

**Security of the European Union in Contemporary World:
Human Security and its Implication for the European Integration Process**

Paper prepared for the 7th Pan-European International Relations Conference,
Stockholm 9-11 September 2010
(draft version, please do not quote)

Author:

Zbyněk Dubský, University of Economics, Prague

Introduction

Security is considered to be the essential and key precondition of development after the end of the Cold War. However the end of the Cold War has created an expectation or opportunity that traditional concept of security preoccupied with state-centric issues of deterrence, strategic alliances, military (nuclear) confrontation, will be broadened or redefined. At the global level pervasive poverty and deepening inequality are distinctive features of the contemporary global social landscape, and prevention of violent conflict requires a comprehensive, equitable, and inclusive approach to development, because the growth of material inequality is evident between states, within states, and also between private corporations (Thomas: pp. 225-244). As a result security is not guaranteed by traditional strategies based mainly on protection of its borders or deterrence.

The phrase “human security” became one of the new constructs for new security thinking and debates. An obstacle to analysis of “human security” was the lack of a clear consensus as what it is, and what it seeks to do, as understood by Matt McDonald (McDonald 2003: pp. 278-280) or Edward Newmen (Newmen 2001, pp. 242-247). Despite the variety of conceptions, there are elements shared universally by all definitions of human security. The concept of human security shows four essential and rather innovative characteristics (Dalby 2000: pp. 5-6). The first one involves universal appeal of such concept applicable without any exceptions on the global and regional; the second one shows that all security components are

interconnected, and interdependent as a consequence; the third characteristic is its emphasis on timely warning and prevention ensuring security; and the fourth and probably the most important one is the above-mentioned shift of the referent object. If compared with traditional security concepts where security of individuals derives from the state security, human security emphasises individuality. The focus is therefore not on the state, territorial security and armament issues, but on citizens of the state, society or, in a universalistic approach, all the population on Earth, and protection from chronic threats. Individual as the referent object of security lies at the core of human security and summarisation of a security threat is centred at the threats to quality of life of individuals. Human security not only responds to ordinary people's needs in dealing with sources of threats, but also empowers people and societies as a means of security.

Another area of broad consensus concerns the need to recognise the role of non-state actors as agents of security. The realization of human security involves not only governments, but a broader participation of different actors as well as international and regional organizations, non-governmental organizations, and local communities. The opening up of the role of a political security agency to non-state actors in the human security discourse towards altering the normative context in which states define and practise security is also an important contribution of the concept (McDonald 2003: pp. 292). Concept of human security recognises the importance of orienting security away from the traditional and exclusive concern with armed conflict. The concept requires disarmament, cooperation and mutual trust. Threats to human security are local as well as global, such as uncontrolled growth of population, unequal economic opportunities, excessive international migration, degradation of the environment, drug production and trading, and international terrorism.

On the other hand the universality of human security (a concept that aspires to explain anything explains almost nothing) and change of reference object is cause of vagueness of the concept, that is why critiques speak about lack of analytical clarity (how to identify, categorize and prioritize what truly must be protected?) and little analytical value seeing human security as new wine in old bottles (Henk 2005: pp. 97-104). Roland Paris has pointed out that human security can be understood in different ways: as a political agenda or campaign, as a rallying cry (the idea of human security has successfully united a diverse coalition of states and international agencies), as a new conceptualization of security, or as a guide for policymakers and academic researchers as a change of paradigm in security studies (Paris 2001). The criticism is that it is difficult to see how the human security concept could

be “operationalised” within present configurations of power and decision-making processes (McDonald 2003, p. 280). After ten years of discussion seems that the question of definition is for the discussion somewhat inefficient.

The study describes some aspects of current state of discussion about human security concept based on identification of structural changes in the global security environment and of new security perceptions. It focuses on basic development phases of this concept at the UN ground. The second part of the paper analyses the EU as a Security Actor in the New Security Environment. However, the EU, using a mixture of civilian, military and normative instruments, is more than yet another security player as it redefines the security concept and even participates in creation of a new security paradigm. The last part of the paper focuses on the potential of the human security to be a strategic concept for the european external action.

Innovations in Security Concepts in the New Security Environment

The globalised world has existed in a new security environment with increasingly open borders in which the internal and external aspects of security are indissolubly linked. Traditionally, these two domains were dealt with separately, respecting clearly distinguished security threats they were to react to. Originally, internal security threats used to be perceived as crimes and other torts within state borders, whereas external threats were understood as threats resulting from aggressive behaviour of states in the international environment. Yet it seems that many security threats cannot be defined explicitly as a purely internal or purely external threat. Transnational threats can be found at the top of the “new” security agenda, while traditional threats based on perception of states as threats lose their relevance (Lutterbeck 2005: pp. 231-253). The clearly state-centric security conception shifts to a more multilateral or interstate understanding of security. In addition, states are no longer the only source of threat, but non-state entities (including traditional and new terrorist organisations, radical religious, sectarian or extremist movements) become a threat as well.

Increasing levels of global interdependence further bear to the growing consensus that today's security threats go beyond the traditional understanding of defence threats, to include poverty, economic inequality, human rights abuses, diseases, pollution and other environmental issues, and natural disasters as well as “protection from sudden and hateful disruptions in the patterns of daily life” (Human Development Report, 1994). The concept of security and level of its provision has been modified in a radical way and mainly extended.

Under human security, poverty and inequality are now considered root causes of individual vulnerability. Frances Stewart argues that security and development are deeply interconnected (Stewart 2004). Proponents of the concept of “human security” articulated in the UN Development Programme’s 1994, Human Development Report, and the Commission on Human Security’s 2003 report, Human Security Now, argue that the threat agenda should be broadened to include hunger, disease and natural disasters because these kill far more people than war, genocide and terrorism combined¹. This is not a detailed specification of crucial aspects of “human security” but rather an attempt to show, regardless of potential future hierarchy, the complex nature of security threats endangering human lives. Thus the approach is often called “freedom from want” and “freedom from fear” expressing its dichotomy. The two approaches to “human security” are complementary rather than contradictory. While the UNDP 1994 report originally argued that “human security” requires attention to both, divisions have gradually emerged over the proper scope of threats to rights, safety and lives, which need to be responded to.

The “human security” paradigm borrows from a number of different new approaches. It “describes a condition of existence in which basic material needs are met, and which human dignity, including meaningful participation in the life of the community, can be realised.” (Thomas: p. 161). People or rather the human community where people live their lives becomes a referent object. Such “human security” is indivisible. It cannot be pursued by or for one state or social group at the expense of another. The 1994 Human Development Report argues that the concept emerged as a result of forgotten “legitimate concerns of ordinary people who sought security in their daily lives”. Material sufficiency is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition of human security that entails more than physical survival; the concept encompasses non-material dimensions to form a qualitative whole. The qualitative aspects of security are about the achievement of human dignity which incorporates personal autonomy, control over one’s life and unhindered participation in the life of the community“ (Thomas: p. 162).

In one decade the concept moved from the margins of the development debate to global political discourse debate. As I. H. Sira and J. Gräns describe: The concept of human security can be seen as a response to three major changes in international relations after the end of the cold war, namely the introduction of a wide range of new threats (or at least

¹ Authors of the UNDP 1994 report identify seven specific elements of “human security”: economic security, food security, health security, environmental security, personal security, community security and political security (Human Development Report, 1994).

perceived as new by policy-makers), a slow, but steady change and growth of global norms, and the processes and outcomes of globalisation (Sira - Gräns 2010: p.3). It successfully penetrates multilateral global (UN) and regional organisations, is consistently referred to by a number of governments and largely used and appreciated by NGOs.

The EU as an external Security Actor

The integration forming the EU was not intended as an attempt to create a security organisation in the traditional sense. Its external activity rather reflected a dominant inward focus of integration where the integration played its strategic role by establishing a new system of relations among European states (so-called security by being) (Moler 2005). External security issues were on the first time included more notably within the European integration process by the Treaty on European Union signed in Maastricht in 1992 where the second EU pillar consist of a Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP). Still, it was finally to become a common policy instead of cooperation, and the CFSP obtained a legitimate status. The name of the second pillar itself implies a qualitative shift towards a higher stage of integration in common foreign policy and security activities of its member states. The general EU goals clearly show that the EU foreign and security policy should help to build a stronger identity of the EU. CFSP had to correspond to the EU aspirations to be an international organisation that is a global actor and not only a coordinator of individual policies (Smith 2004: pp. 184-185). The EU becomes a securitising actor and a security provider in this process, but it can also be identified as a security referent object (Martinsen 2004, p. 10). The EU was forced into a decision whether it wanted to be a pure “civil power” or partly a “military power”, to what extent it would be able to resolve the issues of social hardship, failed regions and extreme political forces solely through its economic strength and appeal (Pace 2004: pp. 9-16).

The security dimension of the EU has been created in the era with depolarisation of power, and diffused and more dynamic threats and security risks both on the European and global levels. Defence and security are not longer reduced to activities involving use of military means, and they cease to be understood as connected with a clearly defined territory. Similarly to threats, security has become deterritorialised after the end of the bipolar era. In addition to regional conflicts, significant transnational threats, such as terrorism or spread of weapons of mass destruction have been experienced. It seems problematic nowadays to measure strength of international actors solely by their power (i.e. absolutization of power), in

particular if understood as a military power only. In addition, security is not defined only in a negative sense, i.e. as simple absence of war and armed violence. It can be viewed positively – as a condition based on international law, cooperation between organizations, states and their population, replacing the strength by sharing and protecting common values. The European Security Strategy “A Secure Europe in a Better World” adopted by the European Council in Brussels in December 2003 states that “Europe has never been so prosperous, so secure nor so free.” (A Secure Europe in a Better World 2003: p. 1) On the other hand, the document understands that “this is a world of new dangers but also of new opportunities” (Ibid: p. 14). The challenges to Europe thus no longer involve an invasion of its territory by enemy’s forces, but confrontation with “non-territorial” and “asymmetric” threats (Flehtner 2006: p. 168). However, its growing dependence increased the European “vulnerability”. With regard to security globalisation introduces a specific positive aspect of promoting human rights and democracy as universal values.

As to the form of the EU security dimension, it is not a simple reflection of the fall of the iron curtain and new phase of cooperation in Europe, but it is mainly a consequence of the shift in perception of security and its formation and capacity goals were directly influenced by conflicts the European states were confronted with and had to respond to. Wars in former Yugoslavia played an important catalyst role in 1990s. Failure to react was condition for definition of clear, coherent and efficient EU approach. In the first phase, the states were rather forced to speedily look for means of an adequate reaction. Therefore, the attention was first paid to building of capacities for post conflict reconstruction. At that time, the EU was not prepared for conflict prevention but rather for a role in regional stabilisation processes.

The 1999 European headline goal to form a Rapid Reaction Force was a step important for the EU capacity to play a role in UN peace-keeping operations and to build European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP). Subsequently, a decision of civil capability building was made. In June 2000, the Feira European Council defined four priority areas for non-military issues, i.e. police, rule of law, public administration and government, and civil protection of population. Civil capabilities can be used also for long-term peace missions. The ESDP was to become more robust, flexible and more global (Flehtner 2006: p. 163).

In June 2004 the European Council approved a new qualitative goal for the 2010. The goal shall not change and increase the European Headline Goal of 1999 in a radical way, but improve capacities in identified weaker areas. According to the European Headline Goal of 2010 the military forces are to be mobile, flexible, interoperable, prepared for fast deployment

and sustainable in the long-term. It is a highly ambitious goal with an unclear result as military expenditures have not increased (rather they have been further reduced). The goal involves creation of battle groups with 1500 men, including combat support, combat service support and strategic transportation. It is the minimal effective force capable of independent operations that can play a role of the first force during the initial phase of a larger operation.

In June 2004 the European Council also approved the action plan for civil crises. Civilian aspects of crisis management were further developed by the European Council of December 2004 under so-called European Headline Goal 2008. According to the European Headline Goal 2008 the EU shall perform monitoring missions and support EU special representatives. As in the European Headline Goal 2010, the European Headline Goal 2008 elaborates priorities of the 2000 civilian goal in compliance with the ESS conceptual goals. The attention is newly paid to specialists in border protection, organized crime, sexual and violent crimes, trafficking in people, and human rights. The European Headline Goal presupposed preparation of a list of required capacities, evaluation of the size and structure of national contributions, identification of main deficits, and creation of a control mechanism. Credibility of the ESDP depends on sufficient funds and mainly on involvement of European states in conflict regions. Only then a clear political and strategic concept can be defined. For this reason the EU aims to strengthen both the military and civil ESDP capabilities and human security capabilities, require civil–military coordination.

The process also required faster European and national decision-making and planning processes. However, the EU continues to be operable in particular in peace-keeping operations, i.e. in stabilisation and political reconstruction. In other missions, the EU capabilities remain to be rather limited. In June 2001 the Göteborg European Council adopted an EU program for violent conflict prevention. The EU therefore tended to prefer preventive actions to responses to dangers. On the other hand, the ESS stressed that the EU aim was to “develop a strategic culture that fosters early, rapid, and when necessary, robust intervention.” (A Secure Europe in a Better World 2003: p. 11). Today the EU is present in 16 missions on 3 continents, and has a substantial amount of personnel on the ground in these missions. The missions vary in terms of aims, scope, size and level of activity, and include those on policing, the rule of law, military missions, monitoring and planning, and security sector reforms (Sira - Gräns 2010: p.2). Counting those that are still active, the EU’s total contribution to date entails 26 separate missions. European external interventions in the

context of human security examines book edited by M. Martin and M. Kaldor *The European Union and Human Security, External Interventions and Missions* (Martin – Kaldor 2009).

The questions whether the EU security policy is primarily directed at defending the European homeland or rather at securing international peace and order are central to the debate on the EU external security (Flehtner 2006: pp. 168-172). This is evidenced by unclear contractual basis for CFSP goals, and nature and specific content of the security policy. The EU emphasises the need for cooperation on the international level and cooperation build-up in international organisations. Providing and strengthening security of the EU member states are not the only, and probably not even the main motivation for recent rapid development of the ESDP, characterised by capacity building, institutionalisation and strengthening of mechanisms in the security dimension. As a result, the EU is equipped in a more complex way for its external activities and for good governance as one of the CFSP; the European space becomes identified as a more homogenous environment.

The reasons include the fact that there are only few problems the EU can tackle on its own, but mainly the maintenance of effective multilateralism providing better opportunities to the EU as a non-military organisation to raise the profile of its influence (Grevi 2004). Strengthening its security and military capacities should enable the EU in the future to meet its strategic goal of becoming in many respects a leading, independent actor in the multipolar world. Many argue that the security dimension of the European integration process is a logical segment and essential precondition of continued political integration whereas the mention of need for provision of external security in its traditional conception is less frequent in such discussions.

There is a clear dichotomy of arguments for building and strengthening the ESDP. On one hand it could be based on the traditional argument of defence as the core of security and on the other hand it is the argument of EU as a creator of international order and peace. The reality of the EU reflects both these approaches that are “independent” and “equal” (Flehtner 2006: p. 161). This is evidenced by definition of CFSP goals in the Treaty on European Union where the goal to “strengthen the security of the Union and its Member States” is preceded by “to safeguard the common values, fundamental interests and independence of the Union”. It is important that no military or civil capacities are directly associated with any of the approaches. In addition, the EU is unable to respond to some key questions related to the European security project, such as the character of potential intervention, its justification and limits or building of collective security. Plus no conditions have been defined stating when the

EU is authorised to use military force to defend its security or for stabilisation of other regions (Lindley-French – Agieri 2004: p. 9).

The ESDP has become an important means of identification and independence of Europe. Gradual Europeanization of foreign and security policies of the EU member states can be expected when the internal EU organisational logic, i.e. more specifically the EU political and economic dynamics, pushes the national actors to adapt to it and become part of the logic (Fanes 2001: pp. 2-4). Building of the ESDP is an essential condition for a European foreign policy as a collective project through which the national actors carry out partly joint and partly independent international actions (Hill – Wallace 1996, p. 5).

The above-mentioned shows that the ESDP structure and focus differ from other international security regimes as well as from the security policies of the EU member states even though according to the treaties and agreements the CFSP includes all security aspects (Flehtner 2006: p. 158-159). The EU is not transforming itself into a standard “hard security” organisation. To a certain level its “militarisation”, i.e. capacity building, is not intended for traditional military actions of coercion. It is not connected with increasing military expenditures, it does not require drastic increase in number of weapons systems, it does not contemplate military power building or drastic increase of resources for military research and development or arms production. Europe has been so far hesitating when it comes to fast restructuring of its armies. It is rather motivated by its aim to gradually establish the EU as a visible factor in the globalised world, capable of supporting its political and economic activities via civil and military means. Human security approach may be the only way to close what is in security studies often described as the security gap. Proponents of human security arguments, that in a human security operation, the job of the military is to protect and preserve rather than to fight an enemy (Kaldor-Martin-Selchow 2008: p. 2). Kaldor, Martin and Selchow also argued:

“The advantage of the term ‘human security’ is that it can be used to combine many of the concepts and ideas that have been developed in the ESDP. It can encompass conflict prevention, crisis management and civil–military cooperation, and indeed it draws on the assumptions inherent in these concepts. But it also offers a way to act, a set of principles for crisis management, conflict prevention and civil–military cooperation“. (Kaldor-Martin-Selchow 2007: p. 283)

It seems that the European tendency to a “holistic approach to security is as much a reflection of their postmodern tradition as of their martial weakness” (Payne 2003: p. 14).

Human Security: European way to security?

For the EU the adoption of the human security concept would represent a qualitative change in the conduct of EU foreign and security policy. Proponents of the human security Kaldor and Glasius argued that there are three fundamental motives for the EU to adopt the concept of human security in the CFSP and ESDP: morality, legality and self-interest (Kaldor-Glasius 2005: pp. 62-82). The phrase “human security” is one of the new constructs for new security thinking in Europe and debates around four key questions: Who or what should be the referent object of security? Who or what threatens security? Who has the prerogative to provide such security? What methods and instruments are appropriate in providing security in the new security environment? (Terrif 1999: p. 3). Under human security, poverty and inequality are now considered root causes of individual vulnerability. Though it remained subject to many varying definition and disputed for its political appropriateness, scope, content and analytical ambiguity, the concept of human security as a new paradigm “subsequently became something of a benchmark for an emerging new model of “security”” (Henk 2005, p. 92) and human security can be regarded as a paradigm shift from traditional national security approaches. Proponents of the human security are convinced that human security can be seen as a proactive strategic narrative with the potential to further EU foreign policy integration (Kaldor- Martin-Selchow 2007: p. 273).

The concept of human security is for the EU connected with an attempt at positive definition of security when security is not perceived only as a simple non-existence of threats or as a capability to tackle the threats. As K. Annan describes: “Peace means much more than the absence of war. Human security can no longer be understood in purely military terms. Rather, it must encompass economic development, social justice, environmental protection, democratization, disarmament, and respect for human rights and the rule of law” (Annan 2001). And finally The human security could represent a qualitative shift at a discursive level, but in organizing EU foreign and security policy actions at an operational level also.

For the EU is relevant that concept of human security contributed to broadening of security over new non-military threats and deepening security beyond state security (McDonald 2003: p. 277). The concept involves a fundamental departure from an orthodox Realist international security analysis that has the state as the exclusive primary referent object. Instead, human beings and their complex social and economic relations are given primacy

with or over states. In the words of Heinbecker, human security is about “the ability to protect people as well as to safeguard states”. (Heinbecker, p. 2). EU is representing in this external security politic the understanding that it is possible to transform relations between states².

The EU is often portrayed as a normative power in world politics, being a strong promoter of the normative principles generally acknowledged in the United Nations system (Sira-Gräns 2010, p. 1). As McDonald describes: “Human security seems to speak to a changing normative international context, and is itself (through the norms and values embedded in the approach) contributing to that normative change, at the least through questioning the appropriateness of traditional conceptions and practices of security” (McDonald 2003, p. 295). Human security concept seems to be a suitable answer to the external normative role of the EU. These can include the promotion of nine normative principles: sustainable peace, freedom, democracy, human rights, the rule of law, equality, social solidarity, sustainable development and good governance (Manners 2008: pp. 45-60).

The new security concept on the European Continent adds economic, social, cultural and environmental aspects to the traditional military and political dimension of security. As stated in the introductory part of this paper, security is much broader and complex in the new security environment, falling into many interconnected areas that influence each other. Security issues as well as defence issues have been historically and factually closely connected in Europe to issues of national sovereignty, national interests and ambitions (Webber 2003).

Human security can be seen from the EU point of view as crucial for stabilisation of the world and it officially found its way into the EU policy arena in 2003 by influencing some of the analytical parts of the European Security Strategy, which makes the case for preventive engagement and effective multilateralism, although it does not explicitly refer to them as such. Member states have made available military forces for the European Rapid Reaction Force, as well as civilian capabilities. The promotion “of sustainable economic development, of democracy and respect of human rights, of viable political structures, healthy environmental and social conditions represent the core elements of structural stability. A crucial condition is to manage change without resorting to conflict”. (Menotti-Vencato 2008, p. 106)

The European Security Strategy was an essential first step towards constituting the Union’s external security policy personality. But it still leaves unanswered key questions

² As J. Solana solemn describes „We know that it is possible to transform relations between states and alter the lives of millions of citizens. That should continue to be a source of inspiration for all of us“ (Solana 2007)

about where the EU should intervene beyond its borders and according to which criteria. This means that the EU's security strategy is only a 'pre-strategic concept' (Lindley-French 2004). Figuratively speaking the potential first line of defence of European states moves to close or far foreign countries, and human security reflects this.

The task for the EU is to define human security in a way which is characteristically European as distinct from the other proponents of the human security (for example Japan or Canada). Therefore, a Study Group, chaired by Professor Mary Kaldor, was convened in autumn 2003 at the behest of High Representative for Common Foreign and Security Policy Javier Solana to examine the possibility of formulating and implementing an EU human security policy or doctrine. The report of this group, "A Human Security Doctrine for Europe", published in September 2004 proposes a security policy based rather on human security than state security. This report is about implementation of the European Security Strategy and it argues that Europe needs the capability to make a more active contribution to global security. It needs military forces but military forces need to be configured and used in new ways. The report focuses on regional conflicts and failed states, which are the source of new global threats including terrorism, weapons of mass destruction and organised crime.

There are three reasons for such paradigmatic shift. The first reason is morality based on humanist principles and requirements of dignity and security. It could be argued "that the EU has a moral and political obligation to lend its expertise and experience in multilateralism to the human security process" (Kostopoulos 2006, p. 7). The second reason is legal, and the report argues that international institutions have not only a right, but also a legal obligation to concern themselves with human security worldwide because Articles 55 and 56 of the UN Charter oblige states to promote universal respect for human rights and their observance. The third reason mentioned by the report is "enlightened self-interest", i.e. the EU cannot be secure while people living outside the EU live in severe insecurity. The third reason emphasises that human security approach is not only a manifestation of idealism, but also a manifestation of realism (A Human Security Doctrine for Europe 2004). For Liotta and Owen is the Human Security Doctrine and not European Security Strategy document they clearly declare Europe's responsibility to act beyond its borders "independently if necessary" (Liotta – Owen 2006).

The report notes that in today's world, there is a gap between current security capabilities, consisting largely of military forces, and real security needs. While traditional security policy was based on defending borders and containing threats, the treats cannot be

isolated in the globalised world. The emphasis is on preventive activities and effective international cooperation; the EU proceeds from an assumption that security of Europe consist in its responsibility for global security. The defined threats the EU faces are universal.

The Human Security Doctrine is based on the principles of primacy of human rights, clear political authority, multilateralism, bottom-up approach, regional focus, use of legal instruments, and appropriate use of force, i.e. minimal use of force. Military power is therefore perceived as a necessary but “unwanted” and “reactive” part of the whole range of instruments the EU has at its disposal (Martinsen 2004, p. 33). Europe tends to prefer a policy of “constructive engagement” to build stability and security on various levels (Cameron 2002). We can assume that the EU will continue to have limited capabilities for projecting its power. Nevertheless, military forces will become the backbone of EU security dimension, and together with political and economic tools they will be a part of preventive engagement of the EU around the world. On the hand we can see a human security model as offering the EU both the theoretical and operational thicket of the use of force (Matlary 2006).

In reality there is a conceptual shift where the EU becomes an organisation using its soft power, i.e. a successful peace project can persuade other partners in a political discussion without the use of military or economic power (Kotsopoulos 2006). And the soft power policy is an appropriate means in the environment of multilateral cooperation and interdependence. In the political dimension the typical strategic EU approach can be seen as an adoption of a “doctrine of non-escalation”. The human security doctrine becomes a general political goal “bridging the Union’s traditional status as a civilian power and the new foreign policy instruments” (Martinsen 2004: p. 12). The EU focus should be rather on conflict prevention, region stabilization within post conflict reconstruction, military advice and help, and support to third countries in combating terrorism. The finding is not surprising because the 20th century became a tragic period of fatal conflicts in the human evolution due to European problems resulting in two world wars and consequently to the Cold War. The aim is not to obtain or approximate a dominant position in the military area as this cannot lead on its own to resolution of security problems. It would require diplomacy, economic and political power; commitment to international law, institutions and working multilateralism. The focus on multilateralism reflects a “non-aggressive” strategy when the EU follows international legitimacy and responsibility, and underlines the EU’s intention to use force as the last resort only (Evangelista: pp. 22-23).

The Laeken Declaration on the Future of Europe sees the role of Europe in its ability to play a stabilising role worldwide and to point the way ahead for many countries and peoples and in particular to shoulder its responsibilities in the governance of globalisation. Human security expresses the unique character of CFSP/ESDP and enables them to project the EU's personality on the world stage (Kaldor-Martin-Selchow 2007: p. 288). Robert Cooper states that "the post-modern European response to danger is to further expand the system of cooperative empire" (Cooper 2004: p. 78). We can assume that the EU will aim to use its experience from evolution processes on the European Continent within its external activities. The concept of human security is necessary in order to help the Europeans to know what they mean when they talk about the ideas, values and goals of EU external position.

Conclusions

EU is the youngest, but no doubt a very ambitious actor in the global security sphere. The EU Summit in Nice in December 2000 confirmed that Europe should play fully its role on the international scene, assuming responsibility if faced with crises. The EU should strengthen its capacity to mobilise "a vast range of both civilian and military means and instruments, thus giving it an overall crisis-management and conflict-prevention capability in support of the objectives of the Common Foreign and Security Policy". The EU instruments in the area of security and defence are expanding to include an autonomous capacity to take decisions and action.

Nevertheless, the EU is not only another security actor but it also redefines the concept of security, building a new security paradigm. The human security concept has been one of the outcomes of debates at the turn of 1980s and 1990s about abandoning the state-centric approach to security and conceptualising security of individual (Copenhagen school, Third World school, Feminism). The concept has been quickly accepted in international politics, becoming a part of agendas of many international organisations (UN, WB and EU) as well as a number of middle-sized countries. The primary focus on development issues of the first half of 1990s has been superseded by discussions on paradigmatic change of security and by efforts to define a scholarly framework of research.

A frequent criticism of the human security concept is that it is too idealistic (Kaldor-Martin-Selchow 2008: p. 2). Human security still has a long way to go before there is agreement on one precise definitive. But it can be argued that this paradigm shift is already

under way. Despite its lack of clarity on the theoretical level the concept has survived and has become vital, bridging human security, human rights and human development, and provoking further reflection on sustainable concept of human security in the EU. Human security allows multifaceted response to multidimensional threats and allows for integrated and interdisciplinary analysis.

Strategic pro-active conception based on the human security is one way in which the EU can address the need for greater clarity about its goals and methods as a global security actor which has the potential to further EU foreign policy integration. The advantage of the human security concept is that it also offers a way to act and a set of principles for external European action in meeting the EU's aim of being a "force for good" in the world.

The emphasis on the human security concept could also bridge the distinct divide between an emphasis on norms or soft techniques of persuasion and a readiness to use coercive measures using the full range of military and civilian instruments. Human security is about why civil and military capabilities are combined. The human security concept could justify the development of European capacities in the frame of CFSP as well as collective actions.

Bibliography

A Human Security Doctrine for Europe: the Barcelona report of the study group on Europe's security capabilities

A Secure Europe in a Better World, European Security Strategy, Brussels, 2003

BÜRGER, Ch. STRITZEL, H.: *New European Security Theory, Zur Emergenz eines neuen europäischen Forschungsprogramms*, In. *Zeitschrift für Internationale Beziehungen*, 12/2005, 2005

CAMERON, F.: *Transatlantic Relations: A European Perspective*, The European Policy Centre: Brussels, 2002

Cologne European Council Declaration on Strengthening the Common European Policy on Security and Defence, Annex III, Conclusions of the Presidency, European Council Cologne 3 - 4 June 1999

Conceptual Framework on the ESDP dimension of the fight against terrorism, 2005 Council of the European Union, doc. 10462/05, Brussels 2005

COOPER, R.: *The Breaking of nations: Order and Chaos in the Twenty-First Century*, London: Atlantic Books, London 2004

DALBY, S.: *Geopolitical Change and Contemporary Security Studies: Contextualizing the Human Security Agenda*, Working Paper No. 30, Institute of International Relations the University of British Columbia, 2000

European Council Declaration on the contribution of CSFP, including ESDP, in the fight against terrorism, Seville, June 2002

European Defence - A Proposal for a White Paper. Report of an Independent Task Force, European Union Institute for Security Studies, Paris 2004

EVANGELISTA, M.: *Is There a „European Approach to Security? <http://www.isodarco.it/courses/andalo05/paper/andalo05-evangelista.pdf>* [6.11.2006]

FLECHTNER, S.: *European Security and Defence /Policy: Between „Offensive Defence“ and „Human Security“*, In. Internationale Politik und Gesellschaft, Issue 4/2006

FOSSUM, J. E.: *Still a Union of deep diversity? The Convention and Constitution for Europe*, Arena Working Paper 21/03, 2003

GLASIUS, M., KALDOR, M.: *Individuals First: A Human Security Strategy for the European Union*, Internationale Politik und Gesellschaft, 01/2005

GREVI, G.: *No Strategy without Politics*. Ideas Factory – European Policy Centre, Brussels 2004

HAINÉ, J.-Y.: *An historical perspective* in GNESOTTO, N.: *EU Security and Defence Policy, The first five years (1999-2004)*, Institute for Security Studies, Paris 2004

HENK, D.: *Human Security: Relevance and Implications*, Parameters, Summer, 2005

HILL, CH., WALLACE, W.: *Introduction: actors and actions*. In: Hill Christopher: *The Actors in European Foreign Policy*, Routledge, London 1996

KALDOR, M., MARTIN, M., SELCHOW, S.: *Human Security: A European Strategic Narrative*, International Policy Analysis, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, 2008

KALDOR, M., MARTIN, M., SELCHOW, S.: *Human security: a new strategic narrative for Europe*, International Affairs, Volume 83, Issue 2, 2007

KOTSOPOULOS, J.: *A human security agenda for the EU?*, EPC Issue Paper No. 48, EPC 2006

KRAUSE, K., WILLIAMS, M.: *From Strategy to Security: Foundations of Critical Security Studies*, in KRAUSE, K., WILLIAMS, M. (ed.): *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*, University of Minnesota Press, 1997

LINDLEY-FRENCH, J, AGIERI, F.: *A European defence Strategy*, Gütersloh 2004

LINDLEY-FRENCH, J.: *The Revolution in security affairs: hard and soft security dynamics in the 21st century*. *European Security*, 2004, 13(1):1-15, 2004

LIOTTA, P., OWEN, T.: *Sense and Symbolism. Europe takes on Human Security*, Parameters

LUTTERBECK, D.: *Blurring the Dividing Line: The Convergence of Internal and External Security in Western Europe*. In: *European Security*, Vol. 14, 2/2005

MANNERS, I.: *The normative ethics of the European Union*, International Affairs, Vol. 84, No.1, 2008

MARTIN, M., KALDOR, M.: *The European Union and Human Security, External Interventions and Missions*, : Routledge, 2009

MARTINSEN, P. M.: *The European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) - a Strategic Culture in the Making?*, Paper prepared for the ECPR Conference, 2004

MATLARY, J.: *When Soft Power Turns Hard. Is an EU Strategic Culture possible?*, *Security Dialogue* Vol 37 no 1 March, 2006

McDONALD, M.: *Human Security and the Construction of Security*, *Global Society*, Vol. 16, No. 3, 2003

MENOTTI, R., VENCATO, M.F.: *The European Security strategy and the partners*, in BISHOP, s., ANDERSSON, J.J. (ed.): *The EU and the European Security Strategy, Forging a global Europe*, Routledge, 2008

MOLER, B.: *The EU as a Security Actor, "Security by Being" and "Security by Doing"*, DIIS Report, Danish institute for International Studies, Copenhagen 2005

NEWMEN, E.: Human Security and Constructivism, *International Studies Perspectives*, Vol. 2, 2001

OWEN, T.: *Challenges and Opportunities for Defining and Measuring Human Security*, *Disarmament Forum*, no. 3, 2004

PACE, M.: *Governing conflicts: an analysis of the EU policy on border conflicts in and around its periphery*, Paper for presentation at the Europe in the World Centre International Workshop on The EU periphery and European identity, Liverpool 2004

PARIS, R.: *Human Security, Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?* In: *International Security*, Vol. 26, No. 2, 2001, str. 87-102

PASTORE, F.: *Reconciling the Prince's two "Arms", Internal-external security policy coordination in the European Union*, Occasional papers 30, The Institute for Security Studies Western European Union, Paris 2001

PAYNE, K.: *The European security and Defence Policy and the future of NATO*, 2003

PHILIPPART, E.: *Deconstruction and reconstruction of EU pillars: the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership and the Models East Peace Process*, ECPR-ISA, Vien 1998

POLITI, A.: *European Security: the New Transnational Risk*, Chaliot Papers 29, Institute for Security Studies Western European Union, Paris 1997

Presidency Conclusions – Brussels, 25/26 March 2004

SIRA, I.H., GRÄNS, J.: *The Promotion of Human Security in EU Security Policies*, INEX Policy Brief No. 7 / March 2010

SMITH, M. E.: *Europe's Foreign and Security Policy, the Institutionalization of Cooperation*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2004

SOLANA, J.: *'Europe in the world in 2057', European Union the Next Fifty Years*, FT Business, March 2007

STEWART, F.: *Development and Security*, Centre for Research on Inequality, Human Security, and Ethnicity (CRISE), Working Paper 3, University of Oxford, 2004

TERRIF, T. et al.: *Security Studies Today*, Polity Press, Blackwell Publishing, 1999

THOMAS, C.: *Where is the Third World now?*, Review of International Studies,
25

WEBBER, M.: *The Governance of European Security*, Paper delivered at the
conference: Whither Europe? Borders, Boundaries, Frontiers in a Changing World,
Centre for European Research at Göteborg University, 2003