NATIONAL AND HUMAN SECURITY CONCEPT

Mitko Kotovchevski
"Ss. Cyril and Methodius" University in Skopje, Faculty of Philosophy – Skopje, Republic of
Macedonia kotovcevski@gmail.com
Blagica Kotovchevska
MIT University – Skopje, Republic of Macedonia blagica.kotovcevska@gmail.com

Abstract: The security of people is the most important political care, that is, in the new era, the focus towards the discipline of security of people has been changed to a great extent instead of a focus towards the country: it is the human security (individual security). The human security concept, unlike the traditional national security concept, emphasizes the security of the individuals as primary, rather than the security of the country as an entity. The new security concept started to develop at the end of the eighties of the last century, a period when modern societies and the world as a whole increasingly started to face the variably security paradigm and the radically changed (diversified) security environment. The alarming ambiguity of security as a concept results with the irreconcilability of the two viewpoints on national and human (individual) security. Probably it is impossible to reconcile the two viewpoints, as well as the two concepts that seek for fulfillment of the usual strive and expectation to realize security as a value. These arguments unequivocally confirm the conclusion that there is no and that there can't be necessary harmony between the national and the human security.
Keywords: security; national security concept; human security concept.

1. INTRODUCTION

The security of people is the most important political care, that is, in the new era, the focus towards the discipline of security of people has been changed to a great extent instead of a focus towards the country: it is the human security (individual security).

If the conclusion from the text of the entire military era of the twentieth century was that security of people was inseparably connected to the safety of the countries, now that era is leaving in the museum of history. Today, the researches of security within global politics are focused on the greatest fears: the threats to the lives of people.

"The security concept would have to change in the future from an exclusive emphasis on national security to a much greater emphasis on human security, from security through weapons to security through human development, from territory to food, employment and social security"[196]

2. NATIONAL SECURITY CONCEPT

Although the term national security in the initial period of its emergence did not have sufficiently clear content, within time its clear determination and specifying occurred. The focus of the national security started to consider and analyze the totality of the political, military and economic efforts undertaken by governments in the realization of the internal and external security of their countries.

In the international encyclopedia in social sciences, national security is defined as "ability of a country (nation) to protect its internal values from external threats", (one-sided definition in regard to the "dangers" – author's note).

Other authors define national security as a "function of the national countries by means of which, in accordance with their possibilities, now and in future, respecting the global changes and development of the world, they protect their own identity, survival and interests".[197]

According to Walter Lippmaun, "the country has security when it does not have to sacrifice its basic values without war or with it".

From the analysis of the content of this definition we can concluded that it is also imprecise and incomplete and it is focused more on determination and elaboration of the level/the extent of security of one country. Coping with the threats of the basic values is considered by the author exceptionally by applying classical standard instruments without specific clarification of the phenomenon of national security.

Arnold Wolfers has more complex determination of national security, in an objective sense he measures it with "absence of threat of the basic social values, and in subjective sense it refers to the absence of fear for the society

---

[196] (UNPP (1993) Human Development Report. Peoples Participation, Oxford: Oxford University Press.)
[197] A. Huwaydi, Militarization and security in the Middle East, PrinterPublishes, 1989., стр. 16.

that its basic values will be threatened",198 (quite a useful definition that deviates from the strict methodological criteria for creation of definitions).

Kenn Booth in his analyses concludes that stable security is achieved only by those people and countries that do not deprive others from security, and this can be achieved only if security is understood as a process of liberation."199

Barry Buzan and his fundamental book "Peoples, States and Fear"200 represent the core for the formation of the so called Copenhagen school in 1983. In his book for the first time, except the military, other key areas of security have been identified: political, social, economic and ecological. Military security broadly refers to the mutual relations of armed (defensive and offensive) abilities of the countries, as well as the familiarization of the countries with the intentions of other countries.

Political security refers to the organizational ability of the country, the system of effective state management and the ideology that guarantees legitimacy.

Economic security is related to the "guarantee of resources, funds and markets, necessary for the maintenance of the acceptable level of welfare of people and the power of the country."

The social field of security implies the existence of acceptable conditions for development of the traditional forms of language, culture and national identity in general (national traditions of the nation) by providing possibilities of its evolution.

Economic security is defined as preservation and support of the local and planetary biosphere as a key environment – system that all human activities rely on.

All these fields are fundamental fields for analysis of the security policy of the modern countries. In his important work, Buzan critically reviewed the existing definitions of national security considering that they are useful, however not sufficient to understand national security. In order to contribute for the determination of the term national security, Buzan reviews national security at three levels and in few fields of human activity. The levels of review are individual, national (state) and international, while the fields for review include the military, political, commercial, social and economic field.

The critics of this study (particularly neorealists) indicate that if one follows the path of extension of the spectrum of security, there would be no end practically. In their opinion, all important issues of the state and social management will always be able to transform into problems of security and due to the equal position according to the presumption of the priority to reach to blockage of management (in security).

According to his critics, if overload with this problematic occurs, there wouldn't be sufficient resources for its realization whereby the process of destruction of the trust in the political management will be inevitable.

According to the analyses of Buzan, the national (state) level is the most important one because it determines the other two levels of security. In modern conditions, the standard unit of security continues to be the sovereign territorial country together with the previously pointed out five basic fields (military, political, economic, social and ecological).

Also, according to Buzan in the case of security, the discussion is related to the search for liberation from the threat. When this discussion is within the context of the international system, the security refers to the ability of the countries and the societies to maintain their independent identity and their functional integrity.

When it comes to realization of stable security according to the interpretations by Wheeler and Booth "stable security can be achieved by people and groups if they do not take away that security from someone: it can be achieved if the security is considered a process of emancipation."201

According to Michael X. X. Louw, national security includes traditional defense policy and "non-military actions for a country to ensure its total capacity to survive as a political entity in order to exercise influence and to accomplish internal and international goals."202

In terms of the function of national security in the protection of important national values, we will present the definition of Frank N. Trager and Frank L. Simonie, and according to them "national security is part of the

---

[198] A.   Wolfers, National Security of Ambiguous Symbol, Political Science Quarterly, 67/4, 1952, стр. 167-168

[199] K. Booth, Security Emancipation, Review of International Studies 17(4), 1991., стр. 313-326

[200] B.   Buzan, (Peoples, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post Cold War Era, Harwester Wheatsheaf, London, 1991, стр. 19-20

[201] Wheeler, N.J. and Booth. K. (1992), „The Security Dilemma"; in J.Baylis and N.J. Rengger (eds) Dilemmas of World Politics; International isues M A Changing world (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

[202] Michael H.H. Louw, National Security Pretoria, iss-University of Pretoria, 1978, according to the quotes from "The Purpose of the Symposium".

governmental politics the goal of which is the creation of national and international political conditions favorable for protection or expansion of the important national values against the existing and potential enemies."203

In all presented definitions, simply due to semantic reasons, it is difficult to avoid the absolute sense of security, which is not convenient in terms of the idea of measurable graduated spectrum. These definitions, despite the determination of some criteria of national security, do not offer complete representation about the firmness of the concept. Most of these definitions avoid the essential questions, the essential values, unreleased from contradictions with (non)separation of the subjective and the objective aspects of security, by pointing out only war as the only form of danger that is relevant for the national security – complete disposition toward an absolute view of security.

According to Kegly and Wirtkopf, national security is "Psychological freedom of the country from the fear that the country will not be able to oppose the threats of its existence and the national values that come from the inside or the outside".204

According to our considerations, we can define national security as "An ability of the country to full and successfully protect its vital national, state and social values, survival and identity from all forms and types of threats."

"Condition of the country and the society to timely oppose and eliminate real dangers, threats and risks and provide psychological liberation from the fears of threatening their values, survival, identity and the peaceful independent, unobstructed and overall development."

From the previously presented opinions and attitudes regarding national security, a conclusion can be made that national security on one hand implies the condition of security of the national country, and on the other hand it implies the awareness and organized action of the country and the society in order to ensure survival, development and existence of the individual, the society and the country, that is, their securing from all sources of threats and at all levels, in all fields of the country and the society.

The priority of national security should be the provisioning of freedom, independence and integrity of the country, the sovereignty and the territorial integrity, the human liberties and rights of the citizens and the subnational and national groups, the political and social stability and prosperity of the society and the country, stable and dynamic development and unobstructed functioning of the legal country, stable and sustainable public order and personal security of the citizens, as well as a healthy living environment.

The creation of the social country changed the role of the country that obtained double function in this field – securer and protector. This is a critical point that radically changes also the notion of what national security comprises of. As the country changes in the new conditions of globalization and the new complex international surrounding, the new variable role of the country also implies new – modified function of national security.

Many authors today claim that the term globalization implies "weakening of state structures and the autonomy and power of the country".205

Faced with the new globalizing economic and security problems, many modern countries become less able to satisfy / realize an important part of the functions that the citizens expect from them. The country is no longer capable of being a simultaneous securer for the population, guarantor of the internal social stability and competitor of the increasingly complex and increasingly mutually dependent international arena.

"The innate" contradictions of these state roles are increasingly deepened and their negative impact is multiplied in a period of change or crisis. The changed role of the country (weakened or strengthened) enforces the country to adjust and find new ways to react to the new global economic trends that can often harm its security. In this regard, it is also important to emphasize the transformation of the political to the identity. Individuals often "lose" their identity of become distant from "state identity" and they decreasingly identify themselves with their own country, rather they identify themselves with numerous non-state groups. It is another serious impact on the national state concept because the patriotism and the nationalism of citizens is eroded to a great extent – and this is an important factor for identification of the citizens with the values of the modern country and attraction of their loyalty.

3. HUMAN SECURITY CONCEPT

The human security concept, unlike the traditional national security concept, emphasizes the security of the individuals as primary, rather than the security of the country as an entity. The new security concept started to

203 Frank N. Trager and Frank L. Simonie, „An introduction to the Study of National Security", bo F.N.Trager and P.S. Hronenberg, National Security and American Society Lowrense Kansas, University Press of Kansas, (1973) p.36
204 Извор: Charles W. Kegly. Jr. and Eugene R. Wirtkopf. (2001) World Politics-Trend and Transformation, Wadsford, a division of Thompson Learning, inc. pp.655.
205 Ulkich Beeck, World Risk Society, Polity Press/ Blackwell Publishers, Canbridge, UK. 1999.

develop at the end of the eighties of the last century, a period when modern societies and the world as a whole increasingly started to face the variably security paradigm and the radically changed (diversified) security environment.

Security is subjective in that individual fears do not always agree with the reality of threats. This reality is very important because it leads through the questions that are important, instead the priorities of governments. The security of governments is not the same with the security of people they should represent. (for example, the Development of global human rights, the existence of global systemic failures: the spread of hunger and curable diseases in a world with limited food and medications so that they can oppose them).

The importance of security is not only a mystery of the academic science, its weight comes to the fore as an important attribute in the "real" objective political matters. This conclusion also arises from the fact that the threats to the security of states represent a priority for the governments, but also the threats to the lives of people should represent the highest priority of the contemporary states and their governments. Their comprehensive understanding of security should not be exceptionally limited on pure military aspects.

"Our survival does not depend only on the military balance but also on the global cooperation to create a sustainable biological environment based on equally distributed resources."206

The human security concept is a vertical and horizontal expansion (or deepening) of the traditional idea of national security, defined as protection of the state sovereignty and the territorial integrity from military threats.

The concept of human security is mentioned for the first time in the edition Report on human development from 1994, an edition of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP 1994). The report defines the scope of human security and it covers seven fields:

- Economic security – secure basic income for individuals, usually from production or mercenary work, or as the last option, from some public financed network of social protection.
- Security of food – care for all the people to have constant physical and economic access to the most necessary food.
- Health security – guarantee of minimum protection from diseases and unhealthy lifestyle.
- Security of the environment – protection of people from the short-term and long-term devastation of nature, threats in the environment as a result of the human and setback of the natural environment.
- Personal security – protection of people from physical violence, from the country or other countries, from violent individuals or sub-national factors, from domestic violence and abuse by adults.
- Security of the community – protection of people from the loss of traditional relations and values and from sectarian and ethnic violence.
- Political security – care for the people to live in a society that respects basic human rights and guarantees the freedom of individuals and groups, protecting the attempts of the government to impose control of ideas and information.

The aspect of human security is mostly related to social security, because people in the human environment where they exist, are surrounded, that is, exposed to social, economic and political impacts and consequences that cannot be avoided.

"Social threats come in many different forms, however there are four obvious basic types: physical dangers (pain, injury, death), economic dangers (seizure or destruction of property, having no access to workplace or resources), threats related to rights (prison, denial of normal civil liberties) and threats for the position or the status (degradation, public humiliation)".

In this regard, security of individuals cannot be defined so easily and simply. All included factors that are necessary for the operationalization of this term – life, health, status, wellbeing, freedom, are much more complex, with many layers, and often they are contradictive. These variables are often burdened with the differences between the objective assessment, most of them cannot be replaced (life, extremities, status), while the casual relations that refer to threats are unclear.

"The definitions in the sentences give the nuance of this ambiguity by mentioning how it is to be protected from danger, to feel safe and be free from doubts. The referent threats (the danger and the complex ones) are very unclear, and the subjective feeling of security has no relation to being truly secure."

The paradox, of course, is that the country also becomes a serious source of social danger for the individual that always sees it as a mechanism for achieving adequate levels of security in terms of social threats. Although this conclusion unequivocally emphasizes the paradox between the great expectations and the recognition of the individual by the country, still the security of individuals is inseparably related to the state security. Today, when

---

206 ICDI(1980) North-South: The Report on the International Commission on International Development Issues, London: Pan Books.

modern societies and countries are becoming more unrecognizable, logically a dilemma is imposed: "what is the security of individuals that is irrevocable related to the country, that is, whether its non-recognition is not related to their insecurity".

In the new and variable social and international ambience, the country is becoming a source of controversies and dangers. In what such circumstances and conditions, the conflict between individual and state interest may be significantly large. "It should not be unusual or a paradoxical thing for the individuals to depend on the country for maintenance of the general security in their environment, while at the same time the country is considered an important source of their individual security."

Citizens are faced with many dangers that arise directly or indirectly from the very country. The dangers from the country have an important impact on the overall functioning of the human during his life. The dangers produced by the very country and directed towards individuals can be grouped into four general categories:

- dangers generated by domestic legislation and its non(implementation);
- dangers that arise from the direct political activities of the country against the individuals or the groups;
- dangers that are a product of the fight to control the state machinery and
- dangers that arise from state policies.

There is also another variant of a serious potential for conflict between the individual and the national security. The seriousness of this variant arises from the existence of nuclear weapons and the types of politics for national security that these weapons are based on (threats of alternating nuclear attacks).

4. EXPANSION OF THE SECURITY AND HUMAN SECURITY CONCEPT

"The deepened" approach to the studies of security, that is, the relevance of the term security as a wider and deeper concept, gets an important specific weight in the "real" political matters.

The need of expansion of the relevance of security in global politics was recognized by the famous world statesmen during the seventies of the last century.

The essence of the expansion of the security concept arose from the fact according to which the threats to the security of the countries should represent a priority for governments, however threats to human lives should be increasingly accepted as important or more important that the other "traditional" priorities of the country.

The need of expansion of the concept, that is, the relevance of the term security in global politics, was well recognized in global politics long before its complete modeling was achieved after the termination of the Cold War.

Even in the distant seventies of the past century, the Independent Commission on International Development Issues (ICIDI), headed by the former chancellor of Western Germany, Willy Brant, together with the former prime ministers of Great Britain and Sweden – Hill and Olof Palme, who in their influential report concluded that:

"The important task of the constructive international policy should comprise of (sic) provisioning of new, comprehensive understanding of "security" which will be less limited for the clear military aspects...

Our survival does not depend only on the military business, but also on the global cooperation to create a sustainable biological environment based on differently distributed resources ".

In the era of the Cold War persisted the attitude and the fear that the military threat is the biggest threat for the security of the countries, until the end of the eighties. With the end of the Cold War, their ideas and strives continued to exist and to find a fertile soil in the field of security and international politics. This conclusion only confirms the post-cold war reality according to which the creation and the direction of the international security politics, both for the military, as well as for the nonmilitary aspects and issues, will generate the peace benefits of the nineties.

We can follow the expansion of the security concept quite illustratively also through the UN idea, represented for the first time in the international scene, an idea that in its vision went further than the previously promoted attitudes of the League of Nations. World War II that announced the disintegration of the League of Nations, to a great extent contributed for UN to apply the military access to security, increasingly following the realistic logics. Their "new" idea was directed towards preservation of peace both for the individuals, as well as for the countries, through the preservation and the guarantee of human rights, thereby tracing the road to more comprehensive and deeper understanding of security.

In the 1990s, UN got a new opportunity and capacities to revive, and even more, to develop this "more extensive" and modern way of thinking in accordance with, and in function of the human security concept.

"The security concept must be changed – from exclusive emphasis on national security to a much greater emphasis on security of people, from security through weapons towards security through human development from territory to food, employment and social security".

Predecessor and promoter of the human security concept and idea happened two years before the "official promotion" of the UN, that is, at the Pan-African Conference, cosponsored by the UN and the Organization of African Unity.

"The security concept goes far beyond military thinking. (It) has to be understood in terms of security of the individual persons to live in peace with access to basic products for life and full participation in the work of its society freely and to enjoy all basic human rights".

In this regard, it is inevitable to elaborate the attitudes indicated in the network of human security (promoted at the Conference in Lisen in 1998), according to which:

"Human security became a new measure of global security, as well as a new agenda on global action. Security is a characteristic of the freedom from fear, while the wellbeing is the goal of the freedom from the need. Human security and human development are the two sides of the same coin, mutually strengthening themselves and leading towards an appropriate environment for themselves."

At the end of the twentieth century, the anarchy was an international state system and the dangers from the other countries were greater than ever. In this regard, the access of the realists towards international relations was a return to the opinion that the country is of key importance in the provisioning of lives of its citizens, only under another mask.

The extensive interpretation of security obtained many critics among realists who persistently strived to maintain the narrow focus, that is, the previous essence of the security concept. Their conceptual approach differed from the "new" concept established after the termination of the Cold War. The theoretician Walt strongly advocated a view according to which "the study of security may be defined as a study of threats, use and control of the military force".

Many realists during a specific period feared that the military threats will be more probable and possible in the period after the Cold War regardless of the traditional guarantee of the security of the country, the military balance of power.

The supporters of the wider concept of security still believed that military threats are not the only threats that the countries, the people and the world as a whole will face.

According to Ullman, "security implication in the countries with demographic pressures and exhausted resources should be considered same as the military threats from other countries."

This "security logic" continued to deepen and develop and it started to focus on the other potential threats to the security of people and countries. Mathews at the end of the Cold War, quite logically and justifiably expanded the existing spectrum of threats with "the newly created threats from the problems with the environment, as well as the reduction of the ozone layer and global warming".

It is also typical to emphasize the viewpoint of Ayoob who considered that "internal, rather than external threats are the main threat for the security in most of the less developed countries".

Other authors (Peterson and Sebenius) emphasized in their studies that the crises in education and the increased number of the economic "subclass" should be considered a security threat.

Lyn Jones and Miller included the dangerous nationalism and the social strike from migration in the spectrum of security threats.

Despite the multitude of different attitudes and launched theories in this field, the expansion of the security concept did not refute the logic of realists regarding the conventional security studies. In the new global setting, the "expansion" of the concept implies only expansion of the scope and the spectrum of relevant factors that refer primarily to state power, beyond the field of military and economic matters.

However, "the deepened access" to the security studies, favorite among the pluralists and the social constructivists in international relations, increased the focus on the disciple and the security of people instead of the country. It is essentially the new concept of the controversial human security.

5. CONCLUSION

The alarming ambiguity of security as a concept results with the irreconcilability of the two viewpoints on national and human (individual) security. Probably it is impossible to reconcile the two viewpoints, as well as the two concepts that seek for fulfillment of the usual strive and expectation to realize security as a value.

These arguments unequivocally confirm the conclusion that there is no and that there can't be necessary harmony between the national and the human security.

Also one must point out the inevitable contradiction between the individual and the national security – contradiction that is rooted in the very nature of political collectivities.

"The fight" and the eternal opposition of these two concepts and interests that also have different variations in specific historic circumstances can be reflected through the following conclusions:

1.   "That security is important regardless of the country at a level of individuals.

2. That human security is subjected to positive and negative impacts by the country and that the foundation for non-harmony between human and national security is a permanent contradiction.
3. That the human search for security has different impacts on national security, both as a problem and as a stimulant and limitation.“
4. The harmonization and the reduction of the contradiction between the concept of the human and the national security for a long time will occupy the national thought and practice both as a problem and as a stimulant and limitation.

LITERATURE

[1] Booth, K. (1991). Security Emancipation, Review of International Studies 17(4).
[2] Buzan, B. (1991). Peoples, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post Cold War Era. London: Harwester Wheatsheaf.
[3] Charles W. Kegly. Jr. and Eugene R. Wirtkopf. (2001). World Politics-Trend and Transformation. Wadsford: a division of Thompson Learning, inc.
[4] Frank N. Trager and Frank L. Simonie. (1973). An introduction to the Study of National Security, in F.N.Trager and P.S. Hronenberg, National Security and American Society Lowrense Kansas. University Press of Kansas.
[5] Huwaydi. (1989). Militarization and security in the Middle East. PrinterPublishes.
[6] ICD I(1980). North-South: The Report on the International Commission on International Development Issues. London: Pan Books.
[7] Michael H.H. Louw. (1978). National Security Pretoria, iss-University of Pretoria, according to the quotes from “The Purpose of the Symposium“.
[8] Ulkich Beeck. (1999). World Risk Society. Canbridge: Polity Press/ Blackwell Publishers.
[9] UNPP (1993). Human Development Report. Peoples Participation. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
[10] Wheeler, N.J. and Booth. K. (1992). The Security Dilemma in J.Baylis and N.J. Rengger (eds) Dilemmas of World Politics; International isues M A Changing world. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
[11] Wolfers. (1952). National Security of Ambiguous Symbol. Political Science Quarterly.