INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON
"HUMAN SECURITY – TEN YEARS LATER"
Belgrade, May 14-15, 2004

An international conference on Human Security is organized in order to celebrate the 10th anniversary and to review the last ten years in HS history. It is hosted by Faculty of Civil Defense University of Belgrade.

The Conference is expected to be attended by about 100 participants, comprising political and public sector representatives, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), the private sector, academia, representatives of the people sector, and the media.

In the globalizing, post Cold War era of the 1990s, human security came to play a more salient role in establishing stability in the global order, and ensuring more democratic forms of political and economic participation at the local level.

This conference aims to understand and redefine the place of human security in the present international political order, and to analyze the ways in which HS policy responses over the past decade have been (in)effective. Academics have been working on this issue for a decade but it is now filtering up to the political level, and becoming something real and tangible. The close and pragmatic collaboration now emerging among governments and civil society to find solutions to today's major human security threats will greatly facilitate our task in the years ahead.

The Conference looks at both the nature and magnitude of the social impacts and at the policy responses and actions of the governments, major international development and aid organizations, civil society organizations, NGOs, and research institutes.

Dragana Dulić, Dean of the Faculty of Civil Defence, Belgrade

HUMAN SECURITY: OXYMORON OR STRATEGY?

Many different aspects can be included in an understanding of human security, and it spans a broad range of issues, extending form protecting people from violent conflict to humanitarian relief and peace operations; from the proliferation and illicit trade of small arms to humanitarian interventions; from human rights violations and international humanitarian law, protection of refugees and internally displaced persons to the ban of landmines, terrorism, and drug trafficking; from environmental degradation, infectious diseases such as HIV/AIDS, to capacity building of individuals and collectivities; from the right to health care and access to education, adequate food and water, to a decent standard of living, and the right to political and civil freedom.

As an essentially multidimensional, all-inclusive and holistic concept, it reflects difficulties in delineating and distinguishing 'general' and 'specific' threats (global issues and local particularities) to the security of its 'referent object'. Moreover, since it run across disciplines, and related policy imperatives, there is a fundamental divide about how broadly to define it, and consequently how it would be measured, (whether in terms of objective quantitative indicators or more subjective and qualitative measures).

Because of its "vagueness", its generality and breadth, its operationalization sometimes appears questionable, and can have an effect on policy priority and allocation of resources. Current criticism, coming mostly from the academic world, but from policymakers as well, is that the notion of human security is ambiguous, that it lacks precision and unique definition. Precise definition is not really the aim of the exercise. Ambiguity is inherent to the concept of human security, which is much more a question of approach, that of placing the human being at the centre of security strategies, than a definition. Human security is by all means a powerful strategic concept which has bearing on long-term policy decisions, and which will shape at least our foreseeable future.

Peter Vanhoutte, Law Enforcement Department OSCE Mission in SaM

BASIC CONCEPTS FOR HUMAN SECURITY:
CIVILIAN OVERSIGHT AND DECENTRALIZATION

"Think Globally - Act Locally" While this saying is professed to be the philosophy of most governments and international organisations, they rarely transform this into their actions and activities. Nevertheless, it should be the starting point for all discussions on the development of basic concepts for human security.

Local accountability of the police and security services plays a central part of their reform process, it aims to establish a dialogue between the municipal authorities and the local police and security services. The aim of such dialogue is the development of police and security practices that hold the needs of the community at its core, that upholds the values of a democratic service as its principle and encourages local police and security initiatives that aim to focus on local security needs. As a result of such dialogue, citizens will start to feel more secure as they are included in the local security dialogue. The concept of this dialogue can be further developed into other fields of local interest, on condition that it is linked to local decentralisation, based on the promotion of the principle of subsidiarity, i.e. the principle that the central authority should have a subsidiary function, performing only those tasks which cannot be performed effectively at a more immediate or local level.

Fausto Pedrazzini, Programme Director of NATO Scientific Affairs Division

CIVIL CO-OPERATION IN NATO: AN OPPORTUNITY FOR PROGRESS AND STABILITY

NATO's initiatives for civil co-operation will be presented and discussed. General information on the Partnership for Peace framework will be provided and examples of ongoing civil co-operation programmes will also be discussed.

Special reference will be made to the Security through Science Programme and detailed information will be made available on the support mechanisms (Workshops, Summer Schools, Reintegration Grants and Science for Peace Projects).

A brief description of the participation of Balkan countries in co-operative activities promoted by NATO will also be made.

Peter H. Liotta, Profesor US Naval War College, Newport,

NEW DILEMMAS, OLD IMPEDIMENTS:
THE FUTURE OF HUMAN SECURITY

In the September 1999 issue of *Security Dialogue,* Astri Suhrke pointed to the essential bifurcation that human security as conceptual approach and policy principle continues to suffer from: Is it related more to long-term "human development," such as was suggested in the 1994 United Nations *Human Development Report*, or (as a security issue) does it constitute a principle of intervention during immediate crisis, such as Rwanda in 1994 or Kosovo in 1999 or even Iraq in 2003? The answer to either questions is "Nes"—a little bit of "no" and a little "yes."

And it is precisely because of the imprecision in the use of this term that it has become an attractive mandate in the conduct of foreign policy for some governments and a troubling ambiguity that does not advance serious academic or theoretical debate. Yet the problem is not with "human security" per se. The increased focus on the rights of the individual, sometimes at the expense of the state, has led to intriguing possibilities and, most definitely, uncertain outcomes. It remains unclear whether an ethical and collective policy to support human security will be the focus of most states in the future.

Although security—as basic concept—is frequently considered in the study and analysis of policy decisions, its essential meaning is more widely *disagreed* than agreed on. As one result, we frequently see the proliferation of descriptors added to the basic concept itself. Each of these descriptors lends a perhaps slightly different connotation as well. When we speak of economic security, geographic security, gender security, cultural security, environmental security, ethnic security, military security, physical security, psychological security, political security, societal security, or human security, do we speak of a common identity or do we simply fragment security identities into separate categories, each clearly distinct from the other?

A real debate, nonetheless, ought to be taking place. Rather than dismiss human security outright, a larger examination of what forms of security are relevant and right among communities, states, region, that even might apply to a global rule-set—and what types of security are not relevant—ought to be taking place. If this occurs, a truly remarkable tectonic shift might take place in the conduct of international relations and human affairs.

Zlatko Isaković, Senior Research Fellow, Institute of International Politics and Economics,

HUMAN SECURITY: DEFINITION, THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL PROBLEMS"

The concept of human security, which seems to have gained popularity in the world relatively quickly, is based on theoretical premises which are at least partially common to the premises of the concept of civic security, human rights and some others: human beings and their communities represent the main subjects that are being taken care of, and this is regardless to their race, ideologies, religious affiliations and nationalities. Unfortunately, in practice, these premises are not respected in all cases, and what brings security for one people and community sometimes means a threat to another people and their community. Therefore, one should approach the question of human and other kinds of security in such a way that it exists for all interested parties to as great an extent as possible.

It can be assumed that a broadening of the activities of states, certain international organisations and the EU in the field of human security, as well as in the other related fields, could lead to progress in the development of relative concepts and in processes for their application (including reducing the possibility of mistakes and abuse). With this, progress could also be made in the situation in the field of security generally in the world, thanks above all to the inescapable human, political, economic, scientific and other potentials which these subjects can employ, and this in a relative short period of time, under the condition that the political will for this exists. The question remains as to why states and other subjects of international relations would care more about human security than their own.

Finally, satisfying the human aspiration for security through the use of any kind of concept has an economic aspect or price, which should be taken into account before considering the problematics which are dealt with in this work. Above all, we should not allow people and their communities to begin to serve security, but it should serve them, and this as economically as possible.

Daniel Luz Alvarez, Peace and Disarmament Researcher, Coordinator of the Disarmament and Human Security Program, University of Barcelona

BUILDING HUMAN SECURITY: A PRACTICAL APPROACH FROM DISARMAMENT

- Contemporary violence: contemporary insecurities
- Culture of arms
- Through a new concept of security: the need for a collective security framework
- Possible points of intervention in small arms proliferation
- A new perspective: from micro disarmament to practical measures of disarmament
- Practical measures of disarmament as an element for building citizenship security

Rory Field, Legal Adviser on Organized Crime, OSCE, Belgrade

THE EFFECTS OF ORGANIZED CRIME ON HUMAN SECURITY IN SERBIA

Supporting Human Security, through top down protection and bottom up empowerment, is the means to obtain human rights goals. Organised crime is widely recognised as a threat to the Human Security of the individuals who make up the state as well as being a threat to the institutions which govern the state. Recognition of the malevolent influence of organised crime is a necessary step in undermining it and weakening its grip on society.

In the last few weeks, local media covered a UNICEF report which claimed that 200,000 children live in Serbia below the poverty line and a further 600,000 live in conditions bordering on poverty. It is a simple fact that family poverty puts families under stress and this stress is often taken out on children in the forms of domestic violence as well as abuse, neglect and exploitation. These are Human security issues. It will be difficult to resolve these problems while organised crime operates at the current level and continues to suppress general economic and social progress.

David Law, Senior Fellow for Security Sector Reform, Geneva Centre for the
Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF), Geneva

HUMAN SECURITY AND SECURITY SECTOR REFORM

Human Security and Security Sector Reform are relatively new to the lexicon of
foreign and security policy, having both emerged in the post-Cold War world of
the 1990s. The two concepts have much in common but they are also very
different. The paper will introduce the thinking that underlines security sector
reform and address the way it relates to human security. It will also explore
communalities and differences in terms of their core function, relationship to
the state and state security, objectives, scope, actors, and the criteria that are
associated with their successful implementation. By means of a few practical
examples, the different discourses that typically characterize the two concepts
will be contrasted and compared.

Håkan Wiberg, Senior Research Fellow, Copenhagen Peace Research Institute,

HUMAN SECURITY AND SECURITIZATION: CONCEPTS AND FACTS

Security will always be an "essentiality contested concept", given its place in completing ideologies and the gains to be had for various interest groups by getting their agenda included in a security agenda. The development since the 1960s from the traditional box (politico-military security at single state – or alliance – level) has been to several dimensions or sectors (economic, ecological, cultural, societal, ...) and several levels (global, regional, national, subnational, ...). It has taken place along two paths with some mutual influence: in the scholarly community and in national and international political communities. This development can be seen as new aspects being "discovered" or as the result of "securitization" by successful "securitizing agents" (influential politicians and masse media, etc.) The "enlargement of security" has been contested, both by the traditional " security intelligentia" in military establishments, institutes of foreign affairs, political science departments, etc. – and, in specific cases, by some of the scholars who are in principle positive to it. The "securitization" of an issue area normally leads to its being able to claim more resources and omit normal political procedures, "Desecuritization" to the opposite. Instead of counting with fixed sections, analysis can also deal with what issue areas that have succeeded or failed in getting included into the "threat pictures" of various countries; empirical studies of this suggest that this is affected by such factors as an issue's attractivity to mass media, the existence of organised interest groups around it, the degree to which it can be militarised, etc. The relationship is quite weak between something being seen as a security threat in national doctrines and the risk of my being killed by it.

Abraham Bob Hoogenboom, Professor Forensic Business Studies, Neyenrode University, The Netherlands

PEACEKEEPING INTELLIGENCE AND DEMOCRACY

In this paper I will discuss peacekeeping operations and intelligence within a democratic framework. Why peacekeeping intelligence and why within a democratic framework?

In the first place intelligence has been, is and always will be a fundamental part of political, military, law enforcement and increasingly private sector decision-making processes. The need for foreknowledge was already recognized 2400 years ago by Sun Tzu in *The Art of War*. Increasingly, the need for intelligence is felt in so called peacekeeping operations. Peacekeeping and peace support operations, as all military operations, need intelligence if disasters such as the one that took place in Srebenica in the former Yugoslavia in the summer of 1995 are to be avoided.

Too often in the past, intelligence during peacekeeping operations has been neglected, due to the resistance against it within the United Nations and due to the fact that states regard intelligence as a national prerogative and are by nature not inclined to share it.

Although intelligence is necessary we must be constantly aware of the 'slippery road' nature of the intelligence process itself. Non other than Von Clausewitz in his classic *On War* has warned us for the contradictory, false and doubtful character of intelligence.

A diabolitical paradox can be found in intelligence. On the one hand no one denies its necessity. Every one involved knowingly, or unknowingly, is a follower of Sun Tzu. On the other hand intelligence reports are, according to Von Clausewitz: 'mostly false, and the timidity of men acts as a multiplier of lies and untruths'.

Biljana Vankovska, Professor of Political Science and Military Law, University of Skopje, Skopje

NATIONAL VERSUS HUMAN SECURITY: A VIEW FROM MACEDONIA

The state-building process in many post-communist countries has involved the build-up of a national security system as one of its priorities. However, the way it is done usually suffers from actually enforcing the state-strength dilemma and ethnic security dilemma. This is particularly a case in divided and/or conflict-driven societies. Macedonia's case is a good example in this respect.

Macedonian elites hold very traditional approach towards 'national security', which basically means security of the state (and those on power). At least rhetorically, national security and NATO membership had been given priority and constantly overshadowed the other aspects of (human) security. With the aggravation of the crisis, to the contrary, the citizens, regardless the ethnic origin, have become more aware and concerned with human and socio-economic aspects of security. The domestic and international publics have always shared at least one common concern – i.e. inter-ethnic tensions. Again, the perceptions and assessments differed largely shifting from seeing Macedonia as the 'last best hope' for multiethnic democracy in the Balkans and dire predictions of the last scene of the Yugoslav drama. In sum, different securitising agents (i.e. the government, political parties, ethnic leaders, and the international community) have been giving attention to different aspects of security. In general, one can say that all sectors of security (military, economic, political, societal and environmental) were in the focus of political and public discourse – but what always lacked was getting the puzzles into one complete picture, which would result into a national security concept and strategy. The puzzles could not provide a sense for their interdependence and the likelihood of spilling over of insecurity from one sector into another. Moreover, the securitising agents were occasionally removing some threats from the agenda and emphasising others – with no tangible reasons for the shifts.

Finally, it appears that the political establishments and citizens live in two separate worlds each part being preoccupied with its own security perceptions. In opposite to the rather euphoric political claims about country's readiness to join NATO, the public (citizens) is caught in the vicious circle of insecurity that mainly originates in social and economic spheres. Existing gap between political elites and military leaderships, on one side, and the citizens, on the other, is supposed to be bridged through the active role of NGOs, media, research institutions, etc. The ideal picture would be that democracy, and even democratisation, is about alternatives, dialogue between the leaders and the led and about making the citizens' voice heard in the decision-making process.

Macedonia has recently adopted the national security concept but it did not give any clear answer about the security threats and ways to deal with them. The most important and unanswered questions are still: how much (security) is enough and security for whom?

Silvija Panović-Đurić, Legal Adviser, European Council, Belgrade Office,

TERRORISM AND HUMAN RIGHTS – PERSPECTIVE
OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

At the moment of the establishment of the Council of Europe, Pierre Henri-Imbert said: "democratic country does not become nazi country over night, there is a gradual diminishing of human rights and liberties". More than fifty years later, preservation/ protection of human rights, establishment/ development of democracy and rule of law are not only the common aim/ goal of the European states but their common heritage as well.

Only one year after the September 11th terrorist attacks in 2001, the Council of Europe Committee of Ministers adopted "Guidelines on Human Rights and Terrorism" (Guidelines). The key word is balance. A balance, that will enable European states to fight terrorism in the proper/ acceptable way. That is why in the Guidelines (guideline No. I), it is stressed that on the one hand, the states are under an obligation to protect the human rights of everyone within their jurisdiction against terrorist acts, i.e. to undertake all the necessary measures aimed at that, but on the other hand, to take care that those measures are in accordance with the present guidelines, i.e. with the standards enshrined in the European convention on HR as well as in jurisprudence/ case law of the Court in Strasbourg.

Marina Glamočak, Chargée de recherches, CIPES/EHESS, Paris

GLOBALISATION AND EUROPEISATION OF THE SECURITY SECTOR

1. Definition of globalization and Europeisation of security/insecurity sector in a double context:
   - context of nation-state (Etat-nation) and its irresponsibilisation
   - context of globalization of insecurity (classical terrorism, the phenomenon of innovation and technical achievement).
2. Definition of Europeisation of security/insecurity sector with respect to immigration flows (analysis of Shengen visa)
3. Globalization and Europeisation of security - the uncertainty of human security

Saša Mart, Serbian-American Center, Belgrade

SERBIAN SECURITY DILEMMA

Presentation about Serbian Security Dilemma is concentrated on a context of human security aspects of extended theory of Security dilemma applied to case of Serbia and Montenegro.

Consequences of the Wars of Yugoslav succession (new neighboring countries, human rights and over all position of Serbian minority in Croatia, position of Serbian population in Bosnia and Herzegovina – existence of Republika Srpska, situation in Kosovo and Metohia - after the United Nations Mission in Kosovo was establish after the War in 1999 by the UN Security Council Resolution 1244), as well as new international surroundings of the State Union of Serbia and Montenegro - having a common border with European Union and NATO, but been kept for time being from membership in The Partnership for peace, is unavoidable context for understanding of human security aspects of Serbian Security Dilemma as well as state of human security in Serbia and Montenegro and its abilities to fight international terrorism but also to deal with internal political and economic instabilities, fight crime, organized crime, poverty, ill health, illiteracy.

Will be oversimplification, but is important in context of fear and relations between declining and rising counties in a region to understand, that if all countries around you are in the one military alliance, except you, against whom that alliance is?

Did the World changed since Thucydides to present days John Herz and Robert Jervis or just human security following challenges of Twenty-first century is just adding new elements to old puzzles? Is there an integrated approach, as was stated that should be in the Report of the Commission on Human Security?

Is Serbian Security Dilemma as Security Dilemma just universal? Where we are and where we should be?