Tanja Tamminen

Human Security in Post-Status Kosovo:

a Shared European Responsibility

European Union
European Social Fund

Leverage from
the EU
2007–2013

CONTENT

Human Security in Post-Status Kosovo:
a Shared European Responsibility

Tanja Tamminen[1]

Researcher, Finnish Institute of International Affairs

The Human Security Doctrine for Europe is the work of a Study Group led by Professor Mary Kaldor. This article will analyse if, how, and, to what extent the concrete implementation of the Human Security Doctrine proposals are useful in the post-status situation in Kosovo; especially in regards to the launching of the EU civilian crisis management operation. It is argued in this article that the human security concept is important in particular when improving the EU's performance and effectiveness on the ground in crisis areas. This can be achieved, for example, by introducing the human security approach into the EU's crisis management pre-deployment training.

1   Introduction

The Kosovo status negotiations are over, and Kosovo parliament was elected in free[2] and fair elections on the 17 November 2007; now the world prepares for the independence of this debated region[3]. The majority of the inhabitants being Kosovo Albanians, the position of Kosovo in the former Yugoslavia was marginal; it was a poor and underdeveloped region producing agricultural goods and raw minerals for export to other areas of the federation. During the Ottoman period Kosovo was already considered as part of the marginal border regions of the state. As a border region between the past and the future, between shattering Ottoman Empire and the strengthening nation-states in the Balkans, Kosovo was annexed

---

[1] The views expressed in this article are those of the author and do not reflect the views of the Crisis Management Centre Finland.

[2] Free, if Belgrade's pressure on the Kosovo Serbian population to boycott the elections is not counted.

[3] It is useful to note that Kosovo's borders have not been clearly defined in the past. During the late Ottoman period the so called Kosovo vilayet, administrative region, comprised also Novi Pazar in today's Serbia as well as Skopje in today's Macedonia. Kosovo borders as we know them today date from the Second World War.

by Serbia in 1912.[4] Furthermore, when Yugoslavia collapsed in the 1990s Kosovo seemed to be the last unresolved territorial question. Today Kosovo's position appears to have shifted from "the margin of the margins" to the central focus of world politics. Kosovo's yearn for independence has not left many indifferent on the world scene. Even though the so called "West" more or less unanimously supports Kosovo Albanians' wish for sovereignty from Belgrade, Serbia, backed by its strong ally Russia, refuses to recognise an independent Kosovo.

In this tense situation the European Union (EU) prepares to take over civilian crisis management tasks in Kosovo from the United Nations (UN). Since the Kosovo War of 1999, the UN provisional administration, UNMIK (United Nations Mission in Kosovo), has ruled over the region. As the UN prepares to leave, the EU is planning the largest Rule of Law operation in the history of the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) for the post-status Kosovo. The operation will include over 1700 civilian experts from different fields of rule of law: policemen, judges, prosecutors, customs officials and so on. These experts are prepared to assist, monitor and strengthen local institutions. As the international debate concentrates on the status of Kosovo and the judicial basis of the ESDP operation, the main aim of the international assistance, however, seems to fade. Which is the priority – the successful launching of an ESDP operation or the effectiveness of this ESDP operation in achieving its goals? Outside intervention and civilian crisis management, the operations should be based on the reality. The Human Security Doctrine is an excellent tool to underline the need of an approach that focuses on the living conditions of the civilian population in the crisis areas; a fact often overlooked in the political debates about the crisis management.

Professor Mary Kaldor, world renown for her concept of "new wars"[5], is leading a Human Security Study Group[6] at the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE). This article will analyse if, how, and, to what extent the concrete implementation of some of the Human Security Doctrine proposals are useful in the post-status situation in Kosovo – especially in regards to the future launching of the EU civilian crisis management operation. The idea is not to describe the large debate around the concept of human security itself, but to concentrate on the functional recommendations of Mary Kaldor and her Study Group as well as to consider their usefulness and limits in the Kosovo context. I will argue in this article that the human security concept as defined by the Human Security Study Group, is significant, in particular when planning pre-deployment trainings for the EU experts being sent to crisis management operations.

---

[4] Malcolm 1998, 250–256.

[5] Kaldor 1999.

[6] Group includes Ulrich Albrecht, Christine Chinkin, Gemma Collantes Celador, Stefanie Flechtner, Marlies Glasius, Mary Kaldor (Convenor), Kimmo Kiljunen, Jan Klabbers, Jenny Kuper, Sonja Licht, Flavio Lotti, Klaus Reinhardt, Genevieve Schmeder, Pavel Seifter, Narcis Serra, Gert Weisskirchen.

2   Human security – from a concept to the ESDP reality

2.1   Human Security Doctrine for Europe

The Human Security Study Group's report "Human Security Doctrine for Europe" was received by High Representative Javier Solana on 15 September 2004 and is now known as *the Barcelona Report*. A new report[7] from the group was published in the presence of Solana on 8 November 2007 in Madrid (*the Madrid Report[8]*). The philosophy of the Study Group has evolved over the years, but the main approach has remained the same: the ESDP should be based on a certain set of principles, the so called Human Security Doctrine that the Study Group hopes to be adapted as an official EU document.[9]

The Human Security Study Group has been developing and refining the concept of human security since the Barcelona Report 2004. A certain number of case studies on crisis areas based on this concept have been published. Macedonia, Great Lakes region, Sierra Leone, South Caucasus and the Middle East were analysed in a book edited by Marlies Glasius and Mary Kaldor, and some recent case studies on Kosovo, Lebanon, DR Congo, Aceh and Palestine form a part of the Madrid report.[10]

According to Kaldor and her Study Group human security is about the security of individuals and communities as well as about the "interrelationship of 'freedom from fear' and 'freedom from want'".[11] Intolerable threats to human security range from genocide and slavery to natural disasters such as hurricanes or floods to massive violations of the right to food, health and housing.[12] Kaldor and other group members argue that the adoption of a Human Security Doctrine would give new dynamism to the ESDP practices.

> – – human security can be seen as a proactive strategic narrative with the potential to further EU foreign policy integration.[13]

In stating this Kaldor and the Study Group present human security as a discursive change which involves a learning process among EU decision makers and actors. This change in attitudes towards crisis management operations moves the focus from stabilisation of a conflict area to a sustainable human security.

---

[7] In 2006 before the Finnish EU Presidency, the Policy Planning Unit of the Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs asked the Centre for the Study of Global Governance to reconvene the Study Group and look at ways of taking forward a Human Security agenda within the European Union.

[8] Madrid report 2007.

[9] Ibid., 2–4: entitled "CFSP and ESDP: Promoting Human Security: A Proposal for a Declaration or Protocol".

[10] Glasius & Kaldor 2006; Madrid Report 2007.

[11] Madrid Report 2007, 8.

[12] Barcelona Report 2004, 9.

[13] Kaldor et al. 2007.

2.2   Lobbying for certain priorities of action

The Human Security Study Group has a number of high level contacts in the main capitals of the EU and has been lobbying for the adoption of the human security concept as part of the EU's ESDP language. The doctrine in 2004 was based on seven main principles, and in the new Madrid Report two of them have been merged and the new doctrine relies on six main principles.

First, "**the primacy of human rights** is what distinguishes the human security approach from traditional state-based approaches".[14] In the Madrid Report Mary Kaldor and her Study Group underline that "respect for human rights" should be the main challenge of an international operation – not military victory or the temporary suppression of violence. Since 2004 the concept has evolved to embrace United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) definition understanding "protection" as referring to "both physical and material protection, that is economic and social as well as civil and political rights".[15] According to the Barcelona Report, "the primacy of human rights also implies that those who commit gross human rights violations are treated as individual criminals rather than collective enemies".[16] Thus, Kaldor criticises directly for example the "axes of evil" thinking of the United States' foreign policy.

Second, the Human Security Doctrine underlines that any outside intervention "must strive to create **a legitimate political authority**" in the conflict area by providing necessary conditions for democratic institution building through political processes. Similarly, the "intervention must be viewed as legitimate locally and within the international community as a whole".[17] Legitimate political authority is seen as the precondition for human security.

Third, Kaldor appeals for close consultation of local populations by promoting the so called **Bottom-up Approach"** This means involving not only the local political leaders but also civil society and vulnerable or marginal groups in dialogue with the international actors. "This is not just a moral issue", is noted in the Barcelona Report, "it is also a matter of effectiveness. People who live in the affected area are the best source of intelligence."[18]

Fourth, Kaldor's Study Group underlines need for **effective multilateralism** – better division of tasks between different international and local actors. Indeed, in crisis area, commitment to work together is needed, but also commitment to work in the framework of agreed rules and norms in an atmosphere of cooperation and coordination to prevent unnecessary duplication and rivalry.[19]

---

[14] Barcelona Report 2004, 14.
[15] Madrid Report 2007, 4.
[16] Barcelona Report 2004, 15.
[17] Madrid Report, 9.
[18] Barcelona Report 2004, 17.
[19] Madrid Report 2007, 18.

Fifth, the Human Security Doctrine is based on **an integrated regional approach**. According to the Madrid Report, "regional dialogues and action in neighbouring countries should be systematically integrated into policies for crisis". As already noted in the Barcelona Report,

> [T]ime and again, foreign policy analysts have been taken by surprise when, after considerable attention had been given to one conflict, another conflict would seemingly spring up out of the blue in a neighbouring state. Thus, the failure to include Kosovo in the Dayton negotiations over Bosnia Herzegovina was one factor that led to the outbreak of the war in Kosovo in 1999.[20]

Sixth, the Madrid Report also appeals for **clear and transparent strategic direction** when it comes to the EU operations underlining the need of close link between policy-makers and those on the ground.[21] Already in the Barcelona Report this was underlined by noting that the former should have the

> – – ultimate control over operations. Human security missions should be led by a civilian. This should typically be a politician, or someone with a sense for the politics both of the sending states and the host society, with easy access to policy-makers as well as receptive to local political actors.[22]

2.3   Human security training to influence the EU activities

The above mentioned concepts are thus promoted by Human Security Study Group on the European scene. Dr. Mary Martin has been leading the planning of the human security training.[23] A draft concept of the training[24] was presented to the European Group on Training (EGT) partners[25] in Brussels on 26 September 2007. A pilot training based on these plans was held at the Crisis Management Centre Finland in February 2008. The idea was to train a first group of human security "evangelists" (in Mary Martin's words) to promote the human security thinking both on the operational as well as on the policy planning level.

Martin also prepared a case study on the training concept for the Madrid Report in which she underlines the current "mosaic of different national and professional cultures and capabilities" when it comes to civilian crisis management training.[26] It is indeed agreed among member states of the EU that the operational pre-deployment training for seconded personnel to ESDP operation lies in the field of

---

[20] Barcelona Report 2004, 18.

[21] Madrid Report 2007, 10.

[22] Barcelona Report 2004, 16.

[23] Mary Martin, Denisa Kostuvicova and Tanja Tamminen conducted interviews together in Kosovo in September 2007 to prepare the pilot training.

[24] Martin 2007b.

[25] To implement a European Commission financed project on "Training for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management" an informal European Group on Training was formed of different training institutes. The project has been finalized, but the network remains.

[26] Martin 2007a, 2.

responsibility of the member states. Thus, there are no clear instructions on how the training should be conducted and by whom. Certain steps have been taken towards developing a more coherent training regime including a general agreement on a common *Training Needs Assessment* when it comes to the ESDP operations. It includes a specific list of capabilities that are expected from personnel deployed on the field missions. However, the discussion on the question of who should design the trainings is still seen as responsibility of the member states. In this respect the EU is still far from Martin's wish of "generating a new operational culture surrounding crisis management and post-conflict stabilisation".[27]

Martin's proposal to overcome the incoherence of the EU's external operations is to create integrated human security training for both military and civilian personnel deployed on the ground, as well as target the planning of the operations in Brussels. Martin notes in her case study that on the strategic level "European training" has already been conducted since 2005 in the European Security and Defence College (ESDC). Martin sees the development of strategic training as an important step towards the right direction. Other initiatives exist to offer strategic ESDP training for middle and senior ranking diplomatic personnel.[28] The criticism Martin does not address in her paper is that few of these diplomats or other high level officials trained in the ESDP and other classes will eventually be deployed in field missions. It is still quite rare that the newly appointed EUSR or Head of Mission would have the time or the opportunity to attend specific ESDP courses. It is thus a legitimate question how cost-effective these expensive trainings finally are from the point of view of the EU field operations. In general, the percentage of all those who have been trained by the EU or the member state for an ESDP operation, to actually be seconded to an operation is surprisingly low.

The Directorate General E Civilian Crisis Management (DGE IX) in the Council General Secretariat conducted a survey on the EU's on-going operations noting that a large number of personnel deployed on the field wished for more pre-deployment training. A substantial number (36 %) of personnel had not attended any ESDP training what so ever prior to deployment.[29] The EU Planning Team in Kosovo (EUPT) has taken the training issue seriously and organised the first ESDP training conference in Pristina in October 2007. The EUPT invited the EU member state training institutes to attend and plan together solutions to address the acute training needs of the future EU operation in Kosovo.[30] Today most of the solutions are found on an ad hoc basis, but the ESDP training sphere is developing constantly towards new "best practices" that will help future operations.

Mary Martin suggests in her study that a common human security training for those deployed on the field could solve a certain set of problems when it comes to the EU's training agenda. The human security training as a concept itself would of-

---

[27] Martin 2007a, 3.
[28] Ibid., 5–6.
[29] DGE IX 2006.
[30] See http://www.eupt-kosovo.eu/training/.

fer EU personnel a workable toolkit: a security doctrine that could be implemented on the ground thus creating the needed "operational culture" and an agreed "set of norms". Martin suggests that the training should always be region specific, taking the local society as a starting point promoting "bottom-up participation" and including trainers from the specific crisis area itself.[31] The focus of the training should not only be the EU structures, but also the conditions on the ground. It should be noted however, that Martin's proposal does not include a problem that is rarely highlighted: in crisis situation or in a post-conflict society the international community stands in front of a difficult dilemma: who to listen to; whose interpretation of the conflict to believe or to subscribe to or how to learn the situation while still staying impartial; which NGOs or political leaders to support and for which to watch out. While preparing training on conflict situations these questions must be kept in mind – even if they cannot ever be answered exhaustively.

To reinforce the legitimacy of EU's action, Martin suggests that the training should be based on the specific operational mandate of which the trainees will be deployed.[32] This is difficult in such cases when the mandates and rules of engagement, including CONOPS and OPLAN[33], are still restricted documents. Martin underlines that "the Human Security approach requires a commitment by those involved with EU mission to international institutions, and to working through agreed rules and norms, particularly international law". As agreeable as it sounds the EU works in crisis areas also in such a political context where the EU as a political union has political priorities and preferences. The crisis management operations cannot work in a pure vacuum but have to follow the political guidance of member states: thus, for example answers to previously mentioned questions, "which political leaders to support or which local institutions to protect", may also have political meaning. The EU is a political union and its policy goals are determined in a political debate between member states, often as a compromise of their internal policies which has repercussions also on the field mission level.

Despite these practical difficulties of Martin's proposals, she manages to bring up a set of weaknesses that the current ESDP training is facing and to propose pertinent arguments as to how the human security training could respond to these weaknesses. Following the six principles of Human Security Doctrine, Martin notes that current training often lacks mainstreaming of human rights proposing only a human rights module or a lecture as if protecting human rights would not be as cross-cutting issue as gender for example. The Human Security Doctrine emphasises the primacy of human rights protection in all crisis management activities. Martin underlines that often the personal safety of mission personnel is accorded more training than the objective of the operation to protect local populations. The human security training would propose a different perspective. Martin also appeals for more integrated civil-military training to address the current "gap" be-

---

[31] Martin 2007a, 12–13.
[32] Ibid., 12.
[33] CONOPS, Concept of Operations; OPLAN, Operation Plan.

tween different kinds of methods combating old and new security threats. Moreover, Martin reminds us that "effective multilateralism", coordination between different international actors in the crisis areas, should be trained in view of "division of labour" and not as just understanding different work methods of crisis management.[34] According to Martin

> [T]he multilateralism principle would include instruction and enactment scenarios based on how the local situation relates to international law, how to co-ordinate action with other international and local institutions and what kind of division of labour is needed on the ground.[35]

Martin's criticism towards current situations is pertinent. For example, in Kosovo the EU was represented by over half a dozen different actors in 2007: the economic pillar of the UNMIK administration is led by the EU, the European Commission has a liaison office in Kosovo, the technical aid is coordinated by the European Reconstruction Agency (EAR), the EUPT is deployed in the region to plan the future ESDP operation, at the same time the ICO Preparation Team is there to plan the office of the future EU Special Representative (EUSR) office, not to mention the EU Presidency and other member states' liaison offices, the visits of the High Representative Solana or the EU Status Envoy Stefan Lehne during the Ahtisaari period or Wolfgang Ischinger during the troika led negotiations. Indeed, the coherence of the EU activities needs to be improved if the EU plans to conduct a successful ESDP operation in the region.

3 Limits and challenges of the human security thinking

3.1 Human Security in Kosovo under status negotiations

As previously mentioned, certain ideas in the human security training concept are confronted to some practical problems such as the restricted EU documents that cannot be used as basis for training or the not so black and white situations on the ground that cannot always be easily explained in lectures during the training despite inviting local trainers and civil society representatives. Also the human security concept as such has faced a number of criticisms since its launch. I will very rapidly go through certain criticisms that the Human Security Study Group has dealt with on a conceptual level. However, I will analyse more in-depth the limits of the concept in the concrete case of Kosovo. Another set of criticism will be analysed in the framework of the development of European Union's crisis management policies in general.

The concept of human security is not only used by Mary Kaldor and her Study Group but also by other researchers as well as political actors[36]. The concept itself

---

[34] Martin 2007a, 13–14.

[35] Ibid., 17.

[36] UNDP has used the concept in Human Development Reports since 2004 with a broader definition than the one used by Mary Kaldor, a Human Security referee journal is published in Paris by Center for Peace and Human Security (PHS), etc.

has been judged in the academic circles as too vast and too vague to be clearly defined and effectively used in practise.[37] Indeed, the broad definition of the concept for example used by the UNDP can be seen to include all sorts of factors of insecurity. In fact, the wide definition has been criticised as too broad to focus on practical ways of dealing with security threats and it is not considered useful in academic theories or for policy planning. This is why the Human Security Study Group has adopted a much narrower definition of the concept based on the earlier mentioned six principles and focusing on the EU's crisis management activities.[38]

Main criticisms on human security theorising are directly linked with the current debate on the excessive use of the concept of security in international relations; only if an issue is defined as a security issue in today's politics it can get overwhelming attention. Barry Buzan argues that "[O]ver-securitization risks destroying the intellectual coherence of the field, overcomplicating solution finding".[39] Indeed, in speaking about human security, some see a risk of giving space to increasing interventionism by the international community in the name of shared responsibility: "Human security challenges the role of the sovereign state as the sole provider of security" and "provides justification for continued surveillance and engagement, used by dominant powers to legitimize self-interested interventionism".[40] Buzan however reminds us, that "[h]uman security remains state-centric despite the supranational dimensions of the concept". It can be seen as "a new tool for existing governing agencies to shape and control civil populations".[41]

As the Madrid Report puts it,

> [S]ome critics worry that [Human Security] is a new label for neo-imperialism and a way to justify liberal interventionism and a new European militarism. Others argue that far from being hawkish, the concept lacks teeth and is too 'warm and fuzzy' or 'soft'.[42]

Madrid Report answers a number of criticisms but has difficulties in defending the concept against the argument that human security "simply re-labels existing issues and tools".[43] The Madrid Report tries to provide a specific "discursive and operational framework"[44] for these multiple EU activities.

Kosovo represents an interesting test case for human security concept. Kosovo has been a testing ground for many European or Euro-Atlantic foreign and security

---

[37] Excellent synthesis of criticisms and counter-arguments on human security concept can be found in Tadjbakhsh & Chenoy 2007, 59–68.

[38] As this article is based on the Human Security Study Group definition of Human Security, I will not elaborate extensively on the broader debate on "human security" concept. A wide range of sources exist to study the different uses of this concept. See for example Human Security Report (2005).

[39] Buzan inTadjbakhsh & Chenoy 2007, 63.

[40] Buzan in Tadjbakhsh & Chenoy 2007, 64.

[41] Buzan in Tadjbakhsh & Chenoy 2007, 63–64; See also Buzan 2004.

[42] Madrid Report 2007, 10.

[43] Tadjbakhsh & Chenoy 2007, 68.

[44] Madrid Report 2007, 10.

policy ideas ever since the 1999 NATO bombings. That event marked a historical change in the NATO policy lines as for the first time the member states decided to strike against a sovereign state to come to the aid of a persecuted minority. Scholarly debate on the normative legitimacy of the NATO bombings was fierce during and after the bombings.[45] Some peace organisations and activists of political left organised public demonstrations against the bombings in defence of Milosevic's Serbia in Europe as well as for example in Canada.[46] However, it had been the president of Serbia Slobodan Milosevic backed up by most of the political elite and population that removed the autonomous status from the mainly Albanian inhabited province of Kosovo. Albanians were pushed to leave public posts forcing the area to a strange parallel system for 10 years in which Albanians had to organise the public services such as schools and general health services for themselves in private homes. Clandestine elections were held and the province's Albanian population was led by a commonly elected President Ibrahim Rugova, who chose a peaceful resistance policy line to avoid the massacres that were taking place in Bosnia in the early 1990s. Only in the late 1990s young Albanians took up arms and built the Kosovo Liberation Army (UÇK) which struck against Serbian police stations and provoked the Serbian security services to take up ethnic cleansing measures against the Albanian civil population. Finally, these events led to NATO intervention in the spring 1999.

Kosovo came under the UN Security Council resolution 1244 a UN protectorate administered by UNMIK. This solution in the aftermath of the NATO bombings was perceived as provisional. The issue of Kosovo status was to be determined later. However, the years passed under slow and ineffective international administration. UNMIK was built on four pillars which were: 1) Police and Justice, under the direct leadership of the United Nations 2) Civil Administration, also under the direct leadership of the United Nations 3) Democratization and Institution Building, led by the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) and 4) Reconstruction and Economic Development, led by the European Union. Today before the status solution only two of the pillars remain: the OSCE led institutions building pillar and the EU led reconstruction pillar. Most of the tasks in the field of police, justice and civil administration have been transferred to the local institutions including the creation of the Ministries of Justice and Interior in early 2005.

Despite huge international aid for reconstruction, Kosovo's economy was not able to recover in this *limbo* situation where potential private investors did not know whether they were investing in a province of Serbia or a future independent Kosovo. Without independence Kosovo was and is still not able to apply for loans from the international financial institutions such as World Bank or IMF. The extremely young population of Kosovo, of which among the Albanians over 50 percent are under 25 years old, felt trapped in a situation with no prospects. Most of them were not allowed visas to move as *Gastarbeiter* to the Western countries

---

[45] See for example Lutz 1999/2000; Krause 2000; or Booth 2001.
[46] Manifestations in Canada, see for example Leblanc 1999.

but there was no work available in Kosovo. In this situation the threat of social instability was imminent and it burst into violence against the Serb minority during one weekend in spring 2004 in the aftermath of the death of three Albanian children in the Ibar river.

Only this sudden violence woke up the international community and forced the question of Kosovo status to be pushed into the forefront of the EU agenda. The "standards before status" logic had proved to be ineffective as one of the major standards; where as the return of the Serbian displaced persons (IDP) to their homes became a very useful tool in the hands of the Belgrade politicians. As long as the Serbian population felt insecure in Kosovo it was impossible for the Kosovo authorities together with the international community to convince Serbian IDPs to return. As long as the situation remained so, Belgrade was sure that the uncomfortable status issue would not be discussed. However, the UN Secretary General Kofi Annan asked a Norwegian diplomat Kai Eide to write a report on the causes of the 2004 incident, the report concluded that the violence against the Serbian minority was directly caused by the frustration of the Albanian population. In the summer of 2005 in a report to the UN, Kai Eide urged the international community to start the Kosovo status negotiations as soon as possible.[47]

Former Finnish President Martti Ahtisaari was nominated by Secretary General Annan to head these status negotiations in November 2005. An atmosphere of hope arose in Kosovo as the negotiations were not expected to be long. In parallel with the status negotiations the EU wanted to redefine its role in Kosovo. The UN was to leave Kosovo permanently despite the state of affairs and the EU started to plan for the ESDP operation: a Kosovo Rule of Law Operation. An EUPT was sent to Kosovo to make specific plans for the EU action in the post-status Kosovo in late spring 2006. Meanwhile Ahtisaari's status proposal was being drafted through the negotiations between Kosovo and Belgrade representatives on specific issues such as decentralisation, cultural heritage and minority rights. The international community accepted the idea of using the Bosnian model of institution: a High Representative who would have a small international staff to over-see the status implementation. In Kosovo this would be called the ICO, International Civilian Office. The plans were however severely slowed by the Serbian elections in January 2007 and later on by the Russian opposition to a new UN Security Council resolution based on Ahtisaari plan in summer 2007.

In this situation Ahtisaari backed off from the negotiations and the Contact Group on Kosovo took over. Wolfgang Ischinger was nominated to represent the EU in negotiations but many observers noted that this move from the hands of the UNOSEK[48] to the hands of the old great nations (United States, United Kingdom, Russia, France, Germany and Italy) marked a clear failure of the EU's authority on the subject. However, the Ahtisaari plan of supervised sovereignty was never tak-

---

[47] Eide 2005.

[48] UNOSEK, Office of the Special Envoy of the Secretary-General of the United Nations for the future status process for Kosovo.

en off the table and was kept as a basis of all EU and Western planning for future international presence in Kosovo, a presence that is supposed to be closer to the local population than the distant UNMIK administration had been.

Different studies and surveys have been conducted in Kosovo to analyse the human security situation and public perceptions of security.[49] Some of these studies/ surveys do not use the human security concept but touch upon the human security issues. Some of these use the concept but maybe with slightly different definitions than Mary Kaldor's Study Group.[50] Despite different approaches, clearly the main security issue identified by Albanian, Serbian and other minority populations in Kosovo is economic uncertainty and unemployment (around 45 %). Almost 70 % of Kosovars still live in the country side, mainly living on small one family farms. The extremely young population lacks education. Schools are over crowded and working in triple shifts if not even with 4 shifts a day assuring each child at least few hours of teaching. Teachers are underpaid and unmotivated. A number of women living in rural areas are still illiterate.[51] Kaldor's theoretical framework would indeed be useful in raising some major issues in Kosovo's current situation.[52]

Human Security Study Group work on Kosovo has concentrated on the case of Serbian minority, a group that is keenly observed by the world. During UNMIK time they were a tool of Belgrade, asked to boycott all elections and all cooperation with the UN or local authorities in Kosovo. Despite a number of efforts from the international side and the significant drop of interethnic crime, the integration of the Serbian enclaves has failed. A number of other communities suffer a similar fate in the current situation: Roma, Ashkali, Gorani and other smaller ethnic minorities require integration policies and special attention.

Human security doctrine is not only about protecting vulnerable groups, but about listening to local knowledge, respecting local ownership and about legitimate action. These are pertinent questions when deciding upon the amount of executive powers of the future ESDP operation and the rights of intervention ("the corrective powers") of the International Civilian Representative. How to strengthen local ownership, accountability of the local leaders as well as the legitimacy of international presence? These are all basic human security questions. They can be analysed on the basis of the lessons learnt in Bosnia and Herzegovina or even in UNMIK. How will the future EU operation manage to overcome the problems of UNMIK: sounding superior, lacking coordination and coherence with other inter-

---

[49] Eide 2005; ICG 2007; Saferworld 2007a; 2007b; UNDP 2006a; UNDP Early Warning Report 2007.

[50] Forum for Civic Initiatives and Saferworld 2007.

[51] Illiteracy in Kosovo is among the highest in Europe, see UNDP 2006a, 12–13. "In rural areas, for example, about 9.5 percent of females aged 16 to 19 are estimated to be illiterate; moreover, one in four young women in those areas has very limited knowledge of reading and writing." (UNDP 2006b, 41)

[52] Šabović (2007) uses the framework and brings up the economic dimension of Human Security.

national actors on the field? The human security concept is a useful tool in analysing these kinds of issues.

Trying to implement an academic concept into a crisis area reality or EU's ESDP bureaucracy is not an easy task. In the Kosovo case, it is in fact a pity that the Human Security Study Group has not concentrated on the above mentioned questions to contribute in developing the future EU operation in Kosovo. The Study Group has on the contrary shown strong criticism towards the Ahtisaari plan that has been widely accepted as the "best plan possible" to solve the Kosovo stalemate. The Ahtisaari plan sees a wide range of special rights to the minority communities in the post-status Kosovo – a set of rights that even highly esteemed democratic countries such as Finland are not able to implement in their minority areas[53]. The criticism of the Human Security Study Group focuses on the non-involvement of the local inhabitants in the status negotiations. The Kosovo status negotiations were however led by the Kosovo Albanian side, the so called Unity Team, including representatives of all major parties as well as an NGO representative. The decentralisation plan has not been debated at the municipal level which according to Denisa Kostuvicova, for example, is a major shortcoming of the plan.[54] The criticism does not take into account however the extremely difficult context of the negotiations, for example Belgrade representing Kosovo Serbs. More useful from the practical EU perspective would be a Human Security approach that does not propose a new academic status proposal but focuses on the best (human security) practices of the EU personnel to implement the status proposal achieved under pressure of world politics.

3.2   ESDP development in parallel to human security debate

On the political EU field the attempt of Kaldor's Study Group to lobby for the Human Security Doctrine concept has often been confronted with the argument: "We are already doing this, we just don't call it Human Security". Indeed, as elaborated more precisely later in this article, the human security principles are often included in the EU policy making and it is a legitimate question to ask, what would be the added value of a new concept in the EU security policy discourse if the content of human security principles are already existing. As such the Madrid Report gives very few concrete proposals for decision makers on operational changes in EU activities – if not counting the training proposals.

Civilian crisis management aims at strengthening the democratisation, respect for human rights and rule of law, good governance and functioning civil society in post-conflict areas. It is clear that military means are not enough to resolve a conflict – they can merely stop the violence, protect human lives and provide more stable environment for the civilian actors to take up other responsibilities in the

---

[53] Cf. Sámi people in the Finnish Lapland. Finland has not ratified the ILO-Convention No. 169 on Indigenous Peoples. (See for example CCPR 2004)
[54] See for instance Kostuvicova et al. 2007.

field of conflict management and peace building. As Mary Kaldor and the Human Security Study Group underlines, the functioning coordination and cooperation between civil and military actors is an absolute necessity.

This is an issue that has been underlined on the EU agenda as well. As such the ESDP field of activities is still developing. If the military side was first thought of in the European Council of December 1999 in Helsinki the EU member states underlined, in the aftermath of the earlier Kosovo War, that EU needs to coordinate and develop its non-military capabilities. Since 1999 EU civilian crisis management has become one of the most useful tools of the EU in the field of ESDP. The EU has launched operation in the Balkans, the Caucasus as well as in Africa and the fields of activities are multiple: including police and justice sector reform, border management, monitoring peace agreements, training, and so on. Currently the EU has 12 operations on-going or being planned.

The EU's Security Strategy from December 2003 defined a certain set of EU's global challenges which were in many cases echoing the United States' security doctrine drafted in the post 9/11. To answer some of these threats, EU's crisis management capabilities were further developed. In December 2004 work to prepare the Civilian Headline Goal 2008 was launched. The goal was to create such civilian capabilities that the EU would be able to conduct multiple and different kinds of civilian operations at the same time. This could either be independent operations or parts of other military operations. This would integrate the expertise of different EU focus areas such as policing, rule of law and civilian administration. According to the plans, operations should be able to be launched in less than a month from the moment that the political agreement is reached. The EU activities should be coherent and coordinated with the EU Commission activities. Indeed, one of the major practical flaws of the EU's rapid action is that the EU Commission is in charge of the money. When political decisions on the launch of an operation can be reached quite fast, the procurement and money related issues often lag behind.

Following the military Headline Goal example the Civilian Headline Goal 2008 process developed scenarios of future civilian crisis management challenges and the needs for civilian capabilities. As there are many actors involved in civilian crisis management, coordination between the EU institutions and different international organisations was strongly underlined. In addition, Civilian Headline Goal led to the creation of the rapid reaction activities, the so called Civilian Response Teams, which are ready to be deployed in 3 to 5 days and can work for example to make first assessments in the conflict areas, support in establishing a new operation or bring in expertise in a crucial phase of an earlier launched operation. Just recently, in the November 2007 General Affairs and External Relations Council (GAERC) agreed on the report of the Civilian Headline Goal 2008 and launched a new process called Civilian Headline Goal 2010 to further strengthen the EU's capabilities to conduct field operations.

Thus, the debates inside the EU follow a certain agreed pattern. The ambassadorial level (PSC) has the political leadership over ESDP operations. "New best practices" are invented both in the field missions and during meetings in Brussels (including the CHG process). The Barcelona Report has most certainly contributed to the thinking of the civilian crisis management capabilities. The proposals of the Barcelona Report were not seen as possible to implement and the EU did not endorse the report. However the concept of human security did stay in the debate inside the EU and impacts initiatives such as the planning. The Human Security Study Group still hopes that the Madrid Report which has been striped off the impractical proposals will be endorsed by the EU. The problem is that the EU has come a long way since 2004. A number of human security issues are currently discussed on different levels of the EU decision making process (CIVCOM, PMG, PSC, etc.[55]). In the EU the discussions are focused (including in the earlier mentioned Civilian Headline Goal process) on: the need to strengthen civil-military cooperation, to implement the UN Security Council Resolution 1325 on women in armed conflicts, to focus on DDR and SSR activities[56], to improve crisis management training, to strengthen cooperation with civil society actors and other international actors as well as on linking and synchronising security and development issues. Indeed, all these issues can be found in the last year GAERG conclusions for example. Moreover, in November 2007 the EU Ministers of Defence and Development Aid held for the first time a meeting together to collectively discuss security and development issues and to agree on common Council conclusion.

Even though it is not discussed in the conceptual framework of human security, many of Kaldor's and her Study Groups' ideas are thus on the table in the EU. The work of the EUPT in Kosovo is an excellent example of how the EU is improving its crisis management activities in the spirit of "Human Security" even if it is not labelled as such. Consulting the local population, taking into account regional impact of EU activities, planning better training and evaluation policies for the operation, the EUPT is creating "best practices" for ESDP operations. Even though the EU is improving its activities, and this is also noted in the new Madrid Report, there are still plenty of issues that need to be tackled. For example, the effective multilateralism emphasised both in the Madrid Report as in the political debates inside the EU still needs improving. Not only are the EU actors on the field often unaware of their activities; Commission's technical aid projects can be planned with no link to ESDP operation planning for example. Close dialogue and coordination between the EU, NATO, the OSCE and the UN in the case of Kosovo is an absolute requirement for the success of the future ESDP operation. However, if it is considered on the political field as a matter of human security is another question.

---

[55] CIVCOM, *Committee for Civilian Aspects of Crisis Management*; PMG, *Politico-Military Working Group*; and PSC, *Political and Security Committee*. They are all in charge of civilian crisis management planning.

[56] DDR, *Disarmament Demobilisation Reintegration*; SSR, *Security Sector Reform*.

4   Kosovo focused Human Security training

4.1   Future ESDP operation in Kosovo

In this last chapter I will argue that a major test case for the human security concept – controversial or not – will be the post-status Kosovo. I will conclude this chapter by underlining the usefulness of the human security philosophy when preparing trainings for the EU experts to be deployed in Kosovo.

As already discussed, in June 1999 the UN Security Council adapted the famous resolution 1244 that established the provisional UN administration, UNMIK[57], to Kosovo. UNMIK has been in charge of the civilian administration, promoting autonomy and self-government in Kosovo by gradually transferring its responsibilities into the hands of the Kosovo authorities, the Provisional Interim Government of Kosovo (PISG). The resolution 1244 also called on UNMIK to facilitate a political process to determine Kosovo's future status.

Based on the UNSC resolution 1244 in November 2005 the Secretary General launched the process to determine Kosovo's future status. His Special Envoy Martti Ahtisaari made a status proposal in early 2007 on "supervised independence". The proposal calls for the abolishment of the remaining UNMIK factions and the creation of a much smaller and lighter International Civilian Office. The idea is to follow the example of Office of the High Representative (OHR) in Bosnia and Herzegovina and to name a High Representative (HR) of the International community to supervise the implementation of the status agreement. The HR would also be nominated as the EU Special Representative. This new international presence in Kosovo would promote local ownership and accountability. The EU is considered to have a special role in the post-status Kosovo as the EUSR (double hatted as the International Civilian Representative, and maybe if needed even triple hatted as the SRSG[58]) will supervise the status implementation. Moreover, the EU is sending to Kosovo the largest civilian crisis management operation of the ESDP's history.

The idea was not to create a new UNMIK that was already perceived as distant and unfair by the local population. There are several court cases pending against international organisations – no one has dealt with them during UNMIK administration. Some Kosovo citizens have felt mistreated by UNMIK but have had no forum to discuss grievances. The EUPT in Kosovo has underlined the willingness of the EU to be more close to Kosovo's local institutions and people. International judges are planned to sit together with local judges in the same buildings and not in some distant "ivory towers" behind heavily armed military personnel. At least on the surface the relations between international civilian crisis management personnel and the local population are planned to change. Does this also mean a change in the perceptions of the international role in contributing to the security of Kosovo? What will be the security doctrine of the future mission?

---

[57] http://www.unmikonline.org/intro.htm, accessed 27/11/2008.

[58] Special Representative of the UN Secretary General in case the UN Security Council resolution 1244 is not changed.

Despite or due to (the not so surprising) the failure of the negotiations between Pristina and Belgrade, the Ahtisaari plan is still expected to be the basis of the future status of Kosovo. The EUPT has been in place since the spring 2006 to plan the future ESDP operation to the post-status Kosovo. The Team has produced extensive set of options, needs assessments and financial blueprints for the future operation. However, the Concept of Operations can be decided upon only after the status solution, whether the UN Security Council resolution or, more likely, Kosovo's coordinated independence declaration and the recognition of the United States and the EU member states. For example, the possible executive powers of the EU operation and other specific parts of its mandate cannot be decided before the actual status of Kosovo is known. According to the primary plans, the future ESDP operation would include around 1700 international experts. Their main tasks would lie in the field of mentoring, monitoring and assisting Kosovo's own authorities, including police, justice and customs. A specific transition period between the actual deployment of the ESDP operation and the closing down of UNMIK (120 days) is foreseen in the Ahtisaari plan, but can also depend on the political decisions when Kosovo government actually declares independence; the UNSC resolution 1244 may ne extended and thus a mini-UNMIK maybe needed. All these questions remain to be answered at the time of writing of this article. Close cooperation between the international actors is, in any case, an absolute necessity. These plans also require quite a massive training effort to give the personnel of the future EU mission the specific ESDP and Kosovo knowledge needed in order to implement the operation efficiently.

4.2   Added value of Kosovo specific human security training

Indeed, the member states have been asked to organise Kosovo specific ESDP training for those experts that they count to propose for the seconded positions in the future operation.[59] Crisis Management Centre Finland prepared in cooperation with Mary Kaldor, Mary Martin and the Human Security Study Group, a Kosovo specific Human Security training which took place in February 2008.[60] These efforts are a clear answer to the EUPT appeal for better member state accountability in the field of ESDP training.

Kosovo focused human security training can at the same time contribute to the training of future ESDP personnel, but will also have a larger scope trying to influence not only those deployed on the field but also those they need to cooperate with whether in Brussels (Commission or Council Secretariat) or on the military side in Kosovo (Kfor) for example. Even though one pilot training cannot reach a large audience, the first step is significant. In Kosovo case, the human security approach can bring up some essential issues that are not often considered in the civilian crisis management efforts in place today.

---

[59] For example, in Finland, the Crisis Management Centre Finland, located in Kuopio, has already organised three Integrated Rule of Law courses that focused on Kosovo.

[60] *Applying Human Security in Crisis Management*, 11.–15.2.2008, Kuopio, Finland. See more at www.cmcfinland.fi.

The supremacy of human rights principle underlines that all locals are equal citizens. Often crisis management operations tend to take for granted that international staff treats minority and majority populations equally. Minority and majority divide is not however always an ethnic question. As underlined in Human Security Doctrine's "bottom-up" principle, international actors deployed on the ground should take into account and consult not only obvious minority groups such as ethnic minorities, but also other vulnerable groups that can be children, handicap, or even majority groups as in Kosovo case women or youth.

It is obvious that gender issues should be mainstreamed all through the international activities whether crisis management, reconstruction or humanitarian aid in crisis areas. Women are the best source of information when it comes to planning effective ways of helping their living conditions. There is a debate if women should be more involved in the peace negotiations because of their equal rights of being represented or because of their capabilities of reconciliation. Either way, their participation is seen as something that should be promoted. The Kosovo Women's network is in constant dialogue with mutual visits with the Women in Black of Serbia – a dialogue that could not be imagined among the men.[61] These kinds of examples are numerous but not so many times listened to; women do have a voice in Kosovo.

But who talks about the youth?[62] Are the young people equal citizens in the eyes of the international actors or are they perceived more as a security threat in Kosovo? Indeed, when talking about the youth in Kosovo, too often attention is drawn to that weekend in the spring 2004 when the mobs of young men stormed on the streets and burnt orthodox churches in revenge of the death of 3 Albanian children, or to the spring 2007 when youngsters manifested against status negotiations and two of them got killed by the rubber bullets of the international police. The population of Kosovo is extremely young and growing; some estimates count about 70 % of the population under 30 years. At the same time, this population lacks employment prospects, education opportunities or possibilities to immigrate. How to consult young people? How to integrate them in the dialogue between internationals and locals? These are important challenges for the future ESDP operation. For example, in the situation where the political elite has lost legitimacy in the eyes of the population, it is the population itself that suffers from the lack of education in a situation where the government makes future plans mainly on prospects of mining and electricity production. There is indeed no clear plan on reforming the education sector in Kosovo.

This young population expects a lot from the post-status times – a better future. A deep disappointment could be fatal. In this sense, also the human security principle of legitimate political leadership should be closely studied in the training. How to gain legitimacy in the eyes of the local population? How to support local

---

[61] The Kosova Women's Network and Women in Black Network Serbia formed the Women's Peace Coalition on 7 May 2006 (Kosovar Women's Voice 2006, 1)

[62] Kuper 2007.

institutions, local ownership and local accountability? The coordinator of the Internal Security Sector Review of Kosovo[63], Anthony Welch, underlines that the EU "needs to allow the new Kosovo – – to find its own way, make its own mistakes and grow as a society and political entity".[64] Too often, international advisors find it easier to draft the laws by themselves or make the project proposals on their own as they realise their counterparts in local institutions would not know how to do. How to avoid this again, as the EU sends a huge number of experts in the field? And how not to give promises that EU actors cannot keep? For example, the ESDP operation will not have such financial instruments in its hands as the Commission has. A smooth cooperation and coordination – as Kaldor says "effective multilateralism" – is a virtue that the EU actors in the field need to acquire.

5   Conclusion

It is evident that the European Union is facing a major challenge when launching an ESDP operation in Kosovo. First, it is a challenge for the EU's internal unity. Some countries seem more reluctant to recognise the independence of Kosovo than others which creates a problem for the commonly agreed judicial basis of the operation in a situation where Serbia is not ready to accept the internationally imposed status solution. As the credibility of the ESDP depends on how the EU is able to deal with such a sensitive political issue, it is however highly probable that the EU manages to get over its internal hesitations and launch the operation.

Second, the operation challenges the EU's credibility not only on the international scene but also in the field in Kosovo. Is EU able to deliver its promises, assist the institutions to take up more responsibility and ownership and contribute to Kosovo's sustainable development? Is EU able to convince the local population as well as the local leadership of the necessity and legitimacy of reforms and the signification of the EU perspective? On the Serbian side the EU perspective, even though it is often underlined in political discourse, it has not brought the same pace of reforms as in the candidate countries. On the contrary, many observers often wonder if Serbia even wants to join the EU in the future. The EU's ESDP operation in Kosovo will be closely linked to EU's enlargement policies and the EU assistance is based on the EU membership perspective.

As the European Union develops its common foreign and security policy, Kosovo, is a very useful test case for an integrated rule of law operation and the development of civilian crisis management operation. The EU partners discuss the EU's credibility, the EU's capabilities, and the EU's position on the world scene. The third challenge I would like to point out in the spirit of the Human Security Doctrine, is however the most important: the effectiveness of the EU activities, the added value of the EU operation, the actual benefits that the EU's civilian crisis management operation brings on the ground to the lives of local populations.

---

[63] UNDP 2006a.
[64] Welch 2006, 234.

   This article has made an effort to underline the specific value but also the limits of the Human Security theorising in the concrete civilian crisis management planning of the EU using the Kosovo case as an example. How the human security approach can be useful is to find concrete ways to enhance the EU's performance on the ground in crisis areas. By emphasising the primacy of human rights and the need of effective cooperation between different international actors, the Human Security Doctrine reveals relevant areas where the EU should improve the carrying out of crisis management activities. To underline in pre-mission human security trainings the EU's accountability towards the local populations is already a goal in itself.

REFERENCES

Primary documents

Barcelona Report (2004): *A Human Security Doctrine for Europe: The Barcelona Report of the Study Group on Europe's Security Capabilities presented to EU High Representative for Common Foreign and Security Policy Javier Solana in Barcelona on 15 September 2004*. Http://www.lse.ac.uk/Depts/global/researchhumansecurity.htm.

CCPR (International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, United Nations) (2004): *Concluding observations of the Human Rights Committee: Finland*. 02/12/2004. Http://www.unhchr.ch/tbs/doc.nsf/(Symbol)/CCPR.CO.82.FIN.En?Opendocument, accessed on 3/1/2008.

DGE IX 2006: *EU/ESDP Training Survey 2006*.

Eide, Kai (2005): "A comprehensive review of the situation in Kosovo". Http://www.un-osek.org/docref/KaiEidereport.pdf

Forum for Civic Initiatives and Saferworld (2007): *Human security in Kosovo: A survey of perceptions*, May 2007. Http://www.saferworld.org.uk/images/pubdocs/Human_Security_in_Kosovo_English.pdf.

Human Security Report (2005): Human Security Centre, Liu Institute for Global Issues, University of British Columbia. Http://www.humansecurityreport.info/content/view/28/63/.

Human Security Study Group, London School of Economics. Http://www.lse.ac.uk/Depts/global/researchhumansecurity.htm

International Crisis Group (2007a): "Breaking the Kosovo Stalemate: Europe's Responsibility" *Europe Report*, No. 185, 21 August 2007. Http://www.crisisgroup.org/home/index.cfm?id=5018&l=1.

International Crisis Group (2007b): "Kosovo Countdown: A Blueprint for Transition". *Europe Report*, No. 188, 6 December 2007. Http://www.crisisgroup.org/home/index.cfm?id=5201&l=1.

Madrid Report (2007): *A European Way of Security: The Madrid Report of the Human Security Study Group comprising a Proposal and Background Report by Human Security Study Group (LSE), launched in Madrid 8th November*. Http://www.lse.ac.uk/Depts/global/PDFs/Madrid%20Report%20Final%20for%20distribution.pdf.

Saferworld (2007): "Kosovo at the crossroads: Perceptions of conflict, access to justice and opportunities for peace in Kosovo", December 2007. Http://www.saferworld.org.uk/images/pubdocs/SafePlace%20Conflict%20Analysis%202%20Report%20 20071202%20English.pdf.

UNDP Kosovo Internal Security Sector Review (2006a). Http://www.kosovo.undp.org/repository/docs/ISSR_report_eng_ver2.pdf.

UNDP Kosovo Human Development Report (2006b): "Youth – A new generation for a new Kosovo". Http://www.kosovo.undp.org/repository/docs/hdr_eng.pdf.

UNDP Kosovo Early Warning Report (2007). Http://www.kosovo.undp.org/repository/docs/EWR17_eng.pdf.

UNOSEK Kosovo Comprehensive status proposal. Http://www.unosek.org/unosek/en/statusproposal.html.

UN Security Council Resolution 1244. Http://www.nato.int/Kosovo/docu/u990610a.htm.

Bibliography

Booth, Ken (ed.) (2001): *The Kosovo Tragedy: the Human Rights Dimensions*. London: Frank Cass.

Buzan, Barry (2004): "A Reductionist, Idealistic Notion that Adds Little Analytical Value". *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 35, No. 3, September.

Calic, Marie-Janine (2007): "EU Enlargement and Common Foreign and Security Policy in the Western Balkans". *Südosteuropa Mitteilungen*, No. 1, Jahrgang 47, 12–19.

Dahl-Eriksen, Tor (2007): "Human Security – a New Concept which Adds New Dimensions to Important Human Rights Discussions?" Paper presented in a Conference International Relations and Security Theories: Impacts and Influences organized by CERI, Paris in cooperation with University of Tromsø, Norway.

Glasius, Marlies & Mary Kaldor (eds.) (2006): *A Human Security Doctrine for Europe*. London: Routledge.

Kaldor, Mary (1999): *New and Old Wars: Organised Violence in a Global Era*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Kaldor, Mary (2007): "Human Security in the Balkans". *Südosteuropa Mitteilungen*, No. 1, Jahrgang 47, 6–11.

Kaldor, Mary, Mary Martin & Sabine Selchow (2007): "Human Security: a New Strategic Narrative for Europe". *International Affairs*, 83(2), 273–288.

Kosova Women's Voice (2006): "Serbian, Kosovar Women Unite: Issue Statement", Vol 4, Issue 2, Spring. Http://www.womensnetwork.org/pdf/newsletters/kwniv-2-eng-e.pdf.

Kostuvicova, Denisa, Vesna Bojicic-Dzelilovic & Pavel Seifter (2007): *European Zones of Human Security: A Proposal for the European Union*. Paper commissioned by the Human Security Study Group.

Krause, Joachim (ed.) (2000): K*osovo – Humanitäre Intervention und cooperative Sicherheit in Europa*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.

Kuper, Jenny (2007): "A Minor Matter? Young People in an EU Human Security Doctrine". Paper commissioned by the Human Security Study Group and prepared for the International Workshop on an EU Human Security Doctrine: London February 8 and 9, 2007. Http://www.lse.ac.uk/Depts/global/PDFs/HS2007YoungPeople.pdf.

Leblanc, Guy (1999): "Manifestation à Ottawa contre les bombardements de l'OTAN". *World Socialist Website*. Https://wsws.org/francais/News/1999/juin99/8juin_ottamani.shtml.

Lutz, Dieter S. (ed.) (1999/2000): *Der Kosovo-Krieg. Rechtliche und rechtsethische Aspekte*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.

Martin, Mary (2007a): "Secure Learning: The role of training in embedding a Human Security doctrine for Europe: Case Study for the Madrid Report of the Human Security Study Group". Http://www.lse.ac.uk/Depts/global/PDFs/HS2007SecureLearning.pdf.

Martin, Mary (2007b): *Human security training concept for CMC Finland*. Not published.

Šaboviæ, Senad (2007): "A Human Security Assessment of EU Engagement in Kosovo". Http://www.lse.ac.uk/Depts/global/PDFs/HS2007Kosovo.pdf.

Tadjbakhsh, Shahrbanou & Anuradha Chenoy (2007): *Human Security: Concepts and Implications*. Routledge.

Welch, Anthony Cleland (2006): "Achieving Human Security after Intra-State Conflict: the Lessons of Kosovo". *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, 14(2), August, 221–239.