows, insufficient global solidarity during the COVID-19 pandemic, and rising authoritarianism in global politics. The purpose of this study is to examine the extent to which the Human Security Network has met its objectives since its founding in light of the difficulties that have contributed to the decline of the global liberal order and its principles, as well as any organisational shortcomings.

[1] Prof. Dr., Faculty of Political Sciences, Department of International Relations, Aydın Adnan Menderes University, Turkey. E-Mail: bsagir@adu.edu.tr, https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4774-7438.

[2] PhD Candidate, Institute of Social Sciences, Department of International Relations, Kırklareli University, Tureky. E-Mail: orcun.mutlu95@outlook.com, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5735-792X.

[3] Ass. Prof., Faculty of Political Sciences, Department of International Relations, Aydın Adnan Menderes University, Turkey. E-Mail: baris.gursoy@adu.edu.tr, https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0537-3511.

Introduction

"We think too much and feel too little. More than machinery, we need humanity; more than cleverness, we need kindness and gentleness. Without these qualities, life will be violent and will be lost", says Charlie Chaplin in his brilliant work "The Great Dictator". The dominance of the state-centric perspective has resulted in a general tendency to discuss states, power, and wars in International Relations (IR). Thus, scholars and practitioners have mostly missed the importance of the "human" in IR. However, with the end of the Cold War, the "if the state is secured, the individual and the society will be secured" assumption of the traditional security conception has been widely questioned due to global, pervasive, and multidimensional security threats. Accordingly, there have emerged many different theoretical and conceptual perspectives for considering a broadened security agenda and deepening security in terms of various referent objects.[4] The security concept has been reconceptualised beyond state-centric and power-based security thinking.

Security discourses have been influenced by the globalisation process, erosion of state authority, and the existence of new security threats in the post-Cold War period. Global socio-economic inequalities and humanitarian disasters like human rights violations have led to the development of the human security concept (Ağır 2022). As a turning point in the development of the human security concept, the 1994 Human Development Report of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP 1994a, 22) defined the concept by suggesting that "everything changed… and we require a new manner of thinking… we need a transition from nuclear security to human security". Thus, there has gradually emerged a security thinking beyond the state-centric security agenda.

The concept of "human security" is conceptualised as a product of the normative and liberal world order of the 1990s, which was also known as "the humanitarian decade" of global politics. According to normative theory, there is a need to improve common principles that underpin global common good and responsibility. In addition to intellectual interest in human security, a few states, such as Canada and Japan, made some efforts on human security during the 1990s. Such efforts at the state level reveal that the deepening and widening debates in security studies have a positive impact on foreign and security policy formulations. Since the article focuses on global changes and challenges to the Human Security Network (HSN), state-level variables, such as the government changes in the HSN member countries,

---

[4] For more details about the debate of the widening and deepening of the security concept, see: Buzan 1991, Bilgin 2003, Bilgin 2010, Booth 1991, and Krause and Williams 1996.

are excluded from the study. On the other hand, some international organisations, such as the European Union (EU) and non-governmental organisations (NGOs), such as the International Committee of the Red Cross, give considerable attention to human security. This change in international politics is an important turning point in the transition of human security from the idea level to practical applications. Thus, the Human Security Network (HSN) as the main subject of the article emerged in 1999 among like-minded states focusing on the promotion of human security.

The HSN is an example of a policy framework for coordination and action on the part of countries united by a commitment to applying a human security perspective to global problems (Julio and Brauch 2009, 991). In this article, we will first analyse the activities carried out by the HSN and its achievements for global security since its establishment in 1999. However, the HSN faced a myriad of challenges in the 21st century when the traditional conception of security increased its importance, especially since the start of the 21st century. Therefore, we also aim to examine how the HSN was influenced by the recent global developments and, subsequently, the rise of traditional security understanding in international politics. Although the HSN has somewhat receded out of the public spotlight, its spirit, goals, and people-centred and prevention-orientated approach to global challenges and issues are crucial for the peace and safety of all.

The main contribution of this article to scholarly debates in the Security Studies subfield is to analyse the influence of the erosion of the liberal international order on normative security thinking concerning human security and its symbolic institutionalisation, the HSN. Another reason is that in the recent literature on the human security concept, it is not easy to find any comprehensive and deep study on the HSN, besides some exceptions. The analysis of the article is mostly based on the review and analysis of the relevant literature on the human security concept and official documents of the HSN. Thus, it aims to generate a policy analysis about the HSN and its decline.

The Concept of Human Security

Human security aims to consider individuals in a collective manner as the referent objects of security. The 1994 Human Development Report of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) emphasised human security by pointing to the need for a change from a state-centric security conception to a human-centric security conception. Firstly, the report considers human security a universal concern for all individuals (UNDP 1994a). Secondly, for the report, the components of security are interdependent, and any development such as a pandemic, terrorism,

refugee flow, or environmental pollution in any part of the world could have an implication on the rest. Thirdly, human security could be provided with the prevention of any humanitarian crisis rather than intervention in it (UNDP 1994a). Fourthly, it is argued that the referent object of security is people, not states (UNDP 1994a, 22-23). These elements differentiate human security from traditional security conceptions.

Security conditions of the post-Cold War era directly influenced the development of the human security concept. The disappearance of the global nuclear war led to the consideration of the growing importance of non-military security issues. At the same time, the democratisation process has increased its significance as a result of the expansion of democracy in world politics. Connectedly, the basic rights and freedoms of individuals and their socio-economic conditions have been largely regarded by many actors in world politics. In this respect, human security has been an important perspective for comprehending many challenges, risks, and threats to human beings, such as violations of human rights, gender issues, environmental degradation, and socio-economic problems. Moreover, the emergence of the human security concept has been a part of the growing importance and influence of liberal values and concepts in international relations (Ağır 2022). Indeed, the main mission of states in terms of providing their people's security has been subject to assessments by the United Nations (UN), the EU, and non-governmental international organisations (NGOs) such as Amnesty International. One explicit piece of evidence of the growing importance of the human security conception is related to its adaptation by some states, such as Canada, Norway, and Japan; some international organisations, such as the UN and the EU; and some informal initiatives of states, such as the HSN (Ağır 2022).

Human security means creating political, social, environmental, economic, military, and cultural systems that together give people the building blocks of survival, livelihood, and dignity (CHS 2003, 4). The concept of human security is defined according to two different conceptions: *freedom from fear* and *freedom from want*. The freedom from fear aspect of human security emphasises the protection of people from physical violence such as war, riots, terrorism, and ethnic conflicts. The freedom from want aspect of the concept gives attention to structural violence, such as socio-economic problems, poverty, and lack of educational and healthcare services (UNDP 1994a, 24). Despite these two different human security conceptions, there is a complementary relationship between them because they consider the threats to human security in a multidimensional and comprehensive manner.

Threats to human security target the physical integrity of an individual and his/her ability to make choices freely. In the UNDP's (1994b, 230-234)

Human Development Report, personal security, community security, economic security, food security, environmental security, political security, and health security are described as local threats to human security. In addition to these local threats, the 1994 Report gives attention to global or transnational issues, such as global economic inequalities, international migration, environmental issues, and international terrorism that threaten the security and welfare of human beings. It is clear that the concept of human security comprises actors and agendas beyond those of traditional international politics.

In economic security, threats are defined in the following way: employment opportunities, poverty, homelessness, job security, etc. In food security, threats are defined as poor access to food and drinkable water, etc. In health security, threats are defined as infectious diseases, air pollution, poor access to healthcare services, etc. In environmental security, threats are defined as degradation of the ecosystem, water scarcity, deforestation, air pollution, etc. In personal security, threats are defined in the context of physical violence, such as torture, war, crime, rape, suicide, and drug use. In community security, threats are defined as discrimination, assimilation, weakening, and/or disappearing of traditional languages and cultures, etc. In political security, threats are defined as political repression of the states and governments, systematic human rights violations, militarisation of society, etc. These components of human security display themselves in the emergence of both regional and global norms and institutions, from human development and humanitarian law to human rights and democracy.[5]

Who Provides Human Security and How?

The human security conception does not explicitly determine a specific responsible actor for providing human security. An individual himself/herself is not in any position to provide human security. That is why human security can be provided by larger units such as society, state, and global and/or regional international institutions. The state, in particular, should assume the primary role in providing human security since it constitutes the most important macro-structure in terms of responsibility for security. However, human security can be deeply at risk in the case of fragile states (Thakur 2006, 257). What if a state is unwilling and/or incapable of providing security to its citizens? This situation points to a significant dilemma. Although the

---

[5] For further information, please see: Alkire 2003, Brauch 2005, Chandler 2008, Gasper 2005, Hough 2004, Kaldor 2007, McDonald 2002, Paris 2001, Tadjbakhsh and Chenoy 2007, and Zwi 2004.

democratic state remains the only desirable actor for human security, a number of states remain undemocratic in the international scene. Indeed, the concept of "responsibility to protect", enhanced by the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS), questions the norm of non-intervention and state sovereignty concerning the protection of human rights and freedoms. In addition to the state's role in solving human security problems, the concept of human security also requires cooperation with civil society.

With human security, not only is the scope of security broadened and deepened, but also the providers of security constitute a network of multiple actors (Amouyel 2006, 16-17). Thus, human security has increasingly become a part of the security agendas of various international commissions, international organisations, and states. For instance, through the European Security Strategy of 2003, the EU has launched an initiative to integrate the human security concept with the Union's foreign and security policy. Moreover, some states, such as Canada, Norway, and Japan, have become the leading countries for the promotion of the human security conception for world security. Canada and Norway define their human security conceptions in respect of the absence of direct violence, such as war, terrorism, and violent rebellions, to the well-being and right to live of individuals. However, according to Japanese foreign policy, "human security covers all the menaces that threaten human survival, daily life, and dignity, such as environmental degradation, violations of human rights, organised crime, refugees, poverty, anti-personnel landmines, and infectious diseases such as AIDS" (DFAIT 1999b; MFAJ 1999, UN 2006). Moreover, Japan established the UN Human Security Fund in 1999 to operationalise the human security concept. The Human Security Trust Fund for Human Security supports projects directly related to peace-building activities, poverty, food security, and human trafficking (UN 2009, 56-57). It is clear that Japan has embraced a more comprehensive human security perspective in respect of freedom from want.

In addition to these states, some international organisations emphasise the importance of the human security conception. For instance, in 2003, the Organisation of American States (OAS) issued the Declaration on Security in the Americas, in which the importance of human security is emphasised (UN, 2010). The EU made several references to human security in its European Security Strategy 2003 by stating that new security threats are mostly non-military and cannot be dealt with by military instruments (EC 2003, 3-5). The Human Security Doctrine for Europe, prepared by the Human Security Working Group in 2004, suggested the integration of the human security concept with the EU's security policy (HSWG 2004). On the other hand, the

refusal of the EU Constitution by France and Denmark prevented the official integration of human security into the Union (Ağır 2015).

However, there are still institutional problems in strengthening the human security conception. For instance, although inter-organisational cooperation is a necessity in the formulation of human security policy and implementation, many actors of global politics, such as the EU, the OAS, the UN, and the HSN, that pay attention to human security policy do not interact sufficiently (Prezelj 2008, 13). The institutionalisation of norms of human security should be at the heart of the UN activities and global economic and financial institutions. However, their policies and activities can be effective if states stand behind them (Bajpai 2000, 31). In this respect, it should be underlined that the effective application of human security suffers from adequate support from the powerful states (Mahmud et al. 2008, 67). On the other hand, the growing interdependence of global politics makes cooperation among states, international organisations, and civil society inevitable for dealing with human security threats.

Erosion of Liberal International Order and Its Impact on Security Thinking

The end of the Cold War brought about an era of great expectations. Thus, a positive atmosphere for multilateralism, cooperation, dialogue, international law, and diplomacy in global political issues emerged. In parallel with the growing importance of human rights, freedoms, and democracy, a liberal understanding of international relations began to focus on the survival and well-being of individuals. Accordingly, the responsibilities and duties of states have been subject to re-evaluation by scholars and practitioners. Moreover, during the first decade of the post-Cold War era, regionalism and integration processes became popular practices for states within globalisation. All in all, the concept of human security found suitable conditions to express its necessity for global security. It is obvious that most of the current security threats have a multidimensional and transboundary character. That is why environmental degradation, migration issues, global socio-economic disparities, and pandemics cannot be solved by individual states' efforts.

Although multilateralism and international law seemed to be the defining features of global politics during the 1990s concerning the protection of human rights, NATO realised the "Allied Force" operation without having any authorisation from the UN by any Security Council resolution. However, a turning point happened on September 11, 2001, through terrorist attacks on the targets in the United States of America (USA). Eventually, a new and quite

different form of politics would begin to shape international relations. The 9/11 attacks and the following events in the 2000s, such as the "war on terror", the "Arab Spring", the rise of authoritarianism and populism, the "Syrian civil war", mass migration, the 2008 global financial crisis, BREXIT, and their reflections on global politics, had an undermining impact on the liberal understanding of International Relations (IR) and subsequently the human security conception.

As a part of the US's strongest reaction to the attacks, Washington declared the "war on global terror", and in the 2002 National Security Strategy Document of the US, "our best defence is a good offence" is declared as its main method (NSS 2002). This will be called the Bush Doctrine and the "preemptive strike". Thus, multilateralism, international law, and liberal values were strongly ignored by the US administration. For instance, the absence of any UNSC resolution and the lack of support from some of its European allies did not lead to any hesitation in the US occupation of Iraq. On the other hand, such a unilateral action has become a precedent for the Russian Federation and some other states' aggressive and status-quo-challenging behaviours in realising their national security interests by regarding the traditional security conception.

The unilateral actions of states such as the US and Russia have been completely contradictory to the basic assumptions of liberal theory in IR. In addition to neglecting the role of international institutions, some important documents of international law, such as the Statute of Rome, the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty, the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and the Kyoto Protocol, have been trivialised by many states for their narrow national interest definitions. However, all these international efforts are important for global peace and security and compatible with the human security conception.

While old concepts and methods of international politics have been revisited, particularly after the 9/11 events, the state security paradigm was reintroduced by privileging military security and geopolitical competition in global politics. The discourses and practices of states during more than two decades have caused the weakening of liberal thinking. Accordingly, the notion of multilateralism has been gradually replaced by unilateralism, given the rising importance of the state at the heart of security issues again.

The following events are the symbolic developments of the erosion of the liberal order and liberal security thinking: disappointing results of the Arab Spring in bringing democracy, human rights, and equality to peoples of the Middle East and North Africa; the socio-economic repercussions of the 2008 global financial crisis; the backsliding of the integration efforts of the EU regarding Brexit; the slowing down of the accession process of candidate countries; and reactions to migrant and refugee peoples and their socio-

political effect in terms of rising intolerance to "other". Moreover, there is a lack of liberal leadership in the promotion of liberal values and ideals. In contrast, there are populist, authoritarian, and nationalist political leaders who follow illiberal, nationalistic, and mostly egoist perspectives about security issues that directly target individuals. For instance, according to Ikenberry, Donald Trump was the first president who has been actively hostile to liberal internationalism since the 1930s (2018, 7). Particularly since the pandemic, it is argued that the entrenchment of authoritarianism and exacerbation of nationalism undermine the popularity and authority of international institutions that buttress the principle of multilateralism (Huang 2021, 20). John Mearsheimer argues that "it was clear that the liberal international order was in deep trouble. The tectonic plates that underpin it are shifting, and little can be done to repair and rescue it" (2019, 7). This is not an exacerbated approach given the decreasing influence of multilateralism, liberal principles, and normative values in global politics. It also has an implication for security thinking in the framework of boosting the traditional security conception.

The Birth of the Human Security Network

Traditionally, states form coalitions for political, economic, military, and/or strategic interests. However, the HSN represents an attempt to encourage the global community on a broad range of human security initiatives. The cooperative activities between Canada and Norway regarding human rights issues played an important role in the HSN establishment process with the participation of other like-minded states in the coalition.

In December 1997, the Ottawa Convention on Anti-Personnel Landmines was signed by 131 states. Canada's Foreign Minister Lloyd Axworthy and his Norwegian counterpart Knut Vollebæk met for the first time in Ottawa, Canada. Norway has been among the first countries to join the "Ottawa Treaty", the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production, and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and their Destruction. Norway, Canada, and other like-minded states agreed to collaborate in providing resources for demining and aid to victims (Axworthy et al. 2014, 144). Thus, the foundations of the Human Security Network were introduced during the negotiations of the Ottawa Convention. And also, the entry into force of the Ottawa Convention in 1999 was an important achievement. The idea that Ottawa's success could be replicated in other human security issues led to the emergence of the idea of forming an informal agenda-setting group. It can be claimed that this success inspired the formation process of the HSN.

After the two meetings between Axworthy and Vollebæk, the Lysøen Declaration (Canada-Norway Partnership for Action) was signed on May 11, 1998, in Bergen. Human security is conceptualised to provide the protection of human rights, lives, and security from threats of physical violence in the Lysøen Declaration (DFAIT 1999a, 2). Indeed, both Canada's and Norway's human security conceptions emphasised the freedom from the fear aspect of the concept by prioritising the protection of civilians in armed conflicts, preventing humanitarian catastrophes like genocidal actions in Srebrenica and Rwanda (Axworthy 1997, 183-196; Axworthy 2001, 6). On the other hand, the HSN defines human security with respect to both freedom from fear and freedom from want (UN 2010). However, most of the efforts and activities of the HSN are mainly focused on the issues of physical violence and their implications for global peace and security. The campaign for banning landmines, efforts to prevent the expansion of small arms and light weapons, and the signing of the Rome Statute for the establishment of the International Criminal Court are the main examples of a narrow conception of human security (Krause 2007, 4).

With regard to emerging human security issues, Norway and Canada, via the Lysøen Declaration, agreed to establish a framework for consultation and concerted action in the areas of enhancing human security, promoting human rights, strengthening humanitarian law, preventing conflict, and fostering democracy and good governance, as well as cooperation in the Arctic (Axworthy et al. 2014, 144). In order to achieve these objectives, they agreed to hold ministerial meetings at least once a year to review progress and set priorities. There was also an emphasis on the involvement of civil society, relevant international bodies, and other states (Small 2001, 232).

Accordingly, in the early summer of 1998, Axworthy visited the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) Summit, and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) Ministerial Conference to promote the human security agenda for global politics. The foreign ministers of Switzerland, Austria, Ireland, and Thailand expressed enthusiasm for joining a new human security group. In consultation with Norway, it was decided to approach the Netherlands, Slovenia, Jordan, South Africa, and Chile. The latter four countries, in particular, were invited in order to provide a cross-regional balance. Vollebaek offered to invite all the ministers to Bergen in May 1999 for a meeting to build on "the spirit of Lysoen" (Small 2001, 233). As a result of discussions in the Bergen meeting, the "Human Security Network" emerged to include the participation of like-minded states and non-governmental international organisations in respect of human security.

The HSN was comprised of thirteen countries: Austria, Canada, Chile, Greece, Ireland, Jordan, Mali, the Netherlands, Norway, Slovenia, South Africa (observer status), Switzerland, and Thailand. At the constituent meeting of the HSN in Bergen in May 1999, representatives of these thirteen countries were joined by the representatives of several international organisations and non-governmental organisations, including the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, Save the Children, the International Committee of the Red Cross, Amnesty International, Coalition to Stop the Use of Child Soldiers, Coalition to Combat Land Mines, and Coalition to Combat Small Arms (Axworthy et al. 2014, 145). During the HSN's meeting on September 26, 2013, it was stated that "all members have shown unity in their commitment to human security... It is this diversity that gives the Network its strength" (PMCUN 2013). Thus, the HSN promotes the integration of the human security approach into policies and programmes at the regional, national, and international levels.

In addition to pioneer states in human security, such as Canada, Norway, and Japan, some other states, such as Jordan, Ecuador, Lithuania, and Thailand, have sought to make human security a part of their national security policies. In this respect, for instance, in 2008, Ecuador made human security a part of its constitution in order to find a more human-centric solution to the problems of the country. Thailand became the first state to establish a human security ministry in the world. Human security was also recognised as the primary value of Lithuania's national security in the 2012 National Security Strategy, which was more comprehensive and included the economy, energy security, human rights, public health, and the prevention of transnational organised crime (UN 2013).

The HSN has created a structure that is explicitly informal and flexible, thereby providing an effective approach for promoting international action on concrete problems. The HSN's effectiveness is the result of three key advantages: First, it has developed a capacity for international agenda-setting. The member countries have succeeded in placing several human security issues on the international agenda. Such issues include landmine destruction and aid to landmine victims, small arms trafficking, the rights of children in armed conflict, international humanitarian law, and the impact of climate change on vulnerable groups (Julio and Brauch 2009, 1000-1001). Second, it has emphasised the multidimensional nature of the concept of human security. Third, it has become a platform through which countries can lobby collectively for issues of common concern. Human security provides the framework through which like-minded countries can work together to address global problems. Moreover, it allows countries that have little power on the international stage to leverage their collective influence and experiences to become relevant players in international policymaking (Julio

and Brauch 2009, 994). For instance, the promotion of the establishment of the HSN by Canada and Norway is also related to their search for status in international politics (Suhrke 1999, 267).

The HSN used a variety of informal mechanisms, including annual ministerial meetings, to universalise the human security idea. The first meeting at the level of Ministers of Foreign Affairs was held in Bergen, Norway, in 1999. In this meeting, the issues of anti-personnel landmines, children in armed conflict, human rights, international humanitarian law, the International Criminal Court, peacekeeping, organised crime, and development and security were addressed by the participants. At the second meeting of the HSN in Lucerne, Switzerland, in 2000, the issues of small arms, armed non-state actors, education in human rights, children in armed conflict, conflict prevention, the International Criminal Court, anti-personnel landmines, and protecting civilians in armed conflict were extensively addressed and discussed by the members of the coalition (Julio and Brauch 2009, 994). At the third meeting of the HSN in Petra, Jordan, in 2001, the issues of development and human security, peacekeeping, children in armed conflict, human security index, HIV/AIDS, gender and human security, and, lastly, small arms constituted the main items of the agenda addressed by the participant countries (HRW 2001; Julio and Brauch 2009, 992; UN 2001). In Santiago, Chile, in 2002, at the fourth meeting of the HSN, participant countries discussed the human security index, education in human rights, public security, and human security (Julio and Brauch 2009, 992; OAS 2003). In Graz, Austria, in 2003, at the fifth meeting of the HSN, participant countries addressed the issues of children in armed conflict and education in human rights (Julio and Brauch 2009, 992, MOFA, 2006). In Bamako, Mali, in 2004, at the sixth meeting of the Network, participant countries discussed the issues of children in armed conflict, small arms trafficking, gender and peacekeeping, and education in human rights (Julio and Brauch 2009, 992; MOFA 2004). In Ottawa, Canada, in 2005, at the seventh meeting of the HSN, the issues of the United Nations reform and the UN Secretary-General Report "In Larger Freedom" were extensively addressed by the participant countries. In Bangkok, Thailand, in 2006, at the eighth meeting of the HSN, the issues of people-centred development, HIV/AIDS, human trafficking, global environmental change, and natural hazards (Julio and Brauch 2009, 992; MOFA 2005) were discussed. Also, during the meeting in Bangkok, Japan initiated a policy titled "Toward Forming Friends of Human Security" (Julio and Brauch 2009, 992). In Ljubljana, Slovenia, in 2007, at the ninth meeting of the HSN, the issues of landmines, protection of women and children, fight against HIV/AIDS, human trafficking, fight against poverty, and climate change impact on vulnerable groups were discussed by the participants (Julio and Brauch 2009, 994). These meetings of the HSN were continued with the

meetings in Athens, Greece, in 2008, and Dublin, Ireland, in 2009, and thus an important agenda for human security was created with the participation and contributions of the coalition countries. Although during these meetings, some issues of human security became a topic of discussion on the agenda, some coalition countries, such as Chile and Mali, have incorporated human security into their foreign policies, but to a lesser degree.

Agenda and Achievements of the HSN

The HSN has sought to bring global attention to new and emerging issues about the security conditions of human beings. By applying a human security perspective to global problems, the HSN aims to energise political processes aimed at preventing or solving conflicts and promoting peace and development. The agenda of the HSN focuses on all four pillars of the human security concept: "freedom from want", "freedom from fear", "freedom to live in dignity", and "freedom from hazard impacts" (Julio and Brauch 2009, 992-998). For instance, in 2005, the HSN defined a working plan (2005-2008) that includes some areas of collaboration, such as effective multilateral institutions, promotion of human rights, protection of civilians, preventing the spread of small arms and landmines, and emphasis on the relationships between women, peace and security, HIV/AIDS, and poverty (Julio and Brauch 2009, 994-996).

The HSN played a key role in the achievement process of some important international conventions, such as the Anti-Personnel Landmines Agreement in 1997 (Ottawa Convention), the signing of the Kyoto Protocol in 1997, the Action Plan against Small Arms, the Additional Protocol to the Convention of the Rights of the Child, the Additional Protocol to the Convention Against Torture, and the Treaty of Rome in 1998, which established the International Criminal Court (Julio and Brauch 2009, 996). Moreover, the HSN played a role during the acceptance of some thematic resolutions of the UN Security Council on Children and Armed Conflict and on Women, Peace and Security, and the unanimous adoption in 2005 by the UN member states of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) (Axworthy et al. 2014, 145-146). The HSN has been active in the promotion of a rule-based system of global cooperation and the protection of people. These achievements have revealed that common ground in the context of human security could lead to practical results for global peace and security.

The work agenda of the HSN has been organised around a series of intergovernmental meetings held in each of the member countries. In these meetings, the participants discuss future areas where the HSN should become involved. Each of the member countries has used these meetings to direct the attention of the global community to a range of national and regional issues. For instance, while Canada, Switzerland, and Austria give attention to human

rights education, Mali emphasises the importance of the issue of child soldiers and the protection of civilians in humanitarian crises in Africa. In the same way, while Thailand gives importance to the spread of AIDS in Southeast Asia, Greece seeks to regard the relationship between human security and the climate change impact on vulnerable groups (Julio and Brauch 2009, 996-997).

In his speech during the ninth ministerial meeting of the HSN on May 18, 2007, in Ljubljana, Yukio Takasu (2009), Ambassador of Japan in charge of human security, stated that the relevance of human security was extensively acknowledged as a result of the affirmed consensus during the Outcome of the World Summit in September 2005. As an implication, the Friends of Human Security (FHS) met for the first time in October 2006 in New York. The second meeting was organised in April 2007 under the co-chairmanship of Japan and Mexico and the participation of 33 countries, including the US and Russia. The FHS is another informal forum of representatives who desire to cooperate to make the human security approach better reflected in the UN activities and to carry out joint activities (Takasu 2009). For instance, on September 23, 2009, in New York, during the annual ministerial meeting of the HSN hosted by the Permanent Mission of Switzerland to the UN, the relationship between peace and justice was strongly emphasised, especially in post-conflict societies (O'Brien 2009). On August 19, 2013, in New York, the representative of Chile in the UN made a speech on behalf of the HSN about the protection of civilians in armed conflicts (PMCUN 2013). Thus, the HSN has sought to increase the awareness of the UN member states, the UN bodies, and global civil society about the potential of human security conception for global peace and security.

Conclusion

The human security concept has constituted a challenge to traditional security thinking since the early 1990s. The human security concept is a product of structural and normative conditions of global politics and a timely offered concept, both in terms of its focused referent object and a broadened security agenda. The implementation of human security necessitates a qualitative change in the formation of foreign and security policies of the actors (Ağır 2022). The effects of human security problems have been felt differently by various states and regions. States must share a common understanding with multilateralism to struggle with these problems. Global security problems ask for global solutions. The formation of the HSN, acceptance of human security by international organisations, such as the UN, the EU, and the OAS, and promotion of the concept by some countries, such as Japan, Canada, and Norway, could be considered the success of human

security. However, human security as a normative concept has lost much of its persuasive power among policymakers. Thus, the performance of liberal states will be a determining factor for the future of the HSN.

The HSN could not help the formation of a comprehensive and effective human security regime in global politics because of several developments of the new millennium. This is mainly because of the changing perspectives of states about their security priorities and their methods to address them. Especially the 9/11 events, the Arab Spring, regional conflicts, civil wars, mass migration, economic and financial crises, pandemics, the rise of authoritarianism, unilateral actions taken by states, and mistrust of international organisations are important factors that have caused considerable erosion in the liberal international order. This erosion naturally results in great handicaps for the HSN.

As a normative stand, the HSN could mobilise the global community for the human security conception as an international agenda-setting actor. Thus, many issues of human security could be brought to the attention of some states, international institutions, civil society organisations, academia, media, and global society. It also managed to be an international platform for several states from different regions of the world in the context of the human security conception by emphasising the multidimensional nature of human security.

The HSN failed to hold meetings at the level of heads of state. While Canada did not participate in the meetings after 2011, the meetings of the HSN ended in 2018. Moreover, in Canada, as the pioneer state of the HSN, the term human security was not a subject on the website of its Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and its human security website was also closed. In Norway, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs similarly no longer lists human security as a subject heading on its website. While Canada and Norway, as two driving forces of the HSN, stopped their support for the promotion of human security in global politics due to the lack of effective institutionalisation of the HSN, its activities could not go beyond conducting an international agenda-setting unit and supporting a normative perspective about global security. Therefore, currently, it seems difficult to deepen collaboration among the member states and expand partnerships with other like-minded states on issues of common interest. Moreover, concerning the insufficient institutionalisation of the HSN, it does not have an effective website and social media presence through which its activities, mission, and vision could easily be followed.

Some HSN members demonstrated incoherent attitudes about recent human security issues in global politics. For instance, while the HSN has not addressed the COVID-19 pandemic, migration and refugee issues, the Gaza massacre, and the humanitarian implications of the Ukraine-Russian War,

Canada, Switzerland, and Norway, as the members of the HSN, are among the top actors in the manufacturing and trading of weapons and ammunition in the global market (Tian et al. 2024) despite the HSN's anti-armament initiatives. Additionally, some member countries of the HSN, such as Canada, were involved in the US's global war on terrorism campaign after the 9/11 terrorist attacks despite all its unlawful aspects.

One further problem is the predominant subjectivity of human security threat perception. Similar human security situations can be perceived quite differently around the world. The constructivist approach in social sciences substantiated the idea of contemporary reality as a social construction. Naturally, the perception of human security situations will always be subjective and conflicting. However, this is not a reason that should prevent the scientific community from contributing to minimising these differences. We need an objectivisation of human security in crisis and non-crisis situations. A periodically prepared human security index would be helpful in this regard (Prezelj 2008, 19-20).

The empowered HSN could contribute to providing detailed data collection from individual states. Thus, there will be more effective positions for evaluating and improving risk assessments about human security. The old model of separating state security from human security cannot sufficiently respond to the current generation of challenges around the globe. In global security, we should face long-term structural challenges and sudden crisis-like situations. Indeed, from the inception of the concept of human security to the present day, the nature of the threats human beings face around the world has changed dramatically (JICA Ogata Research Institute 2024). While new threats, such as dangerous planetary changes, cybersecurity, technological developments, social media, and pandemics to human security, have diversified (UNDP 2022), there is a growing need to promote solidarity for achieving human development and security. Certainly, both the human security concept and the HSN still represent a vision that is a dream for many and should be a reality for all.

References

Ağır, Bülent S. 2015. "European Perspective of Human Security: From a Conception to the Reality." In: *Twenty Years of Human Security: Theoretical Foundations and Practical Applications*, edited by Ivica Đorđević, Marina Glamotchak, Svetlana Stanarević, and Jasmina Gačić, 365-374. Belgrade: University of Belgrade – Faculty of Security Studies and Institut Français de Géopolitique Université Paris 8.

Ağır, Bülent S. 2022. *Güvenlik Çalışmaları: Kuram, Kavram ve Eleştiri*. Ankara: Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.

Alkire, Sabina. 2003. "A Conceptual Framework for Human Security." Working Paper 2003-24, Oxford University.

Amouyel, Alexandra. 2006. "What Is Human Security?". *Human Security Journal* 1 (April): 10-23.

Axworthy, Lloyd, Knut Vollebæk, Stein Kuhnle, and Sorpong Peou. 2014. "Introduction: Human Security at 20 - Lysøen Revisited." *Asian Journal of Peacebuilding* 2 (2): 143-149.

Axworthy, Lloyd. 1997. "Canada and Human Security: The Need for Leadership." *International Journal* 52 (2): 183-196.

Axworthy, Lloyd. 2001. "Introduction." In: *Human Security and the New Diplomacy: Protecting People, Promoting Peace*, edited by McRae Bob and Hubert Don, 231-235. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Bajpai, Kanti P. 2000. *Human Security: Concept and Measurement*. Indiana: Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies, University of Notre Dame.

Bilgin, Pınar. 2003. "Individual and Societal Dimensions of Security". *International Studies Review* 5 (2): 203-222.

Bilgin, Pınar. 2010. "Güvenlik Çalışmalarında Yeni Açılımlar: Yeni Güvenlik Çalışmaları". *SAREM Stratejik Araştırmalar Dergisi* 8 (14): 69-96.

Booth, Ken. 1991. "Security and Emancipation". *Review of International Studies* 17 (4): 313-326.

Brauch, Hans G. 2005. "Conceptualizing Human Security: A New Paradigm for Global Governance." In: Global Governance and the Role of the United Nations, 31-58. Berlin: Springer.

Buzan, Barry. 1991. *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era*. 2nd ed. London: Wheatsheaf.

Chandler, David. 2008. "Human Security: The Political and the Ethical". *International Relations* 22 (4): 475-492.

[CHS] Commission on Human Security. 2003. "Human Security Now: Protecting and Empowering People", United Nations Digital Library.. https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/503749?v=pdf

[DFAIT] Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade. 1999a. "A Perspective on Human Security: Chairman's Summary," Lysoen, May 20, 1999. http://www.dfait.maeci.gc.ca/foreignp/HumanSecurity/secur-e.htm

[DFAIT] Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade. 1999b. "Human Security: Safety for People in Changing World", April 1999. https://www.summit-americas.org/canada/humansecurity-english.htm

[EC] European Council. 2003. "European Security Strategy: A Secure Europe in a Better World.", *European Council*. https://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/30823/qc7809568enc.pdf

Gasper, Des. 2005. "The Ethics of Human Security". *International Studies Review* 7 (3): 487-509.

Hough, Peter. 2004. "Human Security and the International Order". *International Politics* 41 (4): 389-405.

[HRW]. 2001. "Amman Declaration on the Use of Child Soldiers", *Human Rights Watch*, April 10, 2001. https://www.hrw.org/news/2001/04/10/amman-declaration-use-children-soldiers

[HSWG] Human Security Working Group. 2004. "A Human Security Doctrine for Europe: The Barcelona Report of the Study Group on Europe's Security Capabilities". https://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2004_2009/documents/dv/human_security_report_/human_security_report_en.pdf.

Huang, Qingming. 2021. "The Pandemic and the Transformation of Liberal International Order". *Journal of Chinese Political Science* 26: 1-26.

Ikenberry, G. John. 2018. "The End of Liberal International Order?". *International Affairs* 94 (1): 7-23.

JICA Ogata Research Institute. 2024. "Human Security Today," No. 2, September, 2024. https://www.jica.go.jp/english/jica_ri/research/pickup/humansecurity/__icsFiles/afieldfile/2024/09/05/JICA_HST_2_summary_EN_web.pdf

Julio, Claudia. F. Fuentes, and Hans G. Brauch. 2009. "The Human Security Network: A Global North-South Coalition." In: *Facing Global Environmental Change: Environmental, Human, Energy, Food, Health and Water Security Concepts*, edited by Hans Günter Brauch et al., 99-–1001. Berlin: Springer.

Kaldor, Mary. 2007. "Human Security: Reflections on Globalization and Intervention". *Global Policy* 1 (1): 25-37.

Krause, Keith, and Michael C. Williams. 1996. "Broadening the Agenda of Security Studies: Politics and Methods". *Mershon International Studies Review* 40 (2): 229-254.

Krause, Keith. 2007. *Towards a Practical Human Security Agenda*. DCAF Policy Paper 26. Geneva: Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces.

Mahmud, Hasan, Muhammad Mahbub Quaisar, Abdus Sabur, and Sharmin Tabanna. 2008. "Human Security or National Security: The Problems and Prospects of the Norm of Human Security". *Journal of Politics and Law* 1 (4):67.

McDonald, Matt. 2002. "Human Security and the New International Order". *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 56 (1): 79-91.

Mearsheimer, John J. 2019. "Bound to Fail: The Rise and Fall of the Liberal International Order". *International Security* 43 (4): 7-50.

[MFAJ] Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan. 1999. "Diplomatic Bluebook 1999: Japan's Diplomacy with Leadership Toward a New Century", *Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan*. https://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/other/bluebook /1999/index.html

[MOFA] Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan. 2004. "Human Security Network Ministerial Meeting – Bamako, Mali", *Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan*, May 27-28. https://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/human_secu/state0405.html

[MOFA] Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan. 2005. "Human Security Network Ministerial Meeting – Graz, Austria," *Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan*, May 18-20. https://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/human_secu/state0505.html

[NSS] National Security Council. 2002. *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America.* https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/ nsc/nss/2002/nss5.html.

[OAS] Organization of American States. 2003. "Human Security Network IVth Ministerial Meeting", July 2-3, 2002. https://scm.oas.org/doc_public/ENGLISH/HIST_03/CP11782E07.doc

O'Brien, Patricia. 2009. "Human Security Network Annual Ministerial Meeting Statement.", September 23, 2009. https://legal.un.org/ola/media/info_ from_lc/POB-keynote.pdf.

Paris, Roland. 2001. "Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?". *International Security* 26 (2): 87-102.

[PMCUN] Permanent Mission of Chile to the United Nations. 2013. "Final Press Release". Human Security Network. https://www.minrel.gob.cl/ minrel_old/site/artic/20131001/asocfile/20131001135640/130920_versi on_final_press_release__2_.pdf.

Prezelj, Iztok. 2008. "Challenges in Conceptualizing and Providing Human Security". *Humsec Journal* 1 (2), 6-26.

Small, Michael. 2001. "The Human Security Network." In: *Human Security and the New Diplomacy: Protecting People, Promoting Peace*, edited by McRae Bob and Hubert Don, 231-235. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Suhrke, Astri. 1999. "Human Security and The Interests of States". *Security dialogue* 30 (3): 265-276.

Tadjbakhsh, Shahrbanou, and Anuradha Chenoy. 2007. *Human Security: Concepts and implications*. London: Routledge.

Takasu, Yukio**.** 2009. "What the Friends of Human Security Aim to Achieve: Measure Progress by Change in the Lives of People", Address on the Report of the Secretary-General on the Work of the Organization at the 64th Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, October 6, 2009. https://www.mofa.go.jp/announce/speech/un2009/un0910.html.

Thakur, Ramesh. 2006. *The United Nations, Peace and Security: From Collective Security to Responsibility to Protect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tian, Nan, Diego Lopes da Silva, Xiaodon Liang, and Lora Scarazzato. 2024. "Trends in World Military Expenditure, 2023", *SIPRI Fact Sheet*, April, 2024.

[UN]. 2001. "General Assembly Report: Human Security Network", *United Nations*. https://documents.un.org/doc/undoc/gen/n01/452/20/pdf/n0145220.pdf

[UN] United Nations. 2006. "Reviewing Norway's Report, Human Rights Committee Calls Country 'Model' on Many Issues", *United Nations*, March 14, 2006. https://press.un.org/en/2006/hrct673.doc.htm

[UN] United Nations. 2009. "Human Security in Theory and Practice: Application of Human Security Concept and the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security", *United Nations.* https://procurement-notices.undp.org/view_file.cfm?doc_id=11983

[UN] United Nations. 2010. "Human Security Report of the Secretary-General", The Follow-up to the Outcome of the Millennium Summit, A/64/701, *United Nations,* March 8, 2010. https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/4035248?v=pdf&ln=en.

[UN] United Nations. 2013. "Human Security Report of the Secretary-General,", The Follow-up to General Assembly Resolution 66/290 on Human Security. Report of the Secretary-General, 23 December 2013. https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/4035248?v=pdf&ln=en.

[UNDP] United Nations Development Programme. 1994a. Human Development Report 1994: New Dimensions of Human Security. https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-1994

[UNDP] United Nations Development Programme. 1994b. "Redefining Security: The Human Dimension". *Current History* 94: 229-236.

[UNDP] United Nations Development Programme. 2022. "Special Report, New Threats to Human Security in the Anthropocene, Demanding Greater Solidarity". New York: UNDP. https://hs.hdr.undp.org/pdf/srhs2022.pdf

Zwi, Anthony B. 2004. "Human Security and the Challenge of Global Health". *International Affairs* 80 (4): 637-653.

MEĐUNARODNO DOBRONAMERNA, ALI INSTITUCIONALNO NEUSPEŠNA: MREŽA LJUDSKE BEZBEDNOSTI

Apstrakt: Kraj Hladnog rata obezbedio je povoljno okruženje za normativne ideje u oblasti bezbednosti, što je dovelo do proširenja i produbljenja koncepta bezbednosti. Time su neke države u globalnoj politici relativno oslobođene tradicionalnih shvatanja bezbednosti i mogu se fokusirati na „ljudsku bezbednost", koja je deo šireg spektra bezbednosnih agendi. U tom kontekstu, koalicija država, zasnovana na zajedničkim stavovima i očekivanjima u vezi sa pitanjima ljudske bezbednosti, pokrenula je inicijativu Mreže ljudske bezbednosti, oslanjajući se na normativni ambijent i postignuća iz devedesetih godina. Međutim, ova inicijativa suočila se s brojnim izazovima u 21. veku, kada je tradicionalno shvatanje bezbednosti ponovo dobilo na značaju, posebno nakon terorističkih napada 11. septembra i ključnih preokreta poput globalne finansijske krize 2008. godine, procesa Bregzita u Evropskoj uniji, neuspeha Arapskog proleća, priliva izbeglica, nedovoljne globalne solidarnosti tokom pandemije COVID-19 i porasta autoritarizma u globalnoj politici. Cilj ove studije je da ispita u kojoj meri je Mreža ljudske bezbednosti ostvarila svoje ciljeve od osnivanja, uzimajući u obzir teškoće koje su doprinele slabljenju globalnog liberalnog poretka i njegovih principa, kao i eventualne organizacione nedostatke.

Ključne reči: bezbednost; ljudska bezbednost; normativni liberalni svet; Mreža ljudske bezbednosti.