



Human Security Today: Perspectives from Civilian Crisis Management

Nanna Hallikainen

CMC Finland Working Papers analyse civilian contributions to peace operations and include recommendations for developing practical capabilities.



Author

Nanna Hallikainen
Research and Development Coordinator
CMC Finland

Contact

research@cmcf Finland.fi

ISSN 1797-1667

Layout and print: Grano Oy

Table of contents

1 Introduction	4
2 History of the concept of “human security”	4
2.1 The UN and global interest in human security	4
2.2 Human security as part of the EU’s foreign and security policy	6
2.3 The latest human security approaches of international organisations	7
3 Human security in civilian crisis management	8
3.1 UN	8
3.2 EU	10
3.3 NATO	12
3.4 Other organisations	13
4 Different approaches of the international organisations	14
5 Conclusion	16
Bibliography	17

1 Introduction

In contrast to the traditional militarised security of states, the concept of human security focuses on security that is human-centred, and which acknowledges that many different and complex threats, such as the economic situation, physical violence, natural disasters, climate change and inequality, can also sometimes simultaneously cause insecurity to people. Human security has been particularly central to the EU's civilian crisis management from the early 2000s. It has also been an important concept in the UN, but less so in UN peace operations. Furthermore, NATO has recently adopted a human security approach.

In the past years, events like Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine and the return to power politics have changed the European foreign policy view on security from a values-driven multilateralist approach to one that emphasises defence and pragmatism (Bargués 2025), and therefore approaches to foreign policy change as well. As the European security narrative is mainly focused on internal and militarised security, is there any room for paying attention to human security in Europe?

This working paper investigates how the concept of human security is currently defined in different international organisations, especially in the context of civilian crisis management. Through a questionnaire and interviews, data was collected on how civilian crisis management experts conceptualise and understand human security. The paper also reflects the relevance and redefinitions of human security on the broader level of international security.

2 History of the concept of “human security”

It is easy to describe the features of human security but difficult to define it as a concept (Gilder 2024). International organisations have approached human security differently at different times, and some of them have also formed their own definitions of the concept. This section presents the history of the human security approaches of the UN, EU and NATO.

2.1 The UN and global interest in human security

The principles of human security were already being mentioned in terms of “freedom from fear and freedom from want” when the UN was founded in 1945. After the Cold War, a new broader perspective and conceptualisation of security was needed after the narrow state-centric view of security. It was seen

that during a time of a decreasing amount of inter-state conflicts, focus on the security of humans was more important, since many threats also exist within countries, such as intra-state conflicts, poverty, environmental degradation, crime and repression. Emphasis was put on what makes people feel secure or insecure. Therefore, the UN took a human rights and development-focused approach to the concept of human security.

The term human security was used for the first time in 1994 in the *Human Development Report* of the UN Development Programme (UNDP). There human security was defined as having two main aspects: “first, safety from such chronic threats as hunger, disease and repression. And second, it means protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the patterns of daily life – whether in homes, in jobs or in communities. Such threats can exist at all levels of national income and development“ (UNDP 1994, 23). The essential characteristics of human security were defined as universality, interdependency, early prevention and people-centredness. The report also divided human security into seven dimensions: economic, food, health, environmental, personal, community and political security. All these elements of human security are interlinked, and a threat to one of them can affect the other dimensions.

The concept of human security started to gain interest by the end of the 1990s and the early 2000s, when its definitions started to be included in more research articles in addition to policy papers, leading the concept to have several definitions and interpretations, for both academics and practitioners. Human security became part of academic debate, international organisations started to become interested in adopting it, and even some countries, such as Canada and Japan, started using human security as a policy tool. A clear distinction of interpretations of human security was described between narrow and broad definitions. The narrow definition emphasises the security of individual people, for example against state violence, which is close to the “responsibility to protect” approach adopted by the Canadian Government. A more comprehensive, broader, definition was the development-focused definition by the UNDP. Kaldor (2007, 178) argued that the best way to describe human security is to combine both, as people need to be protected but their human rights and access to social welfare must also be ensured.

The Commission on Human Security was established in the UN to “promote public understanding, engagement and support of human security and its underlying imperatives; develop the concept of human security as an operational tool for policy formulation and implementation; and propose a concrete programme of action to address critical and pervasive threats to human security” (Commission on Human Security 2003, 153). The report of the Commission defined human security as protecting “the vital core of all human lives in ways that enhance human freedoms and human fulfilment” (Commission on Human Security 2003, 4).

2.2 Human security as part of the EU's foreign and security policy

The EU, on the other hand, has not had an official definition of human security, regardless of the attention human security attracted in the EU as a possible foreign and security policy approach during the first two decades of the 2000s (Kaldor and Selchow 2018). Three reports on human security approaches were made for the EU by the Human Security Study Group (HSSG) which was convened by Mary Kaldor, professor at the London School of Economics (LSE). The first two reports were commissioned by Javier Solana, then the EU High Representative for Common Foreign and Security Policy, and the third by Federica Mogherini, then the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.

The first report, *A Human Security Doctrine for Europe* (2004) was about the implementation of the European Security Strategy adopted in 2003. The report argued that “Europe needs the capability to make a more active contribution to global security” (Human Security Study Group 2004, 5) and suggested that human security would be the appropriate approach for the EU. The report proposed a human security doctrine that also included elements of civilian crisis management. The second report, *A European Way of Security* (Human Security Study Group 2007) further proposed that the EU should commit to human security principles in its external operations and operationalise this on the ground, talking particularly about the EU's civilian and military missions. The third report, *From Hybrid Peace to Human Security: Rethinking EU Strategy towards Conflict* (Human Security Study Group 2016) wanted to use the principles of human security to respond to the crises of the 21st century, and suggested that human security approaches include:

- Creative diplomacy at all levels, including smart multilateralism
- An emphasis on justice across the entire spectrum of abuse and criminality prevalent in today's conflicts
- The use of smart sanctions where they involve engagement with civil society, impact monitoring and compliance with international law
- Conditionality aimed at countering predation, corruption, sectarianism and impunity rather than introducing neo-liberal reforms
- Civilian-led missions that include some combination of humanitarian workers, human rights monitors, legal experts, police and, where needed, military forces, and that involve both men and women.

The third report on human security by the HSSG is slightly different from the first two, and it clearly wants to make a distinction from them based on the foreign and security policy environment in 2016. The *Global Strategy for the European Union's Foreign and Security Policy* from 2016 included several themes from the third HSSG report and used human security as a term, which suggests that the human security approach found its way into EU policy papers even though the EU had not defined the concept itself (Kaldor and Selchow 2018).

2.3 The latest human security approaches of international organisations

The latest definition from the UN states that “human security is an approach to assist Member States in identifying and addressing widespread and cross-cutting challenges to the survival, livelihood and dignity of their people” (UN 2012, 1). The right of people to live in freedom and dignity, free from poverty and despair, and the notion of everyone’s entitlement to freedom from fear and freedom from want are essential parts of the UN approach to human security. Distinct in the approach is that “human security calls for people-centred, comprehensive, context-specific and prevention-oriented responses that strengthen the protection and empowerment of all people and all communities” (ibid., 1). It also highlights that human security is based on national ownership. The UN emphasises responding to the interconnected human insecurities people and communities face because it is rarely a single issue that causes insecurity. The UN Human Security Trust Fund finances various programmes in different countries implemented by UN funds, programmes and specialised agencies.

The EU’s *Strategic Compass for Security and Defence* (2022), the most recent plan of action for strengthening the EU’s security and defence policy by 2030, does not define the EU’s approach to human security but mentions the concept a couple of times and makes it clear that the EU is strongly committed to promoting and advancing human security within and outside the EU.

NATO has only recently adopted the concept of human security as “a multi-sectoral approach that focuses on the protection of people and communities from a range of threats and vulnerabilities” (NATO 2024, 5). An interesting difference to the previous approaches and definitions of human security is that “for NATO the term human security refers to the risks and threats to civilian populations which may arise in all that the Alliance does” (ibid., 6). This means that the risks to human security arise from the actions of NATO rather than from somewhere else, and therefore the Alliance must keep civilians secure.

However, NATO's approach also has some more common features with the UN approach, such as it being people-centred, gender-responsive and protection-oriented. In the work of NATO, human security encompasses five areas of work: protection of civilians, preventing and responding to conflict-related sexual violence, combatting trafficking in human beings, children and armed conflict, and cultural property protection.

3 Human security in civilian crisis management

To better understand the perceptions and definitions of human security in the context of civilian crisis management a questionnaire was sent to 103 Finnish civilian crisis management secondees, and 14 of them (14 %) answered the questionnaire. They worked in mission, field office and secretariat positions at the UN, EU, NATO, OSCE, ICC and Council of Europe. Many of the respondents defined human security more or less similarly, the focus being on humans instead of the state. It was also common that individual needs and different dimensions of human security were highlighted when the respondents gave their personal definitions of human security. Individual needs also create different types of security needs, along the lines of the 1994 UNDP definition, such as personal, community and food security. However, many respondents did not seem to know if their operation, secretariat or international organisation had a definition of human security, and the term human security was not highly present in the everyday life of the operations and secretariats. Five Finnish and non-Finnish experts working at the UN, EU, NATO and ICC were also interviewed. They described how human security is present in their work and in their organisations. Here the questionnaire and interview data are presented organisation by organisation together with the current human security context in civilian crisis management.

3.1 UN

There has been discussion as to whether the increased militarisation of UN stabilisation missions harms the human security of local people. Physical protection in a form of protection of civilians has therefore been given more importance, and it has become the core focus in UN peace operations in terms of the human security approach (Gilder 2024). The protection of civilians in UN peacekeeping is defined as “without prejudice to the primary responsibility of the host state, integrated and coordinated activities by all civilian and

uniformed mission components to prevent, deter or respond to threats of physical violence against civilians, within the mission’s capabilities and areas of deployment, through the use of all necessary means, up to and including deadly force” (UN 2020, 3). Therefore, the concepts of human security and protection of civilians are different, because human security is more comprehensive and cross-cutting, whereas protection of civilians aims to protect civilians from physical violence.

Enhancing human security should be much more than protection from physical violence. Different human security dimensions, such as community, political and environmental security, could also be addressed. UN peace operations should address the root causes of insecurities together with communities and individuals, which then creates more human security. (Gilder 2021, 2024) The United Nations Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) was an implementing agency in several human security programmes of the UN Human Security Trust Fund¹ years ago, but otherwise UN peace operations have not been implementers of programmes. However, human security in the UN approach overarches all the pillars of the UN, so it should also be part of the peace and security pillar of which peacekeeping is part.

The personal human security definitions of the questionnaire respondents seconded to the UN were close to the UN definition of human security. Dignity and different security needs were highlighted. The protection of civilians as UN peace operations’ approach to human security was also present in the answers. Human security could be seen in the respondents’ work by their supporting and training rule of law state actors in protecting civilians, human rights and how to treat the victims of crime.

According to an informant working in a UN police mission, protection of civilians is in the mandate and at the heart of everything. For individual police officers, it is mainly training and awareness-raising. The foreign police unit also carries out physical protection. The mission cooperates with other UN entities and local organisations. However, this does not mean this is a UN human security project, but indicates cooperation with stakeholders and the importance of local ownership. Even though the UN has a distinct human security approach, human security as a term is not mentioned in the mission, but protection of civilians is talked about, according to the informant. The respondents to the questionnaire also related that human security was not mentioned anywhere in the UN peace operations where they worked. The informant worked in another UN peace operation earlier and related that there the presence and visibility of the UN enhanced the feeling of security of the local people.

¹ <https://www.un.org/humansecurity/country/kosovo/>

3.2 EU

Human security has been especially apparent in the EU's civilian crisis management. It seems that the human security approach and EU civilian crisis management were built to be very much alike because they have both been developed simultaneously since the early 2000s. As civilian crisis management also works as a preventative tool and, for example, builds capacities and state security structures, it enhances human security. Because the HSSG essentially developed the concept for European security and defence policy, they managed to enable "a learning process among EU decision makers and actors" to be able to move the focus of crisis management "from stabilisation of a conflict area to a sustainable human security" (Tamminen 2008, 3). CMC Finland also published a training manual on human security in peacebuilding in 2009 and supported the HSSG in making the second report.

However, the current documents on the civilian Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) do not include a definition of human security, nor do they mention the term "human security" much. For example, the *Civilian CSDP Compact* (2023) does not mention human security explicitly, but some of its themes can be identified as advancing human security:

- Local ownership, assessing needs of the host country and enhancing cooperation with civil society at all levels
- Acting throughout the entire conflict cycle
- Addressing security challenges of climate change and environmental degradation
- Promoting and mainstreaming human rights systematically in all activities and exercise human rights due diligence, conflict sensitivity and the do-no-harm approach, to ensure compliance with international law
- Promoting protection of civilians
- Strengthening implementation of the women, peace and security agenda
- Protecting the EU and its citizens
- Promoting the rule of law and accountability in host countries

It is possible that the human security approach was mainstreamed to the EU's civilian CSDP structures during the first two decades of the 2000s and is, therefore, no longer widely referred to as a concept. Instead, the principles and themes are still part of the civilian CSDP, which could inform about the mainstreaming. Also, the EU's security environment and the foreign and security policy focus have shifted, which could mean that human security has no longer been seen as an important topic to emphasise.

Half of the questionnaire respondents in EU civilian crisis management missions and secretariat positions defined human security as individual security that focuses on humans rather than on a state. One respondent defined it as the overall security of a mission member, which indeed focuses on a human, but quite narrowly on a mission member. Two respondents did not know how to define human security. Regardless, everyone saw that human security is part of their work. However, the understanding of the concept could affect their other answers and not everyone described how human security is part of their work. This indicates that the human security concept is not clear to all experts.

The EU Mission in Armenia (EUMA), established in 2023, is the only civilian CSDP mission that currently has the term “human security” in its mandate. One of its mandated tasks is to contribute to “human security in conflict-affected areas, inter alia by gathering information through ad hoc patrolling and reporting on situations where, due to direct or indirect consequences of the conflict, life and basic human rights are endangered” (Council of the European Union 2023). In this task, protection of civilians and the principles of protecting and promoting human rights are in focus.

Even though human security is not mentioned in the mandate of the EU Monitoring Mission in Georgia (EUMM Georgia), the mission has human security teams in all field offices. According to an informant from EUMM Georgia, during patrols, the human security teams talk to people living along the Administrative Boundary Lines (ABL), checking on their human security by asking about their basic needs and feeling of security. In short, the team’s work is to find information on all the issues that human security includes and report on them. Human security is directly linked to the normalisation of everyday life of the people along the ABL and internally displaced people, for example. The teams are also trying to find information about human security in the occupied territories, but they can only monitor the Tbilisi-administrated side, so information-gathering can be difficult sometimes. One way to follow this is through immediate response mechanism meetings OSCE and EUMM hold with both sides of the borderline. Gender mainstreaming also easily falls under the human security team, which they do for example by organising events. Cultural heritage is also part of the team’s work, by checking if people have access to cultural heritage sites along the boundary line or access to churches. They also ask people about the use of languages in schools.

Human security teams’ reporting is used for immediate response mechanism meetings where their practical information about human security needs, such as the potable water situation, is shared. The human security team also cooperates with organisations working with conflict-affected people. The human security team, however, is slightly unstructured according to the informant

because they do not have a particular aim. Sometimes the team is requested by a special report by the mission headquarters, and the reporting section of the mission often chooses human security issues for their reports sent to Civilian Operations Headquarters. Therefore, the informant told they feel the work of the human security team is important. The presence of the EUMM monitors also sometimes makes local people feel safe:

“What I do feel is important if we’re not talking about reporting, but if we’re talking about us and being present along the ABL is that people very often they say thank you for being here. We like you, we feel safe when you’re around.” Informant 1

The informant from a UN police mission made a similar observation that the visibility of peace operation personnel can contribute to the feeling of security of the local population.

Even though EUMM Georgia has human security teams, the introduction presentations to new personnel do not include a definition of human security, which can leave mission members uncertain about what the term means. Therefore, it is important to explain to new mission members what human security is. However, the practical work of the teams goes along the UN approach of human security.

Some respondents to the questionnaire said that human security is part of their EU mission or secretariat’s work, but most often not explicitly. Only one concrete example was given, that human security is mentioned in the mission statement of their secretariat division. Respondents were generally sure that the EU has a definition for human security, but they did not know what the definition is because it has not been visible or talked about anywhere.

3.3 NATO

In the context of NATO’s core task of crisis prevention and management, it mentions that integrating the human security approach “promotes long-term, sustainable peace, security and stability through cooperation with the local authorities, population and civil society” (NATO 2024, 17), making it almost refer to national ownership. NATO does not have civilian crisis management missions, but it is useful to examine how the concept has recently been perceived in the political and military alliance, and how it could change the human security approach in crisis management, but also more broadly in the discussion around international security.

The questionnaire respondent working at NATO defined human security along the lines of NATO's human security definition and emphasised the focus on a human instead of a state. NATO's specific human security approach was new for one of the informants when they started to work at NATO, even though the concept of human security was not new to them.

Because NATO has adopted a human security approach, the implementation of the approach is also operationalised there. As human security is one of the cross-cutting themes at NATO, the staff in advisory tasks should also implement it across their actions, according to an informant working in NATO. There is also a human security advisor whose primary task is human security implementation by advising others to integrate the topic in their work and to directly advise partners on the topic. Human security is still mainstreamed in all the activities of the organisation because it is a new concept for NATO. However, for example, one informant said that human security is not especially mentioned in the basic induction training for the new staff. Furthermore, because NATO's human security approach is wide, one informant said that there is not an equal focus on all the five perspectives of human security.

According to the informants from NATO, there are several other topics that are closely linked with human security. For example, human security is often mentioned alongside international humanitarian law, and the NATO concepts of human security and women, peace and security are interlinked.

Contrary to the perception the NATO documents can give on human security, human security in NATO does not only mean maintaining human security in NATO's own actions even though it is also part of it:

“It's not only ensuring that the adversary can do harm, but also provides access to basic needs and creates secure environment. So, that is more broad societal support to human security.” Informant 5

3.4 Other organisations

The OSCE respondents defined human security in the questionnaire mainly from the UN perspective. However, one of them described that human security is military strategic security and the responsibility of the state to protect the security of its people, which is closer to the NATO approach to human security. One of the OSCE respondents related that human security is part of their work through working with local state security authorities, which comes close to the protection of civilians. One respondent said that human security is not part

of the language of the OSCE because the discourse of the organisation is on comprehensive security, which consists of the politico-military dimension, the economic and environmental dimension and the human dimension.

One respondent from the ICC defined human security in a comprehensive manner which emphasised complementarity of human security to state-centredness, human rights and “constructing the kind of transnational international institutions that can protect them”. However, human security as a concept has not been considered or mentioned at the ICC. The informant who worked there explained that at the ICC, human security is most apparent in the work with victims of international crimes. The human security of the victims has been compromised, and the combination of international criminal justice, human security and human rights have been violated:

“The ICC works to advance human rights. And human security’s approach, that also has the same cause in a way. So, there is this connection between human security and International Criminal Court, and human rights is sort of a combining factor between the two.” Informant 3

The personal human security definition of the respondent from the Council of Europe placed emphasis on a person’s feeling of security in their everyday life. Human security is indirectly part of their work through advancing democracy and civic space.

4 Different approaches of the international organisations

The UN, the EU and NATO all have a comprehensive and wide approach to human security, but it is demonstrated in different ways in practice. The UN might have the most comprehensive approach, which is also rooted in human rights and is development-focused. The UN describes that responses to threats should be people-centred, comprehensive, context-specific and prevention-oriented, but does not define how to respond on an operational level because it should be context-specific. Human security in the EU’s civilian CSDP structures is quite comprehensive as well, but the approach seems to be more tied to the operations, such as through human security teams and how to advance human security comprehensively in other operations of the missions. The EU is the only organisation that does not have an official document defining its approach to human security. NATO calls its human security approach multi-sectoral and has five areas of work related to human security. However, these are not as comprehensive as the UN approach, for example. Also, specific to NATO’s approach

in its human security document is that human security refers to the risks and threats to civilian populations which may arise in all that the Alliance does, even though an interviewee mentioned that it does not only concern NATO's own actions.

Even though the UN was the first to adopt the concept and places much emphasis on it in the organisation, when concerning (civilian) crisis management, UN peace operations emphasise human security the least and is not very comprehensive, as the concept is most apparent in the form of the protection of civilians in UN peace operations. It seems that it is the work of other UN agencies to work with human security. In contrast, the EU, despite its lack of an official definition, has human security mainstreamed in its civilian crisis management structures and has human security related tasks in the form of patrolling and reporting in couple of missions, such as EUMM Georgia and EUM Armenia. In NATO, human security is gaining attention on an operational level and the concept is still being mainstreamed.

The approaches differ because of the different natures, goals and ambitions of the organisations. For example, the responsibilities and strategic objectives of the UN and NATO are different: "NATO is a security organization tasked with keeping its member states secure, while the UN is a collective forum supporting broader pre- and post-conflict programming, including peacebuilding and development" (Meharg & Okros 2025, 9). Therefore, the organisations approach human security from their own points of view.

Human security can also be used as "an agenda-setting concept" for an organisation to bring the most important needs of individuals onto the agenda of action that have been excluded from the traditional concept of and discussion on international security (Gilder 2024, 7). This means that an international organisation can also be context-specific and focus on specific threats to human security. In the EU, this could be seen as going along the lines of the political views of the EU and its member states. For example, while a human security approach in EU foreign and security policy was initially created to address security risks outside the EU, now that the EU is experiencing threats from inside, the security narrative is also changing (Bargués 2025).

It seems that the UN approach to human security is the most widely known and used approach, and the EU and NATO apply it in their own approaches. It has been argued that because NATO's approach is new, there is a good opportunity for the organisation to take a lead and "develop sophisticated mechanisms for the detection of human security threats and military and civil responses" (Gilder 2024, 9-10). This could lead to NATO's human security approach becoming the leading approach for many, especially in the field of military and defence, with people and different organisations understanding the concept in different ways. It can be a positive aspect that human security

thinking is applied in different international organisations and in their own contexts of work. However, if the NATO approach starts to contest the more comprehensive human security concept of the UN, this can become a risk for multidimensional human security thinking where all the security needs of people are addressed.

5 Conclusion

While human security has become a term used in civilian crisis management, the definition is not widely explained to experts working with human security themes, according to the questionnaire and interviews of this working paper. Therefore, several competing understandings and definitions of human security exist. Furthermore, the concept of human security is not much talked about in operations and secretariats unless they have specific structures or tasks involving the concept. When looking at the mandates and work of civilian crisis management of the EU, UN, NATO and others, they have elements of the comprehensive UN human security approach. For example, the work of civilian crisis management towards good governance, sustainable institutions, security sector reform and gender equality enhance human security.

When considering what the views on human security look like in the larger field of international security and politics, it initially seems that the concept has not received much attention recently because of the emphasis on militarisation and power politics. One exception is NATO's new approach to bring human security into the field of military and defence.²

In the context of the EU and the environment of new security threats, the response to them will not be sustainable if the principles of human security approach are not considered. There is a real need in the EU for investing in defence, but in the end, it is humans who live within and outside the EU, and the thinking should also concern their security and what makes them feel secure, as opposed to approaching security solely from the state perspective. On the other hand, threats to human security are generally interdependent and therefore, "human security and state-centred security are not opposite terms; instead they, if anything complete on another. Threat to a state can also be considered to be a threat to human security and vice versa" (Korhonen 2011, 22).

² Although, for example the Ministry of Defence of the United Kingdom published an authoritative policy on human security in defence in 2021: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/human-security-in-defence-jsp-985>

It has been suggested that a new term for human security should be invented (Bargués 2025) which will better describe how security is needed. Recently, new initiatives in redefining human security back to the older comprehensive approach have emerged. The recent report of the UN Secretary-General, *The Security We Need* (2025, 7), which addresses sustainable alternatives for military spending, “calls for a fundamental shift in how we understand and pursue security”. The report talks about human-centred security as an alternative to traditional state-centric military security. Furthermore, the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security and the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute have been organising a series of Nordic Dialogues on Human Security which explore how a human-centred lens can help navigate an evolving global landscape.³ These developments suggest that there are also ongoing assessments and discussions on how to ensure the security of people in the national, foreign and security policies and how to redefine security.

Bibliography

Commission on Human Security (2003): Human Security Now. <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/503749?ln=en&v=pdf>, 21.1.2026.

Council of the European Union (2023): Council Decision (CFSP) 2023/162 of 23 January 2023 on a European Union mission in Armenia (EUMA). <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32023D0162>, 9.9.2025.

Bargués, Pol (2025): “A farewell to human security in EU policy thinking?” Regroup, Focus paper no. 6. <https://www.cidob.org/en/publications/farewell-human-security-eu-policy-thinking>, 22.1.2026.

Gilder, Alexander (2021): *Stabilization and Human Security in UN Peace Operations*. Oxford: Routledge.

Gilder, Alexander (2024): “Peace Operations and Human Security”. *Journal of International Peacekeeping*, 27, 1-11. DOI:10.1163/18754112-27010004.

Human Security Study Group (2004): *A Human Security Doctrine for Europe*. https://www.europarl.europa.eu/meetdocs/2004_2009/documents/dv/human_security_report/_human_security_report_en.pdf, 21.1.2026.

³ Nordic Dialogues on Human Security: <https://www.un.org/humansecurity/nordic-dialogues-on-human-security-human-centred-security-in-a-changing-geopolitical-landscape-perspectives-from-sweden/> and *Human Security in a New Era: Finnish Reflections and Global Implications* <https://fiia.fi/tapahtumat/human-security-in-a-new-era-finnish-reflections-and-global-implications#>

Human Security Study Group (2007): A European Way of Security. [https://eprints.lse.ac.uk/40207/1/A_European_Way_of_Security\(author\).pdf](https://eprints.lse.ac.uk/40207/1/A_European_Way_of_Security(author).pdf), 21.1.2026.

Human Security Study Group (2016): From Hybrid Peace to Human Security: Rethinking EU Strategy towards Conflict. https://eprints.lse.ac.uk/84978/1/Kaldor_From%20hybrid%20peace%20to%20human%20security_2017.pdf, 21.1.2026.

Kaldor, Mary (2007): Human Security. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Kaldor, Mary & Sabine Selchow (2018): "Conclusion: the EU Global Strategy and contemporary conflicts – how much second-generation human security is possible?" In M. Kaldor, I. Rangelov and S. Selchow (Eds.) EU Global Strategy and Human Security: Rethinking Approaches to Conflict, 256-271. Oxford: Routledge.

Kaldor, Mary & Sabine Selchow (2018): "Introduction". In M. Kaldor, I. Rangelov and S. Selchow (Eds.) EU Global Strategy and Human Security : Rethinking Approaches to Conflict, 14-25. Oxford: Routledge.

Korhonen, Senja (2011): "A change of paradigm – Towards human security?" In O. Alm and T. Juntunen (Eds.) Human Security - Perspectives and Practical Examples. 16-26. Helsinki: The Civil Society Conflict Prevention Network KATU.

Meharg, Sarah Jane & Alan Okros (2025): "Conceptualizing human security". Canadian Military Journal, 25(2), 8-13. https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2025/mdn-dnd/D12-8-25-2-eng.pdf, 21.1.2026.

NATO (2024): Human Security Agenda. https://www.nato.int/content/dam/nato/legacy-wcm/media_pdf/2024/8/pdf/240830-human-security-en.pdf, 21.1.2026.

Tamminen, Tanja (2008): Human Security in Post-Status Kosovo: a Shared European Responsibility, CMC Finland Civilian Crisis Management Studies, 1(4/2008). https://www.cmcfinland.fi/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/66418_Studies_4_Tamminen.pdf, 21.1.2026.

UN (2012): General Assembly Resolution 66/290. Follow-up to paragraph 143 on human security of the 2005 World Summit Outcome. <https://documents.un.org/doc/undoc/gen/n11/476/22/pdf/n1147622.pdf>, 21.1.2026.

UN (2020): Handbook: The Protection of Civilians in UN Peacekeeping. https://peacekeeping.un.org/sites/default/files/dpo_poc_handbook_final_as_printed.pdf, 20.1.2026.

UN (2025): The Security We Need. https://front.un-arm.org/Milex-SDG-Study/SG_Report_TheSecurityWeNeed.pdf, 22.1.2026.

UNDP (1994): Human Development Report. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://hdr.undp.org/system/files/documents/hdr1994encompletenostats.pdf>, 21.1.2026.

Photo on the front cover: Johanna Malmelin, Georgia

Photo on the back cover: EUCAP Somalia

