

































realm and has been included in decision-making, policy design, and implementation activities (Owen, 2004; Suhrke, 2014). With this regard, Cilliers (2004) argues that the concept of human security imposes an obligation on the state to provide a facilitating environment for equality and individual participation through democracy, adherence to human rights, and the participation of civil society.

More importantly, the very political value of human security is its core issues and focuses which are relevant in relation to people, especially in post-conflict situations and socio-economically difficult conditions (Kettemann, 2006). It also serves as a dynamic leitmotif for addressing widespread and cross-cutting threats facing governments and people. For this reason, a number of countries have applied the concept of human security as a guiding political principle to articulate their domestic and foreign policies (Fuentes and Aravena, 2005). On top of this, human security has been a rational political response to both national and international policy as it pushes international actors and governments to take more mandates than simply economic growth and political stability (Owen, 2004).

Human security forms an important part of people's well-being. It is therefore an objective of political development. It is this optimism and rationale that governments of Japan, Norway, and Canada, among others, could take a plethora of political initiatives to promote the concept and institutionalize it within the UN security framework (Fukuda-Parr and Messineo, 2012). In these countries, human security as a foreign policy doctrine has become an opportunity to gain greater independence vis-à-vis international institutions, greater influence in the United Nations, and wider credibility on the international stage, particularly in the case of Canada and Japan (Tadjbakhsh, 2009). In support of this, Owen (2004) argues that human security is a political motif having multiple political utilities since it focuses primarily on issues affecting people, and gives a political voice to the otherwise politically marginalized communities.



#### 4. Concluding Remarks

To conclude, even if there have been arguments made against the usefulness of the concept of human security, this essay presents the imperative value and utility of human security. It argues that human security is potentially and widely useful as a new alternative concept, a flexible theory, an analytical framework, an operative institutional policy, and a guiding political instrument. As justified earlier, most social science concepts, such as democracy, conflict resolution, positive peace, and human security are value-laden terms, so one cannot deny this fact in any social science work, possibly research. Social science concepts in general and human security in particular should not be criticized and undermined due to merely being value-laden term/s. Otherwise, it would be hardly convincing if one defined and analyzed these terms as if they are value-free and concert concepts.

Nonetheless, many skeptical realists who argue against the usefulness of human security overlooked the stated conceptual facts of social science terminologies, notably Paris (2001). Because they simply undermined the usefulness of human security by denying the common features of social science concepts as they are value-laden, ambiguous, maybe vague in nature, and have different meanings and implications in different contexts. This is not an exception to human security since it shares these all features in addition to the underdeveloped and emerging conceptual reality it has manifested.

However, due to their incapability to consider this conceptual fact, skeptical realists softly argue that human security has limited usefulness for academicians and policymakers as it lacks precise definition or conceptual clarity. In the humble view of this paper, it would not be impossible to conclude that having divergent implications and lacking precise definitions by no means undermines the critical and analytical values of human security. Thus, it is proper to support, perhaps recommend skeptical arguers to refine their conception of human security and reshuffle their viewpoints against the usefulness of

human security. Because human security is an overriding imperative beyond the conceptual ambiguity it manifests.

In a nutshell, human security is practically useful as a new alternative concept, a comprehensive theory, and an analytical framework of security in various academic discourses, research, and fields of study. For instance, as a new idea, it critically serves as an alternative concept that is currently contributing to widening up broader consciousness of security in lieu of merely focusing on the traditional notion of territorial and/or national security. In other words, human security progressively encourages a leap of consciousness in security thinking all over the world. It further helps to understand non-military threats which the old concept of state security overlooked for a long time.

Moreover, the concept of human security as a theoretical approach and analytical framework is potentially regarded as an applied paradigm. This is because it serves as a comprehensive theory and an analytical framework that is suitable for developing a common understanding of security and upholding global security and international cooperation. It theoretically helps academicians, experts, and practitioners to enrich and broaden their scope of analysis while they explain and analyze multidimensional causes and threats of (in) security. It can be operationally seen as a value-based and people-centered framework for security thinking since it gives prior concern for the people, not the territory of the state.

It is this theoretical and analytical usefulness of human security that increasingly attracted different international organizations, institutional initiatives, and government officials to use it as a working policy document to articulate their national and international policy objectives. This is due to its usefulness and all-inclusive values to understand and analyze threats, resolve core problems underlying potential

threats, and ultimately develop protective measures and actions on the human security agenda in the contemporary security dilemmas as well as peace and development issues.

## References

Alkire, S. (2003). *A Conceptual Framework for Human Security*. Oxford: University of Oxford.

Bajpai, K. (2000). *Human Security: Concept and Measurement*. New Delhi: Kroc Institute.

Baldwin, D. (1997). The Concept of Security. *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 23, pp. 5–26.

Bastow, S et al. (2010). *The Impact of Social Sciences: How Academics and their Research Make a Difference*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publication.

Bellamy, A. & McDonald, M. (2002). The Utility of Human Security: Which Humans? What Security? A Reply to Thomas & Tow, *Security Dialogue*. *Sage Publications*, Vol. 33(3), pp. 373–377.

Burgess, P. (2007). *Non-Military Security Challenges: Contemporary Security and Strategy*. London: Palgrave.

Chandler, D. (2008). Human Security II: Waiting for the Tail to Wag the Dog, a Rejoinder to Ambrosetti, Owen and Wibben. *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 39, pp. 463-473.

CHS (Commission on Human Security). (2003). *Human Security Now*. New York. UN Commission on Human Security.

Cilliers, J. (2004). *Human Security in Africa: A Conceptual Framework for Review*. NP: The African Human Security Initiative (AHSI).

- Debiel, T. (2005). *Mainstreaming Human Security: Concepts and Implications for Development*. Berlin: INEF.
- Dickinson, S. & Prabhakar, M. (2009). *An Analytical Framework for Community Empowerment Evaluations*. London: Queens Printer.
- Edson, S. (2001). *Human Security: An Extended and Annotated International Bibliography*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press.
- Floyd, R. (2007). Human Security and the Copenhagen School's Securitization Approach: Conceptualizing Human Security as a Securitizing Move. *Human Security Journal*, Vol. 5
- Fuentes, C & Aravena, F. (2005). *Promoting Human Security: Ethical, Normative and Educational Frameworks in Latin America and the Caribbean*. NP: UNESCO.
- Fukuda-Parr, S. & Messineo, C. (2012). *Human Security: A Critical Review of the Literature*. A Working Paper No. 11, Centre for Research on Peace and Development (CRPD). Belgium: Leuven.
- Gaspar, D. (2010). The Idea of Human Security,' in O'Brien, A and Kristoffersen, C (eds.), *Climate Change, Ethics and Human Security*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gómez, O & Gaspar, D. (2013). *Human Security: A Thematic Guidance Note for Regional and National Human Development Report Teams*. NP: UNDP.
- Hampson, F. (2008). Human Security. In Williams, P. (2008). *Security Studies: An Introduction*. New York: Rout ledge.
- Haq, M. (1994). New Imperatives of Human Security: Barbara Ward Lecture 1972. *Journal of Development*, Vol. 2, pp. 40-43.

- Heinbecker, P. (2000). Human Security: the Hard Edge. *Canadian Military Journal* (spring):11-16.
- Howard-Hassmann, R. (2011). *Human Security: Undermining Human Rights?* Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University.
- Hussein, K et al. (2004). *Security and Human Security: An Overview of Concepts and Initiatives: What Implies for West Africa*. Paris: Andre Pascal.
- Jolly, R. & Ray, D. (2006). *The Human Security Framework and National Human Development Reports: A Review of Experiences and Current Debates*. NP: UNDP.
- Kaldor, M. (2004). A Force for Intervention: A Human Security Doctrine for Europe and Beyond. *International Herald Tribune*, Sept. 30.
- Kettemann, M. (2006). The Conceptual Debate on Human Security and Its Relevance for the Development of International Law. *Human Security Perspectives*, Vol 1 (3), pp. 23-33.
- King, G & Murray, C. (2001). Rethinking Human Security. *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol, 116 (4), pp. 585-610.
- Liotta, P & Owen, T. (2006). Why Human Security? *The Whitehead Journal of Diplomacy and International Relations*, Vol. 7 (1), pp. 1-18.
- Liotta, P. (2002). Boomerang Effect: The Convergence of National and Human Security. *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 33(4), pp. 473–488.
- Liotta, P et al. (2008). (Ed.). *Environmental Change and Human Security: Recognizing and Acting on Hazard Impacts*. Netherlands: Springer.

- MacFarlane, N & Khong Y. (2006). *Human Security and the UN: A Critical History*. Bloomington: University of Indiana Press.
- Mack, A. (2002). *A Report on the Feasibility of Creating an Annual Human Security Report: Program on Humanitarian Policy and Conflict Research*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Mathew, R. & Fraser, L. (2002). *Global Environmental Change and Human Security: Conceptual and Theoretical Issues*. Irvine: University of California Press.
- Matta, A. & Takács, T. (Eds) (2015) *Human Security as a Tool for Comprehensive Approach for Human Rights and Security Linkages*. The Netherlands: T.M.C. Asser Institute.
- McIntosh, M. (2010). *Perspectives on Human Security: The Emergent Construct*. Australia: Greenleaf Publishing.
- Newman, E. (2004). A Normatively Attractive but Analytically Weak Concept. *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 35 (3), pp. 358-359.
- Owen, T. (2004) Human Security – Conflict, Critique, and Consensus: Colloquium Remarks and a Proposal for a Threshold-Based Definition. *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 35 (3), pp. 373–387.
- Paris, R. (2001). Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air? *International Security*, Vol. 26 (2), pp. 87–102.
- Roberts, D. (2006). Human Security or Human Insecurity? Moving the Debate Forward. *Security Dialogue* Vol. 37 (2), pp. 249–261.
- Rothschild, E (1995). What is Security? *Daedalus* Vol. 124 (3), pp. 53-98.

- Sanjeev, K et al. (2003). *From the Environment and Human Security to Sustainable Security and Development*. Harvard: Carfax Publishing.
- Shani, G. (2007). Introduction, in Sato, M and Pasha, M (eds.) *Protecting Human Security in a Post 9/11 World: Critical and Global Insights*. London: Palgrave.
- Shinoda, H. (2004). *The Concept of Human Security: Historical and Theoretical Implications*. NP: IPSHU.
- Suhrke, A. (2014). Human Security 15 Years after Lysøen: The Case against Drone Killings. *Asian Journal of Peace Building* Vol. 2 (2), pp. 185-198.
- Tadjbakhsh, S & Chenoy, A. (2007). *Human Security: Concepts and Implications*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Tadjbakhsh, S. (2005). *Human Security: Concepts and Implications*. Afghanistan: Les Etudes.
- Tadjbakhsh, S. (2009). *Human Security: Looking Back Before Looking Forward*. A Paper presented at ICHSWA Conference Birjand, Iran November 26th 2009.
- Tamminen, T. (2008). Human Security in Post-Status Kosovo: A Shared European Responsibility. *Finland Civilian Crisis Management Studies*, Vol. 1, pp. 1797-2140.
- Thomas, C. (2001). Global Governance, Development, and Human Security: Exploring the Links. *Third World Quarterly* Vol. 22 (2), pp. 159-75.
- Thomas, C. (2000). *Global Governance, Development, and Human Security*. London: Pluto Publication.
- Thomas, N & Tow, W. (2002). The Utility of Human Security: Sovereignty and Humanitarian Intervention. *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 33 (2), pp. 177–192.

Tsai, Y. (2009). The Emergence of Human Security: A Constructivist View. *International Journal of Peace Studies*, Vol. 14 (2), pp. 14-21.

UNDP/United Nations Development Program. (1994). *Human Development Report*. New York: UNDP.

United Nations. (2014). *Human Security: Unit Strategic Plan for 2014-2017*. New York: NPP.

IEEESEM